

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Air Quality	Andrea Lambert	Response-00357	Added traffic will add to pollution from the number of vehicles using it
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Air Quality	Ashley	Response-00426	The congestion around the area will cause pollution to the local wildlife
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Air Quality	ASHLEY STOWER	Response-01183	Air Quality will be affected considerably with 600 new homes there will be probably at least one / two per house up to four so realistically between 1200 - 200 cars & new car movements. This will effect air quality & living conditions considerably , increased congestion will lead to poor air quality & reduced health.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Air Quality	Brendan Horgan	Response-00610	Standing traffic due to congestion at school times
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Air Quality	Carl	Response-00386	Yet more pollution when vehicles are sat waiting at either end of acorn way
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Air Quality	Chris copley	Response-01246	The air quality will undoubtedly be affected, we have a school, a nursing home and a large school in the exact area. The drop in air quality will have a negative impact on these people's, health as they are also the most vulnerable to these effects
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Air Quality	Clare Tomlinson	Response-00423	Currently, air quality appears to be good - this would be significantly reduced by increased vehicular activity and removal of green space.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Air Quality	Danielle Andrews	Response-01244	The level of proposed housing feels extremely large for the area. With an extra 1000 plus people, there is likely to be a similar quantity of cars which the road isn't designed for.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Air Quality	David Massey	Response-00575	No mention is made of reduction in air quality which will clearly be reduced by added traffic, added bonfires, added wood burner users etc
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Air Quality	David Rees	Response-00566	It is obvious that both during the building phase and steady-state, the significant increase in vehicular traffic on Morley Road must reduce the air quality for its residents.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Air Quality	Donna Pearson	Response-00441	Adding more congestion to the area at rush hours is!ll be detrimental to peoples health..
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Air Quality	Edward James Gregory	Response-00727	Acorn way is very busy, with bad visibility and drainage, and the site of many accidents. Further development will increase congestion, usage and reduce air quality. There are no busses, road is too dangerous for cycling so everyone will use cars increasing pollution
			Gary Murfin	Response-00373	Based on each new home owner having at least one car, maybe more air quality will suffer
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Air Quality	Gillian stillwell	Response-01364	The excessive traffic at school start and finish times added to the extra traffic that will be inevitable will of course decrease air quality
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Air Quality	Glynn Booker	Response-00394	Currently the natural flora has a chance to absorb the amount of carbon produced, the additional concrete and tarmac will mean less carbon absorption especially with the increase in traffic.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Air Quality	Helen Walker	Response-00333	More traffic more air pollution and the air quality is just going to get worse more standing traffic
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Air Quality	Iain Campbell	Response-01179	With a potential of 1100 cars and an increase of buses this will effect the air quality!
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Air Quality	James Bellaby	Response-00340	More cars less quality. More houses more heat generated in that area. Less greenery less oxygen.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Air Quality	Jane Pitwood	Response-01366	Increasing the amount of traffic can only reduce the air quality, particularly as the building of properties in the area will reduce the amount of green space. Maintaining areas of green space is essential in helping to reduce carbon emissions.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Air Quality	Karl Barlow	Response-00756	It's not going to help. The houses will be near Acorn Way, so not ideal.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Air Quality	Laura	Response-00387	Subject: Objection to Planning for 550 Houses on Acorn Way and 160 Houses on Breadsall Hilltop Dear Sir/Madam, I am writing to formally object to the planning for 550 houses on Acorn Way and a further 160 houses on Breadsall Hilltop in Derby. I believe these developments are unsustainable and will have a significantly detrimental impact on the existing community and infrastructure. My objections are based on the following key concerns: 1. Misrepresentation of Target Residents and Increased Traffic: The proposal claims the development on Acorn Way will serve people who wish to live in Ilkeston, Long Eaton and Sandiacre, which is a fantasy. They are 20+ minutes away. The inevitable consequence of these 710 new households will be a substantial increase in traffic. Derby has high pollution levels and this will increase traffic further. 2. Over-Subscription of Local Schools: The schools in the areas surrounding both Acorn Way and Breadsall Hilltop are already over subscribed. The addition of these 710 houses will place an unsustainable burden on these educational facilities. 3. Over-Subscription of Local GP Surgeries: The GP surgeries in the areas surrounding both Acorn Way and Breadsall Hilltop are already over subscribed. The addition of these 710 houses will place an unsustainable burden on these healthcare services. 4. Increased Flood Risk at Breadsall Hilltop: In recent inclement weather, Breadsall village has flooded. Building 160 houses on the land at Breadsall Hilltop will cause further run off and increase the flood risk to Breadsall village and surrounding areas. In conclusion, I strongly believe that these planning applications for 550 houses on Acorn Way and 160 houses on Breadsall Hilltop are ill-conceived and fail to adequately consider the significant negative impacts they will have on the existing community and infrastructure of Derby. I urge the planning authority to reject these applications. A development of this scale in these locations is unsustainable and will severely compromise the quality of life for current and future residents of Derby. Yours faithfully, Mrs Lincoln
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Air Quality	Lewis	Response-00533	Will have negative impact on air quality.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Air Quality	Liz Lockwood	Response-00464	Any increase in cars on Acorn Way will affect the air quality on the road and on the development
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Air Quality	Lou Davis	Response-00336	The green wedge between Oakwood and Spondon allows for some element of reduction in the pollution from the road use.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Air Quality	Lucy Skeet	Response-00388	This will affect the air quality negatively of course
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Air Quality	Mandy Cooling	Response-00313	Destroying natural habitat will continue to wreak unknown hazard to the environment at a time it is so perilous - including destroying air quality
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Air Quality	Mandy Dickens	Response-00425	Due to the additional traffic, which will be at a standstill, the exhaust fumes will add to the already bad air pollution in that area
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Air Quality	Mark potter	Response-00378	Oakwood has already had around 500 houses already build on it with 5 years adding more pollution to the area and you want to add another 550 off acorn way and 180 more off bishops drive adding more pollution to an already populated area let alone the noise pollution

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
	Acorn Way, Derby	Air Quality	Mathew Lennox-Quinn	Response-01363	Goes without saying removing open fields will make air quality worse and flooding
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Air Quality	Nat	Response-00155	Increased pollution due to more vehicles in the area
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Air Quality	Natalie Peake	Response-00794	The increase in vehicle numbers will result in higher air pollution levels, particularly impacting children and young people walking to and from school each day, as well as local residents. The combination of increased congestion and pollution will have a devastating effect on road safety and air quality?both of which are critical to the wellbeing of the community.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Air Quality	Nathan Latymer	Response-00363	The traffic and pollution in this area is awful as it is, with no need for it to be made any worse by adding loads of houses, especially at the island between Acorn Way and Raynesway.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Air Quality	Nick & Jacqui McCrorie	Response-01361	Increased traffic in the area will worsen air pollution
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Air Quality	Nick Charles	Response-01370	According to Plant Life, approximately 68 tons of carbon per hectare (t C ha) is sequestered in neutral grassland per year, in the soil and roots of grass, which remains locked away in the undisturbed soil. And of course, as part of the process of photosynthesis, those grasses help produce the oxygen that we all breathe. The site of approx., 24 ha therefore contains over 1,630 tons of carbon, most of which will be released into the atmosphere, if building is allowed to go ahead. Air quality will be reduced by removing the trees and grass which absorb carbon and the particulates from vehicles, queuing with their engines running at peak times. (See Road Safety and Traffic Congestion above)
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Air Quality	Nicki Harries	Response-00541	More cars, more pollution in what should be a lovely area to live
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Air Quality	Nicola Oliver	Response-00434	More traffic will increase air pollution and affect people?s health
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Air Quality	Oakwood Ward Councillors Eyre, Muthall and Trehwella	Response-01358	The comments in our previous objection remain relevant.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Air Quality	Paul Burge	Response-00289	With the congestion this development brings poorer air quality is bound to follow.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Air Quality	Peter Marshall	Response-00526	The development will significantly increase local traffic, leading to higher emissions and poorer air quality. This poses a serious risk to public health.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Air Quality	Rachael Hinckley	Response-01166	With a potential of 1100 cars this will effect the air quality
			Robert Collis	Response-00355	The increase traffic flow which will increase standing traffic will have a negative effect on the air quality for all
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Air Quality	Scarlett Hamblin	Response-00395	Global warming is an ever increasing problem and by increasing the number of cars and housing it is increasing the global warming contribution. We can do without these houses. We need green spaces to allow the earth to recover from the effects of climate change.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Air Quality	Sharon Coward	Response-00360	Increased traffic will negatively impact the air quality.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Air Quality	Tanya Caldbeck	Response-00919	To many fumes from more housing in area
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Bus Services	Andrea Lambert	Response-00357	Oakwood has limited bus services and the building of more houses will make the matter worse.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Bus Services	Arthur Boulton	Response-01097	There will be no improvement in public transport
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Bus Services	Ashley	Response-00426	Morley Road is a bus road however it is already a problem as the roads are not wide enough
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Bus Services	Carl	Response-00386	More buses required more pollution
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Bus Services	Clare Tomlinson	Response-00423	Are not adequate There is a bus with limited operating times on Morley Road - this does not run on a Sunday.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Bus Services	Courtney Hodges	Response-00403	As our buses have recently been changed, having more houses added will mean the bus services are more busy and will take longer to get into town. This will result in people driving to work, instead of getting the bus
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Bus Services	Danielle Andrews	Response-01244	The bus service already is adequate on this route, this service isn?t excessively used and extra funding should go towards retaining biodiversity and green space around housing
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Bus Services	David Massey	Response-00575	Whilst improved bus service would be welcome the reality is that these homes will all have two cars and won't use the buses, particularly when the bus service will just be wound down
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Bus Services	David Rees	Response-00566	The amended wording ?Financial contributions to increase the frequency of improve bus services and bus halts along Morley Road? is suspicious. The problem with current bus services along Morley Road [Route 32] is that the buses run only hourly. The quality of buses is not an issue, but the frequency is. ?Improve bus services? could just mean new seats on the existing buses! No, this wording is too loose and will not do; one could drive a double-decker bus though these words [excuse the pun]. The original wording ?increase the frequency of bus services? should be retained, together with ?and improve bus halts?. Furthermore, ?Financial contributions? is too loose: how much and for how long needs to be scoped.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Bus Services	Douglas Chambers	Response-01235	Further delays caused by and to buses and passengers will severely handicap particularly the elderly who rely upon the service.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Bus Services	Edward James Gregory	Response-00727	There are no buses here so they cannot be used! This will require all residents to use their own cars and cycling is too dangerous
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Bus Services	Gary Murfin	Response-00373	I'm just reading the comments about bus services, there obviously will have to be more bus?s and routes, also I can?t understand why the bus routes through Danebridge crescent are affected, which is near where I live
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Bus Services	Glynn Booker	Response-00394	Busses going to town don't have suitable paths and safe crossing for children. Busses have been reduced in number so unless these are being increased then mist people will elect to use cars instead.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Bus Services	Helen Walker	Response-00333	What buses no buses go down Acorn Way !
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Bus Services	James Hope	Response-00548	Morley Road is currently only served by one bus each way per hour, the Black Cat service between Derby and Mansfield. A financial contribution to support additional services per hour, either a more frequent Black Cat service or an alternative service to Derby, will be required to make public transport use a viable option for the residents of the new development
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Bus Services	Jane Pitwood	Response-01366	I don't understand how improving bus services on Danebridge Crescent will help with people using public transport in the Acorn Way area!
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Bus Services	Janette Glenn	Response-00421	There are no bus services serving Acorn Way and only the Black Cat serving Morley Road. Residents are therefore likely to use their cars and add to existing pollution and congestion.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Bus Services	Karl Barlow	Response-00756	There are already good bus services. The buses will just be snarled up in all the extra traffic, so this can only be negative.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Bus Services	Kelsey Strachan	Response-00377	Bus service is non existent on Morley Road and other Oakwood services especially infrequent or far from Morely road. Increasing them through investment supposedly expected from this development will be short term and quickly useless. Morley road is too narrow to accommodate regular buses as evidenced by the commotion one bus going down there causes due to cars parked on the road already.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Bus Services	Liz Lockwood	Response-00464	There are no bus services on Acorn Way . The proposals are for people to join bus services that serve Morley Road and Oakwood. Morley road is only served by a small no of services which do not run late at night or have a regular frequency How would people access these services - there are no pavements on Acorn Way . Any route for through the proposed estate would be a long walk.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Bus Services	Lou Davis	Response-00336	The bus service along Morley Road is infrequent and not suitable for the additional impact of 500 additional houses. Local public transport is not adequate immediately adjacent to this proposed development.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Bus Services	Mark potter	Response-00378	I believe There is no bus route that goes down acorn way so agin it?s not easley accessible and people will be driving there cars on acorn way making an already fast congested and dangerous road even more dangerous absolute madness agin
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Bus Services	Mathew Lennox-Quinn	Response-01363	Bus service pointless
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Bus Services	Nick Charles	Response-01370	There is only one bus per hour that runs along Morley Road (32), between Derby city centre and Ilkeston and it does not run in the evening or on Sundays. And since the change to the timetables, the 26 service is now a half hour service as well. The ?Financial contributions to improve bus services and bus halts along Morley Road? is a ridiculous statement, as there are already enough bus stops, but not enough buses for a development of this size. The government is encouraging new housing estates to be built where there is plenty of public transport, so as not to make them car dependent, however this will not be the case here.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Bus Services	Oakwood Ward Councillors Eyre, Mulhall and Trehwella	Response-01358	We believe the comments in our previous objection remain relevant. We fail to believe that improvements to bus halts, and the service provided, without seeking to improve the frequency or add additional routes, will not result in increased bus use. Whilst funding for a Danebridge Crescent service would be welcomed, after services were reduced and amended, we do not believe it would be of much benefit to residents who would reside on this land.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Bus Services	Paul Burge	Response-00289	Bus services have already been reduced and at busy periods getting passed the school exit is impossible.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Bus Services	Rebecca Styles-Jones	Response-00372	Buses struggle on Danebridge Crescent with a large van parked at the top making it difficult to get in/out. We do not need more buses on this route.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Bus Services	Robert Collis	Response-00355	These are already being reduced and infrequent an increase in footfall will not help this situation, currently there are no buses on accom way
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Bus Services	Scarlett Hamblin	Response-00395	Bus services will need to be added to allow for the extra population. This will have knock on effects to both the traffic congestion and also the green house gases that are released from the buses yet again having a negative impact on the surrounding countryside.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Bus Services	Sharon Coward	Response-00360	Insufficient bus services already so without major monetary input to improve this it will have a negative effect.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Flooding / Drainage	Andrea Lambert	Response-00357	Acorn Way is prone to flooding in heavy rain and the road has been closed due to this on numerous occasions. Building more houses and all the extra traffic that will create will make getting out of Oakwood a nightmare
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Flooding / Drainage	Andrea Wightman	Response-00358	Flooding on Acorn Way has got worse over the years. The road has been closed on numerous occasions over the past couple of years and with this development will only get worse
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Flooding / Drainage	Arthur Boulton	Response-01097	Acorn way already has flooding issues this development will only make it worse
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Flooding / Drainage	Ashley	Response-00426	You need to take a real look at acorn way it?s been flooded so many time over the past 2 years
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Flooding / Drainage	Brendan Horgan	Response-00610	The area (especial outside the school) floods regularly. The houses to the right of the main entrance to the school have flooded due to inadequate highway drainage. There is a serious drainage issue at Deborah Drive, with floods of up to 300mm across the carriageway. The highway drainage system on Morley Road is inadequate and not fit for purpose.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Flooding / Drainage	Callum Rhodes	Response-00371	Acorn way has flooded under every moderate of heavy rainfall over the last two years and has to be repeatedly closed for safety. In addition Breadsall village has flooded repeatedly over the years. This will only exasperate issues.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Flooding / Drainage	Carl	Response-00386	Acorn way is already a road that floods in 2 areas that causes major disruption
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Flooding / Drainage	Cheryl Wilde	Response-00328	Acorn Way is notorious for flooding and has often been closed due to flooding. Surely another 550 homes will make this situation worse.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Flooding / Drainage	Chris copley	Response-01246	Often after heavy rain Morley Road sees a lot of run off, the drains can currently only just handle this, more properties would cause a problem here
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Flooding / Drainage	Clare Tomlinson	Response-00423	Acorn Way floods regularly - and the road has been closed on many occasions. It is planning policy not to allow householders to pave over garden space due to the reduction in drainage of surface water - building on a large area will increase exponentially the amount of run off. A case in point is Breadsall Village which has flooded more often since the building of the Persimmon Lime Tree Court Estate - another blot on the landscape.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Flooding / Drainage	Courtney Hodges	Response-00403	The fields flood when it rains in huge amounts, including spilling onto the road which results in the road closing. Adding houses onto the fields will only increase this flood risk
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Flooding / Drainage	Danielle Andrews	Response-01244	Derby is already an area that struggles with flooding. Removing all green land will increase risk in the area
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Flooding / Drainage	David Massey	Response-00575	We live next to the brook. More houses will reduce run off and cause flooding. The brook barely survives heavy rainfall and the environment agency lists the possibility of flooding. Once the houses are built no-one will be able to be held responsible. Flood prevention will be inadequate and the existing home owners downstream will pay the penalty

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Flooding / Drainage	David Rees	Response-00566	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. The cost of the necessary upgrade to the current drainage system must fall to Erewash Borough Council and/or the developer.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Flooding / Drainage	Donna Pearson	Response-00441	Acorn way Morley road are subjugated to flooding every time it rains.To build on that would be a mistake as the houses already on Morley road could be subj cr to flooding
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Flooding / Drainage	Douglas Hunt	Response-00353	There is already a major flooding issue at the lower end if Morley Road and the disruption to natural drainage and additional run of from the development will exacerbate that issue without the provision of additional drainage infrastructure
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Flooding / Drainage	Edward James Gregory	Response-00727	Area is prone to flooding and surface water run off onto the badly designed Acorn Way
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Flooding / Drainage	Emma Daniels	Response-00349	Acorn way never used to flood but ever since the new homes the last couple of years have been terrible, how are new homes going to help this?
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Flooding / Drainage	Gary Murfin	Response-00373	There has always been flooding on Acorn way quite often over the years making it impassable, how will be stopped
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Flooding / Drainage	Gemma	Response-00380	Our garden floods now due to the changes to the road - removing green land and trees to absorb the excess water has a knock on everywhere
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Flooding / Drainage		Response-00384	Acorn way is known for flooding, falling trees, and ice. Adding houses onto it would just increase flooding for a start
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Flooding / Drainage	Glynn Booker	Response-00394	The proposed land is what I understand an absorption belt, without it houses lower down Morely road will be at risk of flooding.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Flooding / Drainage	Helen Walker	Response-00333	Acorn way floods ! Has done and always will do and even more so if more houses are built the two councils need to work together to make this road a safer place, nothing has really changed since the join glad does down there many years ago when it had rained hard and was flooded, less trees etc and you will get more water and floods
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Flooding / Drainage	Iain Campbell	Response-01179	The fields soak up the rain avoiding floods, this site has a potential to cause flooding in the area which you are wanting to create 550 homes next to Morley Road which already has water drainage issues under heavy rain
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Flooding / Drainage	James Bellaby	Response-00340	The area already floods heavily when it rains, it causes the road to be shut down for most of the day. Extra cars on the road will be a nightmare.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Flooding / Drainage	James Hope	Response-00548	As Acorn way is a site with steep inclines, the resultant increased run-off of rain water will drain quickly down to Acorn Way in the East and Morley Road in the West. Both recipient areas currently have flooding issues, with that on Acorn way already having resulted in a number of accidents and one death showing the current limitations of the Acorn Way drainage infrastructure
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Flooding / Drainage	Jane Pitwood	Response-01366	Acorn Way often floods with heavy rainfall, when the current open fields become waterlogged. Building properties and tarmacing over the areas of natural drainage can surely only exacerbate the problem
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Flooding / Drainage	Jason Reader	Response-00321	No information on flood alleviation
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Flooding / Drainage	Jeanette Kent	Response-00400	This road regularly floods during moderate to heavy rainfall. This is getting worse and will no be improved by even more housing having the water running off from them. Fields help to drain water, concrete does not, fact
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Flooding / Drainage	Karen Webster	Response-00419	Even with the drainage improvements, acorn way, which is already a major road is closed due to flooding. Turning fields into houses will only make this worse.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Flooding / Drainage	Karl Barlow	Response-00756	Morley Road is already flooding regularly. All the houses on Morly Road from the farm down to the cut-through have flooded back gardens each tiome it rains. We have seen further flooding down the hill and the extra run off will make flooding a really big issue. Speak to the Garage about flooding.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Flooding / Drainage	Kelsey Strachan	Response-00377	Acorn Way regularly floods during heavy rain and as of recent years has become far worse due to lack of plants in the east fields of acorn Way. Reducing the vegetation on the west side for this development will just compound the issue, likely resulting in full closure of acorn Way in certain periods, adding to the burden of Morley Road being the only alternative. Morley Road will also suffer as the development would be on a hill above and water would run down into Morley road, who's drain already don't cope with heavy rainfall. Will probably increase everyone locals house insurance due to increased flood risk. Placing the burden on current residents once again for developers to swoop in make a fortune and leave the neighbours with all the negatives and no compensation.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Flooding / Drainage	Laura	Response-00387	Subject: Objection to Planning for 550 Houses on Acorn Way and 160 Houses on Breadsall Hilltop Dear Sir/Madam, I am writing to formally object to the planning for 550 houses on Acorn Way and a further 160 houses on Breadsall Hilltop in Derby. I believe these developments are unsustainable and will have a significantly detrimental impact on the existing community and infrastructure. My objections are based on the following key concerns: 1. Misrepresentation of Target Residents and Increased Traffic: The proposal claims the development on Acorn Way will serve people who wish to live in Ilkeston, Long Eaton and Sandiacre, which is a fantasy. They are 20+ minutes away. The inevitable consequence of these 710 new households will be a substantial increase in traffic. Derby has high pollution levels and this will increase traffic further. 2. Over-Subscription of Local Schools: The schools in the areas surrounding both Acorn Way and Breadsall Hilltop are already over subscribed. The addition of these 710 houses will place an unsustainable burden on these educational facilities. 3. Over-Subscription of Local GP Surgeries: The GP surgeries in the areas surrounding both Acorn Way and Breadsall Hilltop are already over subscribed. The addition of these 710 houses will place an unsustainable burden on these healthcare services. 4. Increased Flood Risk at Breadsall Hilltop: In recent inclement weather, Breadsall village has flooded. Building 160 houses on the land at Breadsall Hilltop will cause further run off and increase the flood risk to Breadsall village and surrounding areas. In conclusion, I strongly believe that these planning applications for 550 houses on Acorn Way and 160 houses on Breadsall Hilltop are ill-conceived and fail to adequately consider the significant negative impacts they will have on the existing community and infrastructure of Derby. I urge the planning authority to reject these applications. A development of this scale in these locations is unsustainable and will severely compromise the quality of life for current and future residents of Derby. Yours faithfully, Mrs Lincoln
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Flooding / Drainage	Liz Lockwood	Response-00464	This development will increase the flood risk on both Morley Road and Acorn way as there will be more water runoff from roads and pavements drives etc in place of the fields etc. Acorn Way has been closed on a number of occasions due to flood water making the road impassible esp on the Erewash owned parts. This had caused traffic congestion in Oakwood as traffic must use Morley Road or the estate roads
			Lorna Coope	Response-00365	Acorn way regularly floods with heavy rainfall and causes chaos with traffic.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Flooding / Drainage	Lou Davis	Response-00336	Acorn Way has been subject to multiple road closures in recent years due to flooding. This has caused significant disruption to local residents. Morley Road often has water running down the side like a River - and this is when the fields absorb some of the water. Building houses would significantly increase this risk
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Flooding / Drainage	Mark potter	Response-00378	Acorn way floods regular in winter months so adding more concrete to the fields is going to cause more flooding and acorn way will become a very dangerous road in the winter months even more than it is now, again another brain dead decision
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Flooding / Drainage	Mathew Lennox-Quinn	Response-01363	Read the news this area floods, acorn way closed several times over the years. And removing grassy area to tarmac will only make things worse. Only been in the press about making it law not to tarmac or concrete your garden. So let's building more to flood more
			Nat	Response-00155	The road has been liable to flooding in the last couple of years
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Flooding / Drainage	Natalie Peake	Response-00794	Morley Road already suffers significant flooding each year, and building on this land?part of the natural floodplain?would worsen the problem due to reduced drainage and natural water absorption. Water runs all along Morley road even after light rainfall and it has been scientifically proven that rainfall is becoming heavier - a trend linked to climate change. Specifically, climate change is estimated to have contributed to about a 15% increase in the amount of total rainfall with extreme rainfall events becoming more intense and frequent. Building on this green belt land and removing hedgerows and flood plain will have a catastrophic effect on flooding and lack of maintained drainage systems in place above what was the former canal.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Flooding / Drainage	Neville Chatterton	Response-01078	Flooding in Acorn way is already a problem. The sloping roads and surrounding land already creates severe flooding and this development will cause extra problems.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Flooding / Drainage	Nick Charles	Response-01370	The proposed area of 24.0 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 Academy. In October two years ago, 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 likely to happen many more times in the future. Even a little rain causes water to rush 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.
			Oakwood Ward Councillors Eyre, Mulhall and Trehwella	Response-01358	The comments in our previous objection remain relevant.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Flooding / Drainage	Paul Burge	Response-00289	Heavy rain currently turns Morley rd into a river, add that to the run off from this estate will create havoc for Morley rd residents.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Flooding / Drainage	Peter Marshall	Response-00526	Increased development and impermeable surfaces could exacerbate local flooding risks, especially if existing drainage infrastructure is not improved.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Flooding / Drainage	Rachael Hinckley	Response-01166	The fields soak up the rain avoiding floods, this site has a potential to cause flooding in the area which is wanting to create 550 homes
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Flooding / Drainage	Rebecca Styles-Jones	Response-00372	Since the development Breadsall Hilltop we have seen more and more flooding in Breadsall and Oakwood. Taking away this land will just add to more flooding and existing properties being at risk.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Flooding / Drainage	Robert Collis	Response-00355	This has already been mention in the road safety but how will the water drain away from areas which are currently open land the waste water system needs upgrading to take away the water

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Flooding / Drainage	Scarlett Hamblin	Response-00395	In recent years the flooding situation has become worse and worse with the increased concrete the surface water has nowhere to go except to gather and flood. By increasing the amount of concrete, tarmac and housing it is just increasing the flood risk tenfold.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Flooding / Drainage	Sharon Coward	Response-00360	The lose of farm land to housing will cause increased flooding in an area that already is severely affected by flooding. Acorn way is a major route in & out of oakwood & is often flooding during heavy rain. More housing adjacent to it will only increase the risk of flooding & have a negative impact on the residents of oakwood & surrounding areas.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Flooding / Drainage	Tanya Caldbeck	Response-00919	This area suffers from regular flooding and will become more dangerous with more building built
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Flooding / Drainage	Tom King	Response-00735	Road already hight susceptible to flooding and is often closed. Adding such a large volume of houses will massively increase the issues seen
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Green Belt	Andrea Lambert	Response-00357	If housing keeps being built we'll have no green belt left to enjoy
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Green Belt	Ashley	Response-00426	You are ruining another lovely part of Derby
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Green Belt	ASHLEY STOWER	Response-01183	We should preserve the green belt , there is plenty of opportunities for brown field redevelopment. It increases congestion, increases anti-social behaviour, takes away the well being rights of current residents , add stress to current residents through building. However it is cheap for greedy developers to build on. Erewash council has in effect put the problem on Derby City Council why cant these houses be built at Ilkeston or Long Eaton? they are just pushing to the edge of their area & giving others a problem.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Green Belt	Carl	Response-00386	Leave it allown
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Green Belt	Chris copley	Response-01246	I feel the green belt should be protected, this area is valuables for local children and residents and for many people in the areas is the only area of green belt they can access
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Green Belt	Clare Tomlinson	Response-00423	There are no justifications for building on green fields when sufficient brown field sites exist. Green belt is important both to distinguish between different areas but also to provide a resource for local residents and to protect and encourage wildlife,
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Green Belt	Danielle Andrews	Response-01244	We purchased a home knowing we would have access to public footpaths through fields and that this was green belt land. How easily green belt is removed calls into question whether this is truly protected land. To not preserve any of the land on this side of acorn way is a travesty. Even a reserved section like chaddesden wood would benefit the new housing estates and preserve green land
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Green Belt	David Rees	Response-00566	The proposed development is on Green Belt land; the diagram shown in the initial pages of the on-line objection submission document conveniently ? and incorrectly ? indicates that this area is NOT Green Belt?...dishonourable again. The Erewash Borough Council [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 550 of its new-housing target: hardly ?exceptional circumstances?! If Green Belt is to be encroached, far better to use this area for a solar panel array, which would at least retain the spirit of ?Green?, given the climate crisis.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Green Belt	Donna Pearson	Response-00441	One of the main reasons we bought a house looking on to green belt was for the feeling of being in the countryside and being able to enjoy the wild life. Green belt is impotent for the environment ams should definitely not be built on.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Green Belt	Douglas Hunt	Response-00353	EBC have not provided sufficient reasoning to justify building on green belt when there is more than adequate brown belt available to meet their targets
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Green Belt	Edward James Gregory	Response-00727	Should be protected and development should be in the centre of Erewash, not on the edge of other areas
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Green Belt	Glynn Booker	Response-00394	We shouldn't be building on green belt and when there is still brown belt land available. We must consider how we reduce our carbon not increase it without a reduction plan in place.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Green Belt	Helen Walker	Response-00333	Building on green belt when there are lots of empty properties which can be used as places to live if they were renovated and would make areas look nicer places than creating concrete jungles of houses upon house
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Green Belt	Iain Campbell	Response-01179	What happened to protecting the environment, is this no longer a priority
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Green Belt	James Bellaby	Response-00340	Less habitat for wildlife
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Green Belt	Jane Pitwood	Response-01366	Once the green belt is destroyed by building it will be gone for ever. No amount of landscaping can compensate for that.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Green Belt	Jason Reader	Response-00321	Building on green belt.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Green Belt	Jeanette Kent	Response-00400	The green belt is a very important area for wildlife and should not, upon any condition be built upon. The wildlife is already in mass decline and the building on green belt should be stopped immediately. We need our green belts for the wildlife and as a recreational area. STOP BUILDING ON THEM, THERE IS NOT JUSTIFICATION.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Green Belt	Karl Barlow	Response-00756	Why build on the greenbelt and erode the green spaces of Oakwood further. Derby City already has the worst ration for green spaces, so we really need to get rid of what litytle we have left!
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Green Belt	Kevin Palmer	Response-01895	I objected previously to the allocation of Acorn Way for similar reasons i.e. the land is in the Green Belt and development should not be allowed unless there are special circumstances. It would extend the urban area.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Green Belt	Lewis	Response-00533	The beautiful fields and nice walks will be destroyed
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Green Belt	Liz Lockwood	Response-00464	This area was originally designated at Green Wedge to maintain a distinction between Chaddesden and Oakwood. The loss of green belt land is enormous and has an effect on people and the wildlife that currently lives on this area .
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Green Belt	Lou Davis	Response-00336	Building in this area would lead to a merging of the distinct communities of Spondon, Oakwood and Chaddesden. It is vital to maintain green space/green belt and green wedge - not least because of the benefits for residents but also for biodiversity.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Green Belt	Mandy Cooling	Response-00313	I cannot believe that there is even a proposal to destroy such a massive area of natural habitat. This development will in effect join up Oakwood with Chaddesden and other developments towards Breadsall Village and Hilltop to create a massive conurbation with no natural habitat, causing no doubt untold damage to all natural resources
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Green Belt	Mandy Dickens	Response-00425	This land has a wide range of native wildlife flora and fauna. A lot of which is in danger of becoming extinct. We need our greenbelt sites for this very reason
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Green Belt	Mark Potter	Response-00378	Use all the brown belt land first before taking up the green belt it's an absolute joke that people don't follow the rules and can be bought off for green belt instead of telling them to move on
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Green Belt	Mathew Lennox-Quinn	Response-01363	Is there such a thing nowadays?
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Green Belt	Melanie Arnold	Response-00573	Proposed housing will encroach on to green belt land, adding to pollution from more traffic and construction work when building the houses.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Green Belt	Nick Charles	Response-01370	In a time of potential food insecurity, it seems a very short-sighted decision to take productive farmland out of use. In previous years the fields where you are proposing to build were used to raise hundreds of lambs and have also produced several cuts of silage for winter feeding.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Green Belt	Nicola Oliver	Response-00434	Green belt! The clue is in the name. Don't the government get it? Green! Green needs to be left as being green! Disgusting that the government are allowing green to be changed to grey just so councils can build on it! Corrupt! I wonder if money is involved to change it to grey?
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Green Belt	Oakwood Ward Councillors Eyre, Muthall and Trehwella	Response-01358	Having seen nothing to the contrary, we conclude that the comments in our previous objection remain relevant.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Green Belt	Paul Burge	Response-00289	We moved onto Morley rd 40yrs ago because it wasn't estate bound. We always had a view across open countryside and this plan will destroy that.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Green Belt	Pauline Shephard	Response-00483	While we appreciate more housing is needed, careful thought should be put into where best this should be, not continually taking green spaces, but re-developing derelict and other sites. Enough is enough for the Oakwood area.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Green Belt	Peter Marshall	Response-00526	The proposed development lies within or adjacent to designated green belt land. This land is intended to prevent urban sprawl, protect natural landscapes, and preserve open space for agriculture, recreation, and biodiversity. Approving development here would set a dangerous precedent, permanently damaging the character and integrity of the green belt and undermining long-standing planning policies.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Green Belt	Robert Mee	Response-01579	My main reason for objecting to these developments is that I do not believe that the criteria set out in the NPPF has been met justifying any encroachment into the Green Belt at this time. The Core Strategy and this Amendment are developed in order to meet the housing targets allocated to the council by central government. I do not believe that the number of houses required by government constitutes, in itself, the 'exceptional circumstances' which are required under the Framework. This is particularly so in view of there being no published objective basis for the numbers allocated to each authority. The term 'exceptional circumstances' does include 'instances where an authority cannot meet its identified need for homes'. The waiting list for social housing in the general area might suggest that this is the case, but I do not accept that these plans will go far to address this issue. The vast majority of the planned housing allocations are not even for affordable housing, let alone social housing. Additionally, I do not remember seeing evidence that Erewash has specifically quantified local (i.e. Erewash) housing needs. I also do not believe that much, if any, of the Green Belt selected for development would fit the definition of 'Grey Belt'. As a concept, I can support the idea of Grey Belt as originally reported, i.e. pieces of land within the Green Belt which have previously been developed. Indeed, I can think of a few locally, though they are all fairly small. I find the arguments that I have heard over distances between the edge of Derby and the edge of other towns, and how these distances will still be maintained, extremely spurious. The Green Belt in its entirety exists to prevent Nottingham and Derby from merging. While building on any of these sites does not immediately make the two cities any closer to each other, it does reduce the green space between the two cities, which is precisely what the Green Belt was established to prevent. The Green Belt is a regional initiative, covering two counties and several local authorities. With Erewash having such a high proportion of its land earmarked as Green Belt it is incumbent on the region as a whole to find a solution to the housing shortage, rather than to expect our authority to have to sacrifice its green spaces. This is probably the worst of all the sites (along with Spondon Wood, for which planning permission has already been given), since this site does have the direct effect of enlarging the Derby conurbation which will encroach further into the countryside.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Green Belt	Robert Mee	Response-01508	My main reason for objecting to these developments is that I do not believe that the criteria set out in the NPPF has been met justifying any encroachment into the Green Belt at this time. The Core Strategy and this Amendment are developed in order to meet the housing targets allocated to the council by central government. I do not believe that the number of houses required by government constitutes, in itself, the ?exceptional circumstances? which are required under the Framework. This is particularly so in view of there being no published objective basis for the numbers allocated to each authority. The term ?exceptional circumstances? does include ?instances where an authority cannot meet its identified need for homes?. The waiting list for social housing in the general area might suggest that this is the case, but I do not accept that these plans will go far to address this issue ? the vast majority of the planned housing allocations are not even for affordable housing, let alone social housing. Additionally, I do not remember seeing evidence that Erewash has specifically quantified local (i.e. Erewash) housing needs. I also do not believe that much, if any, of the Green Belt selected for development would fit the definition of ?Grey Belt?. As a concept, I can support the idea of Grey Belt as originally reported, i.e. pieces of land within the Green Belt which have previously been developed ? indeed, I can think of a few locally, though they are all fairly small. I find the arguments that I have heard over distances between the edge of Derby and the edge of other towns, and how these distances will still be maintained, extremely spurious. The Green Belt in its entirety exists to prevent Nottingham and Derby from merging ? while building on any of these sites does not immediately make the two cities any closer to each other, it does reduce the green space between the two cities, which is precisely what the Green Belt was established to prevent. The Green Belt is a regional initiative, covering two counties and several local authorities. With Erewash having such a high proportion of its land earmarked as Green Belt it is incumbent on the region as a whole to find a solution to the housing shortage, rather than to expect our authority to have to sacrifice its green spaces. This is probably the worst of all the sites (along with Spondon Wood, for which planning permission has already been given), since this site does have the direct effect of enlarging the Derby conurbation which will encroach further into the countryside.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Green Belt	Sara Cotton	Response-00368	Don't build on our green land
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Green Belt	Scarlett Hamblin	Response-00395	We need to stay green! We already have an unbelievable amount of houses with plenty of vacancy properties. We do not need more housing built on green areas!
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Green Belt	Shaun Cavanagh	Response-00416	Impact on greenbelt.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Green Belt	Tanya Caldbeck	Response-00919	Illegal and should stay that way. Should not be able to change laws to suit.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Andrea Lambert	Response-00357	Not enough health care facilities without adding to the problem
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Andrea Wightman	Response-00358	There are no suitable local health services. Dr's are impossible to access without over 1000 more patients. There is no nhs dentist available.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Arthur Boulton	Response-01097	Where are the improvements to the already overworked dental, medical and education facilities
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Ashley	Response-00426	Already at stretch need a new surgery
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	ASHLEY STOWER	Response-01183	It is impossible to get an appointment at Oakwood Lister House now , where are another 2000 + people going to get their health provided for & if it is not within the local capability it means more congestion.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Brendan Horgan	Response-00610	Medical centres already over subscribed
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Callum Rhodes	Response-00371	Oakwood already struggles to provide GP appointments and has no NHS dentists in the area anymore. Further houses in Erewash not even providing these services unfairly penalise oakwood without providing them the associated council taxes.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Cameron Coope	Response-00367	GP and Dentist places around the area are already few and far between
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Carl	Response-00386	Unable to get a appointment now so that will get worse which will have a major impact on people's well-being
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Cheryl Wilde	Response-00328	It is hard enough to get a doctors appointment as it is in Oakwood/ Chaddesden surgeries. The facilities available cannot possibly support another 550 homes.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Chloe	Response-00508	Health care is already struggling are you gonna build more hospitals? You guys aren't the one running round in it what about us nurse who are struggling are you gonna hire more people and increase our wages for the stuff we put ourselves through??
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Chris copley	Response-01246	The local doctors are already full, I have to drive to a nearby village to get an appointment. There are also a lot of elderly residents in that area that need extra care
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Clare Tomlinson	Response-00423	It is well both impossible to obtain a gp appointment and the health centre is oversubscribed capacity. There are no NHS dentists in the local area. The journey to the local hospital is lengthy
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Courtney Hodges	Response-00403	Same as the schools, having 2 doctors surgeries which we cannot get an on the day appointment, adding more people will make this even worse than it already is
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Danielle Andrews	Response-01244	Chaddesden park medical is an incredibly busy practice. It can take hundreds of attempts to get through in a morning and appointments are incredibly limited. I will often drive to borrowwash for appointments as chaddesden practice has overflowed. I don't believe the service can handle so many extra people
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	David Massey	Response-00575	There is absolutely not enough healthcare locally to support 550 homes. Getting into the doctor's is difficult. Dentist impossible. Ours are both in Borrowwash
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	David Rees	Response-00566	550 dwellings in the proposed development would contain circa 1200 people. Clearly, this number of people would not be able to be provided with the required healthcare facilities from the current healthcare resources in Oakwood and Chaddesden, so for Erewash Borough Council [EBC] to expect Derby City Council [and its council tax payers] to pick up the costs for healthcare facilities of an additional circa 1200 people, whilst EBC enjoys the council tax of these people, is at best naive and, at worst, disgracefully dishonourable. I was unable to find any coverage of this in the previous issue of EBC's documentation and so I assume that EBC is not offering anything. ECB must provide all necessary school facilities for its own residents.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Donna Pearson	Response-00441	The people of Oakwood and Chaddesden already struggle to be seen by there Dr.Over populating the area is going to cause even more distress to the situation.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Douglas Hunt	Response-00353	Health care facilities in the locality are close to maximum capacity and the additional population will degrade local health care if additional infrastructure is not provided
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Edward James Gregory	Response-00727	Doctors and dentists are already oversubscribed. Erewash does not provide these in this area, so the development should not be considered
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Emma Daniels	Response-00349	Another 550 homes and no mention of extra healthcare facilities. Drs/dentist already struggling and cannot meet demand. Groups of teenagers hanging around and vandalising our parks because of nowhere to go, what happened to youth clubs?
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Gary Murfin	Response-00373	Park Medical and Lister house surgeries are already a full capacity and struggle, it?s already hard to get a appointment quickly, this is a pretty major issue already
			Gemma	Response-00380	Cannot get appointments now so adding more houses- are more doctors local amenities being added to?
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Gillian stillwell	Response-01364	Impossible to get appts in several doctors surgeries now. So adding hundreds of new houses will be disastrous.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Glynn Booker	Response-00394	It is hard enough getting a doctors or dentist appointment as it is without an additional 1000+ people adding to that pressure, we need more healthcare facilities not less!
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Helen Walker	Response-00333	Again the local docs and health facilities will not be able to cope with extra patients again it won?t be Erewash Docs etc it will be City ones which will have cope
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Iain Campbell	Response-01179	This will impact the service (doctors, dentists etc ) in the area to a poor standard, making it even harder to get urgent face to face appointments!
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	JACQUELINE LOUISE KELLY	Response-00327	It is almost impossible to get a doctors appointment, the surgeries are so busy - the other day I was on hold several times for a total of over an hour and half, only to be cut off three times when I reached caller number one, another 550 families trying to access the same facilities will overburden the system completely
			James Birks	Response-00574	Doctors already are full and appointments are difficult to get
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	James Hope	Response-00548	The walking distances to Health facilities are impractical for a large proportion of the population. Consequently the reliance on these facilities would inevitably require the use of either a bus service or motor vehicles. This would not support the EBC commitment to reduce the number of motor vehicle journeys and encourage alternative modes of transport. Thus the new Acornway development population would not necessarily see an easing in access to health services but those reliant on bus transport and walking would see an increase in difficulty when compared to some alternative development locations. The current Doctor and Chemist facilities are already struggling to meet Service Level criteria. The addition of 550 homes will place significant pressure on these facilities to deliver a sustainable service.
			James Muldoon	Response-00338	Not enough in the area currently and absolutely no chance the people in these home will use services further away.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Jane Pitwood	Response-01366	Again, local health facilities are already over subscribed, but there is no proposed provision to include additional facilities within the plans. Why not?
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Janette Glenn	Response-00421	Existing GP practices are already under pressure and often cannot provide appointments for existing residents. The new development would make the existing situation even worse.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Jeanette Kent	Response-00400	We cannot get a doctors appointment now, god knows what would happen with even more people wanting to sign on with our local services
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Karen Webster	Response-00419	You cannot get a GP appointment now, pharmacy?s are struggling with time to fill prescriptions, how are they going to cope with the additional houses, they won?t. There are totally insufficient GP, Dentists to cope with any more houses.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Karl Barlow	Response-00756	There are NO dentist places, the Doctor surgery is full. It is simply untruthful to say that there is capacity. Again, the other new developments will have primacy on places as these will be in Derby City and not Erewash. Maybe build nearer to Erewash facilities - in Breaston or Long Eaton?
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Kelsey Strachan	Response-00377	Impossible to get appointments already for a number of reasons at the small amount of places available. Adding hundreds more people just increases the already huge burden on the small amounts of facilities

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Laura	Response-00387	Subject: Objection to Planning for 550 Houses on Acorn Way and 160 Houses on Breadsall Hilltop Dear Sir/Madam, I am writing to formally object to the planning for 550 houses on Acorn Way and a further 160 houses on Breadsall Hilltop in Derby. I believe these developments are unsustainable and will have a significantly detrimental impact on the existing community and infrastructure. My objections are based on the following key concerns: 1. Misrepresentation of Target Residents and Increased Traffic: The proposal claims the development on Acorn Way will serve people who wish to live in Ilkeston, Long Eaton and Sandiacre, which is a fantasy. They are 20+ minutes away. The inevitable consequence of these 710 new households will be a substantial increase in traffic. Derby has high pollution levels and this will increase traffic further. 2. Over-Subscription of Local Schools: The schools in the areas surrounding both Acorn Way and Breadsall Hilltop are already over subscribed. The addition of these 710 houses will place an unsustainable burden on these educational facilities. 3. Over-Subscription of Local GP Surgeries: The GP surgeries in the areas surrounding both Acorn Way and Breadsall Hilltop are already over subscribed. The addition of these 710 houses will place an unsustainable burden on these healthcare services. 4. Increased Flood Risk at Breadsall Hilltop: In recent inclement weather, Breadsall village has flooded. Building 160 houses on the land at Breadsall Hilltop will cause further run off and increase the flood risk to Breadsall village and surrounding areas. In conclusion, I strongly believe that these planning applications for 550 houses on Acorn Way and 160 houses on Breadsall Hilltop are ill-conceived and fail to adequately consider the significant negative impacts they will have on the existing community and infrastructure of Derby. I urge the planning authority to reject these applications. A development of this scale in these locations is unsustainable and will severely compromise the quality of life for current and future residents of Derby. Yours faithfully, Mrs Lincoln
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Lewis	Response-00533	Already waiting 3 weeks to get a GP appointment! And that's with having to queue outside the door at 8 in the morning. Not enough services for the current population of oakwood let alone another 500 houses
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Liz Lockwood	Response-00464	There are two doctors on Oakwood and both are not taking any new patients - It is nearly impossible to access a GP here. Both of the surgeries are satellite surgeries for ones in Chaddesden and Derby City Centre so would not be expanded to take on new patients. There has been extra demand from the Durose Estate and Lime Lane Estates both of which are due to be enlarged by Erewash council. Where are the facilities in erewash that these people could use instead of pushing them on to Derby's facilities? Similarly there is 1 dentist on Oakwood which is private and not taking on new private or NHS patients
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Lou Davis	Response-00336	All of the local Dr's surgeries are at the limit of their ability to provide healthcare services to residents - an additional 1500-2000 residents (plus) would strain a service which is struggling to cope with- it is impossible to get an appointment at this time without additional patients. There are no local dentists offering NHS services.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Lucy Skeet	Response-00388	Simply not enough!! It's hard enough to get medical appointments as it is, without the addition of more people. It's not sustainable and will cause further struggles for the NHS
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Mandy Cooling	Response-00313	I couldn't see any plans for critical infrastructure to support the influx of hundreds more residents such as plans for doctors? surgeries (which are already groaning under the weight of thousands of patients), schools etc
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Mandy Dickens	Response-00425	The doctors surgeries are already at full capacity any additional patients will not be able to be accommodated
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Mark potter	Response-00378	Oakwood doctors and dentist is a nightmare to get into already and it's made harder with the houses already been build in Oakwood let alone 550 more off acorn way and a further 160 at the bottom of bishops drive, Oakwood needs more doctors and dentist if people keep building houses
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Mathew Lennox-Quinn	Response-01363	Can't even get a GP appointment now without adding more
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Melanie Arnold	Response-00573	Doctors in the area are nearly up to full capacity.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Mr Stephen Langton	Response-00024	There is a clear principle that developments within Erewash borough should not be relying upon and using Healthcare facilities supplied and funded by the adjacent Derby City Council. Now that EBC have started to recognise this principle with the allocation of sites adjacent to existing settlements within the Erewash borough, the Acorn Way and all other proposed sites abutting Derby city conurbation should be withdrawn.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Natalie Peake	Response-00794	I am deeply concerned about the strain this development would place on the already overstretched local infrastructure? particularly in relation to healthcare services. There is currently a well-documented shortage of NHS dentists and GP practices in the area. Local residents already face significant difficulties registering with NHS dentists, and many are unable to secure timely appointments with local GP surgeries. As a result, an increasing number of residents are being forced to rely on the walk-in centre in Derby City Centre, which is both impractical and unsustainable for ongoing healthcare needs. The addition of new homes without a corresponding expansion of essential health services will only exacerbate these problems, leading to longer waiting times, reduced quality of care, and increased pressure on emergency services.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Nathan Latymer	Response-00363	I already struggle to get an appointment at my local (Oakwood) GP, so the addition of loads of houses will only make this worse
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Neville Chatterton	Response-01078	Health care facilities in this area are already very poor and it is very difficult to get appointments
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Nick & Jacqui McCrorie	Response-01361	It is already extremely difficult to obtain a GP appointment in Oakwood. There is no mention in the proposal of any additional medical practices and therefore what is already difficult will become impossible.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Nick Charles	Response-01370	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 1,400 ? 1,800 residents, things will become even more onerous.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Nicola Olver	Response-00434	Doctors are struggling to take on more patients - developers say they will contribute money for expansion but will they pay for more Doctors to be trained and their salaries? I don't think so
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Oakwood Ward Councillors Eyre, Mulhall and Trehwella	Response-01358	The comments in our previous objection remain relevant.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Paul Burge	Response-00289	The current situation within Oakwood is bad enough. People cannot get Doctors or Dentist appointments as it currently stands. To place this development on top of this is ludicrous.
			Pauline Shephard	Response-00483	Try getting a doctor?s appointment in this area. It gets worse and worse with increased population in the area
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Paul Roe	Response-00330	Cannot get GP appointments as it is and residents will want nearest GP service to them which is in Derby city area not yours
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Peter Marshall	Response-00526	Access to healthcare is becoming increasingly difficult, with long waiting times for GP appointments and overstretched services at local clinics and hospitals. Adding hundreds of new residents would only worsen this situation.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Peter Williamson	Response-01458	There are no additional healthcare provisions for those who move here
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Rebecca Styles-Jones	Response-00372	We cannot get appointments at local doctors or get through on the phone even. Another 3,000+ people including children will stand absolutely no chance! Not enough infrastructure.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Robert Collis	Response-00355	Cannot get an NHS dentist or doctors appointment now so what facilities will be provided to facilitate the increase in population
			Sara Cotton	Response-00368	Our doctors are over subscribed and it's difficult to get appointments
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Sarah Smyth	Response-00375	GPs already oversubscribed and you cannot get through on phone nevermind get an appointment. Where will these new residents go? Not an nhs dentist in sight as it is
			Sarah willis	Response-00345	Lack of doctors, dentists to support current community let alone the addition of further population to the area.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Scarlett Hamblin	Response-00395	Trying to get a doctors appointment is already near impossible! I have to make repeated phone calls to try and speak to the doctors let alone actually get an appointment . By increasing the number of people accessing these services it will increase the difficulty yet again.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Sharon Coward	Response-00360	The impact on already pressured health care services will be negative & severely affect the surrounding areas which are not part of Erewash.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Sue Smith	Response-00376	Our local doctors surgeries and dentists are already at full capacity!!! Building new houses will put a huge strain on these services.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Tanya Caldbeck	Response-00919	No GP spaces and no capacity. Will cause further pressure and issues in getting appointments
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	Tom King	Response-00735	Local GPs already overwhelmed and over subscribed
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Healthcare Facilities	William Gregory	Response-00411	Doctors are over whelmed already , current residents in the area cannot get appointments, and if your luck enough to get an appointment it can be weeks before you see a Doctor.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Landscape	Ashley	Response-00426	Build bungalows if anything reduce the height so the views are not completly ruined
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Landscape	ASHLEY STOWER	Response-01183	It is a mixed green residential landscape the whole area would suffer from this excess building, what about drainage Morley road often floods? etc
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Landscape	Carl	Response-00386	New housing estates always look a mess compared with open fields
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Landscape	Cheryl Wilde	Response-00328	Oakwood is losing so much green space with the new developments at the bottom of Bishops Drive and the Persimmon estate by the side of Mansfield Road/Lime Lane plus the proposal for 150 new houses by Chaddesden Wood. Another 550 homes off Acorn Way is ridiculous.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Landscape	Chloe	Response-00508	Beautiful land gone you gonna find anymore to make up for it
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Landscape	Chris copley	Response-01246	The landscape will undoubtedly be badly affected, the area is currently outstandingly beautiful and is accessible by people who cannot afforded cars or transport. To remove this option for people would be terrible
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Landscape	Clare Tomlinson	Response-00423	This may not be a typical beauty spot - but the green hills are a visual stimulant to local residents
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Landscape	Donna Pearson	Response-00441	The view at the moment is stunning and the walk are good for people?s mental health
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Landscape	Edward James Gregory	Response-00727	it is a natural green separation between different housing areas, and should not be degraded by poor quality housing on unsuiatble sites
			Glynn Booker	Response-00394	What are the considerations going to be to the Biodiversity how are you considering Biodiversity Net Gain?
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Landscape	Helen Walker	Response-00333	What landscape you are totally destroying it, concrete jungles are been created, there are no landscapes where you can see green fields anymore
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Landscape	Iain Campbell	Response-01179	We chose to move here because of the quiet location, building houses will effect everyone this area.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Landscape	Jeanette Kent	Response-00400	This is a valued area of green within an urban area, once built upon the landscape will never be the same again and the constant building needs to stop. We need fields etc to provide grazing for farms etc.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Landscape	Karl Barlow	Response-00756	This will destroy the view from my house. I love seeing the oak tree and countryside. All I will be able to see are ugly cheaply built houses on the hill, dominating Oakwood.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Landscape	Kelsey Strachan	Response-00377	Destroys the view for residents who have lived in Oakwood for years to give that view to new builds so developers can charge a markup on landscape they don't own. View from Morley will be oppressive as the development will sit higher than Morley road so will be penned in from either side.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Landscape	Lewis	Response-00533	The views over the fields will be ruined / non existent. Go build somewhere else
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Landscape	Liz Lockwood	Response-00464	All you will be able see is houses - there is little in the propal to say how the site will be landscaped
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Landscape	Lou Davis	Response-00336	The hills and fields of this area - with the trees and hedgerows are a valuable addition to the local area - it is an attractive view which would be spoilt if this proposal goes ahead.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Landscape	Lucy Skeet	Response-00388	It?s going to ruin the landscape even further! There are too many houses ruining our countryside and it is so depressing. Just a ridiculous idea
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Landscape	Mark potter	Response-00378	All theses houses are destroying the landscape of Oakwood all the fields are being taken up trees/hedge's destroyed and removed when Oakwood was know for its nice pictures surroundings and quality houses not any more it?s being destroyed

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Landscape	Natalie Peake	Response-00794	This area is a cherished and well-used green space by the local community for walking, dog exercise, and enjoying nature. The well-trodden path runs from Morley Road is frequently used by residents seeking tranquility and outdoor recreation. This space serves as a vital community asset and an important refuge for wildlife. This proposed development is not only a threat to local wildlife and environmental health, but it also diminishes a valued green space that supports physical and mental well-being for residents.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Landscape	Nick Charles	Response-01370	No comments, as plans for the development are unavailable at the moment.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Landscape	Nicki Harries	Response-00541	Oakwood and nearby has lovely trees and the wood. Please don't build anymore. You'll be destroying lovely walking and areas for people to get connected to the countryside
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Landscape	Paul Burge	Response-00289	Any building on this land will be a detriment to the landscape.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Landscape	Peter Marshall	Response-00526	This development would permanently alter the landscape, diminishing the area's natural beauty, visual amenity, and overall quality of life for existing residents.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Landscape	Rachael Hinkley	Response-01166	This would effect the landscape by making what is a beautiful area to live in now to a eyesore of new built homes
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Landscape	Robert Collis	Response-00355	Acorn way is a border between an estate and open country side and needs to remain so
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Landscape	Scarlett Hamblin	Response-00395	We have little snippets of green at the moment which break up the monotony of housing estates. We do not want to lose these little pockets of greenery by adding more houses to the landscape.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Landscape	Sharon Coward	Response-00360	It will severely affect the landscape for existing residents in the area in a negative way.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Number of Houses	Andrea Wightman	Response-00358	A ridiculous amount of houses, that are not needed in this area
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Number of Houses	Ashley	Response-00426	You need to build more bungalows the benefits would be that older people in Oakwood would downsize to the bungalow freeing up the other properties ..
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Number of Houses	ASHLEY STOWER	Response-01183	Far too many , 600 would mean approximately 2000 new people in an already congested area. It is impossible to navigate via Lees Brook school at opening / closing time. Acorn Way queues back each morning it would be an absolute disaster.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Number of Houses	Cameron Coope	Response-00367	Not enough amenities already in the area
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Number of Houses	Carl	Response-00386	1 is to many in a area that is already stretched
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Number of Houses	Cheryl Wilde	Response-00328	550 new houses is far too many. We just don't have the infrastructure and the facilities to support this.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Number of Houses	Chris copley	Response-01246	The quantity is too much, the local roads can't handle such an increase
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Number of Houses	Clare Tomlinson	Response-00423	This number represents over development of a site which should remain as a green wedge between the local suburban areas.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Number of Houses	Danielle Andrews	Response-01244	This is my greatest concern. Removing all of the green space on the Morley Road side of acorn way and filling it to maximum capacity will put a strain on roads, schooling, doctors and reduce biodiversity and the ability to enjoy green space. Some of this land should be preserved. 550 homes is huge surge in population in an area that is already very busy and will remove the last of the large green space
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Number of Houses	David Massey	Response-00575	When the application was put in for the brook farm it was for far fewer houses with access to Acorn way. Now it seems more houses with access to a smaller road is the plan
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Number of Houses	David Rees	Response-00566	My vote would be for zero houses.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Number of Houses	Donna Pearson	Response-00441	Any number is to high.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Number of Houses	Edward James Gregory	Response-00727	too many on the edge of Erewash, consider proposals in the centre of Erewash
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Number of Houses	Emma Daniels	Response-00349	Too many houses again and no mention of extra facilities
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Number of Houses	Gary Murfin	Response-00373	Again Oakwood is always a very big estate and it's not a great idea to build more houses on the edge of it especially as the council tax will be going to the Erewash council, it obvious the housing is being built as close to the Derby border as possible
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Number of Houses	Glynn Booker	Response-00394	Reducing the number of houses from 600 to 500 will not make any difference if the infrastructure is not being put in place to cope with any number of additional families.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Number of Houses	Iain Campbell	Response-01179	550 is a lot of houses within that area, this could possibly increase crime, which at the moment is very low
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Number of Houses	Jane Pitwood	Response-01366	The type and number of proposed properties is not relevant and is not proportional to the facilities currently in the area. It cannot help alleviate housing needs in the Long Eaton/Sandiacre areas of Erewash, it is nowhere close enough to these places to be of benefit to those wishing to live in those areas.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Number of Houses	Jeanette Kent	Response-00400	No number of houses should be built here, this is a green wedge between Derby and Amber Valley Councils, this should remain a green wedge and not built upon to satisfy housing numbers. Use your own brown field sites first
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Number of Houses	Karl Barlow	Response-00756	This proposal is for far too many houses and vastly underestimates the number of cars it will bring. The foot path across the fields is very well used, as is the bridleway. There are few shops or facilities and there are already other massive building proposals in place - all claiming the same apparent capacity in facilities. There should be no more than a 100 houses, if that many!
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Number of Houses	Liz Lockwood	Response-00464	another 550 - 600 houses in the area just adds to the urban sprawl around Chaddesden Oakwood and Spondon. There are very few details in the proposal on the type or size of houses so unable to comment further
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Number of Houses	Lou Davis	Response-00336	550 houses is a large number for a site in this position. It would obliterate any green space and would be a blot on the landscape.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Number of Houses	Mandy Cooling	Response-00313	This is a massive development and seems far too large for the environment, infrastructure and surrounding areas
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Number of Houses	Mark potter	Response-00378	Again I'm saying the same stuff theres too many houses already been build in Oakwood it needs no more so stop
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Number of Houses	Mathew Lennox-Quinn	Response-01363	That's right bang in more houses to flood area more
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Number of Houses	Nat	Response-00155	Oakwood and Chaddesden are already built up areas
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Number of Houses	Nick & Jacqui McCrorie	Response-01361	With the two other large developments in recent years at Hilltop and Mansfield Road, the ratio of residents vs infrastructure facilities is already overbalanced. This includes schools, medical facilities, community sports etc.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Number of Houses	Nick Charles	Response-01370	550 Houses, the majority of which will probably be large, will add almost 2,000 people to the area. This is unfeasible, given the lack of services, no additional shops, no additional doctors and dentists, no additional school places or community services.
			Oakwood Ward Councillors Eyre, Mulhall and Trehwella	Response-01358	We are pleased to see a reduction from 600 houses to 550 houses, though still believe the development is inappropriate.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Number of Houses	Paul Burge	Response-00289	Any built on green belt is too many.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Number of Houses	Peter Marshall	Response-00526	While I acknowledge the need for new housing, I have serious concerns about the suitability and impact of this development and number of properties being proposed.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Number of Houses	Rebecca Styles-Jones	Response-00372	Already thousands in this area with mainly one road in and one road out, this is a ridiculous location for 100s more.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Number of Houses	Sarah willis	Response-00345	Lack of facilities to support additional home owners to the area, nothing in the plans to address the personal needs that these significant increased community numbers would require.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Number of Houses	Scarlett Hamblin	Response-00395	550 houses is not needed! We already have two new housing estates that have encroached into the local area. There needs to be a limit to the amount of damage these housing developments cause.
			Simon Kittridge	Response-00584	Far too many houses to built on green land already !!
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Number of Houses	Sue Smith	Response-00376	The number of new houses that should be built on Acorn Way is Zero!!!!
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Other	Arthur Boulton	Response-01097	It would seem to me that the developer is making an enormous impact on the area and giving very little back to the local community and making an enormous profit at the expense of the local community
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Other	ASHLEY STOWER	Response-01183	This is a disgraceful plan & those putting it forward should be ashamed of themselves. It is not thought through properly & will bring congestion & misery to the local area.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Other	Carl	Response-00386	If this goes ahead which it probably will as that is Labour for you why Erawadh and not Derby Council our area our Council tax revenue
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Other	Cheryl Wilde	Response-00328	So the council tax from these new 550 houses will not go to Derby City but will go to Erewash and yet it is Derby City who will be supplying the services, road maintenance, street lighting, rubbish and waste collection, education services, cleaning etc. How is that possibly considered acceptable?
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Other	Chris copley	Response-01246	There is no easy access to the proposed site, Morley road cannot handle and increase in traffic, and is already a noisy road, it will have a negative impact on the heath, well-being and safety of local residents
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Other	Clare Tomlinson	Response-00423	This area represents a valuable green space for both wildlife and local residents. This is an unacceptable proposal
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Other	David Rees	Response-00566	The current proposal, which would construct ?at least 2 vehicular accesses onto Morley Road access points? would create a living hell for residents on Morley Road during the construction phase of the development: numerous noisy, very large HGVs and site construction vehicles; reduced air quality; and a lot of mud on the road. Given the size of the proposed development, this disturbance in Morley Road residents' lives would be for a very long period. Mental Health would without doubt become a major issue for those residents. This problem would be solved by moving the access points to Acorn Way, which has no domestic dwellings on it and would therefore have no impact on residents. My earlier comments highlighting the non-viability of the access points being located on Morley Road would also then be solved.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Other	Emma Daniels	Response-00349	Cannot keep putting up houses without proper infrastructure and facilities to support these, other areas in derby have additional schools/parks/surgeries so why is Oakwood not getting the same with all these developments that have already taken place and now wanting to build more homes is an outright disgrace
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Other	Gillian stillwell	Response-01364	Oakwood is one of the largest housing estates in Europe. It is already struggling to cope. Unless it can be guaranteed there will be more school places/ doctors and a better road system and public transport more houses will be a disaster
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Other	Helen Walker	Response-00333	This a totally crazy idea to put houses down here for so many reason but safety has to be one of the main reasons for it not happening, this road was originally built so the people of Oakwood did not have to go through Chaddesden to reduce traffic congestion and air pollution etc now you just creating that problem here now.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Other	Iain Campbell	Response-01179	This is unacceptable and has a potential to have an effect on peoples Mental Health in this area. Oakwood has always been considered as a nice peaceful area which will be affected if this goes ahead!!!!
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Other	JACQUELINE LOUISE KELLY	Response-00327	The Council Tax paid by these new families in these houses will NOT be going to pay for the services they will actually be using
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Other	Jake	Response-01005	This should not be allowed to happen & I completely object!
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Other	James Birks	Response-00574	I don't know why I've bothered filling this in!! Somebody will have been paid a lot of money to make sure it passes! It's a disgrace to even consider the location! Let alone for 550 houses
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Other	James Muldoon	Response-00338	Will Derby city Council get all the council tax as it will be them who will be having to service the new homes with schools, medicine etc.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Other	Janette Glenn	Response-00421	This is another cynical move by Erewash District Council to move their responsibility onto the edge of the city, nominating green field sites, which are more attractive to developers as they are cheaper to develop than brownfield ones. Brownfield sites do exist within the Erewash district. City services, which will be used by the residents in this proposed development, will not receive any council tax to help pay for them. The money will go to Erewash. It is time Erewash took full responsibility and looked at sites that are well within its boundaries and which will use its resources rather than those of another authority.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Other	Jason Reader	Response-00321	People wouldn't object so much if early in the planning application process developers were held accountable for plans of schools / doctors / dentists / roads / flooding. They are always an afterthought and there is no accountability.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Other	Jeanette Kent	Response-00400	We do not need Amber Valley encroaching on Oakwood, using our overstretched facilities whilst paying their taxes to Amber Valley Council. There are plenty of places within a more central Amber Valley area that can be built upon rather than so near to an, already, heavily used facilities

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Other	Karen Webster	Response-00419	Non of the ?contributions? will help with the insufficient infrastructure and the council tax will go to Erewash but the existing Derby council tax payers will suffer.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Other	Karl Barlow	Response-00756	The original proposal seems to be full of poorly based assumptions and proper research has not been done, in order to push this through. This needs proper research and wider consultation. There are no Erewash houses nearby, so the views of Oakwood residents, who know this area, should be properly considered. If you want to cause chaos on the road network, effect child safety, cause flooding and disruption, continue with this project, which I can only see as being pushed as far from Council headquarters as possible.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Other	Kelsey Strachan	Response-00377	It's quite clearly too small and tight an area to put a development on even a smaller one. The roads are all single lanes with high volumes of traffic which gets congested regularly currently with no alternatives possible due to layout of Oakwood. Go find a space that is undeveloped and start fresh rather than cramming it in somewhere to cut costs for a developer because they don't have to build the infrastructure to go with it as they will just ruin our current one in Oakwood for their own personal monetary gain.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Other	Lou Davis	Response-00336	This area is a lovely place to walk with the fog and is well utilised. It is used for grazing and is something which should be preserved
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Other	Mark potter	Response-00378	Oakwood has already had enough house build on its area and surroundings, its doctors and dentist is at stretching point can't even get an appointment now let alone another 550 plus 180 houses being built, the leisure facility?s for children is discussing 1 tiny little park suitable for under 6 nothing for older kids for the already massive estate, 1 small primary school, no secondary school, shops get congested with cars and traffic already makes no sense at all to add more house and more problems to an estate that?s already big a bursting at the seems already, I think oakwood has had enough houses already build in the last 5 years it?s time to move on and build somewhere else
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Other	Mathew Lennox-Quinn	Response-01363	Always the same build more, say you will improve services to only do nothing apart from collect the money
	Acorn Way, Derby	Other	Nick & Jacqui McCrorie	Response-01361	Due to the current size of Oakwood with such a large volume of housing we strongly object to any additional developments!
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Other	Nick Charles	Response-01370	I cannot see the point of Erewash building in what is essentially Derby, except to complete their allocation of new homes. Residents will be paying their Council Tax to EBC, but all other services will be supplied by DCC. The majority of people living here will not be working in Erewash, but rather in Derby. Surely you can find more suitable land/fields closer to your existing towns.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Other	Paul Burge	Response-00289	I find it disgusting that a council can develop land along side a neighbouring council and put extra pressure on their services. Knowing that that council will not gain from any rates raised from that development. If you want extra rateable income do so using your own services, not on already stretched ones. Your future home owners will be moving into an area with no school places (both primary and secondary) No doctors or dental capacity.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Other	Pauline Shephard	Response-00483	For years more and more housing has been built in the area without the infrastructure being put in place first. It really should not be allowed before roads are improved greatly, schools are built, medical facilities installed and a swimming pool added to the leisure centre!! The driving force for all this development is greed and profit NOT what is best for the community and the environment.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Other	Peter Marshall	Response-00526	Given the profound impact this development would have on the landscape, local community, and environment, I urge the planning authority to reject this proposal. We should protect our green spaces and landscapes, which are integral to the identity and wellbeing of our area.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Other	Rebecca Styles-Jones	Response-00372	This will affect Oakwood, Chaddesden and Spondon in the main yet Council Tax will be paid to Erewash so any financial gain will not benefit this area. Not enough school places, doctors, even shops for more people. Object to this. Enough is enough, there are brown sites available that would not affect green land.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Other	Rich King	Response-00383	There isn't enough amenities in that area as it is. None of the plans appeared to put anything extra in
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Other	Scarlett Hamblin	Response-00395	Overall, we need to stop this expansion of housing. We do not need or want any more houses. It will have a negative impact on every aspect of our community. I cannot think of one positive impact by building all these extra houses.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Other	Sharon Coward	Response-00360	Totally inappropriate to build more housing on the boundary with derby city meaning people paying council tax to Erewash will be using the infrastructure & services of derby city.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Andrea Lambert	Response-00357	Acorn Way has regular collisions without more traffic having to use the road to exit Oakwood
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Andrea Wightman	Response-00358	More traffic on acorn way will be extremely dangerous. There are no footpaths so pedestrians will have to walk on a grass verge that is not maintained or along yhe edge of a 60mph busy road
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Ashley	Response-00426	The roads are unsafe you would need a dual carriage down acorn way for this to work
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	ASHLEY STOWER	Response-01183	The amount of traffic & school children leads to daily incidents of near miss, with a junction on Morley Road this will be a disaster for traffic accidents , children accidents. There will also be anti-social behaviour due to frustration parking by the school , junction an absolutely ridiculous idea.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Brendan Horgan	Response-00610	Five schools in the vicinity
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Cameron Coope	Response-00367	A junction off of Acorn Way will lead to risk taking driving.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Carl	Response-00386	Only one place to cross
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Cheryl Wilde	Response-00328	Acorn Way is a 60mph road reducing to 40mph approaching the traffic lights towards Raynesway. Having 550 homes worth of traffic pulling out will increase the risk of accidents.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Chris copley	Response-01246	There is a school at the location that gets very busy especially at opening and closing times, cars already park up on the road and the children have to walk between them, increasing the traffic would exacerbate this issue and would pose a danger to the children. Furthermore there is a care home and nursery near by more traffic will slow down the emergency services getting to these places quickly

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Clare Tomlinson	Response-00423	Acorn Way is a national speed limit road - 60 mph single carriageway - there have been multiple accidents including fatality. The visibility is poor - the road undulates significantly and there are many blind bends. This is made worse by overgrown foliage - this road is under the responsibility of Derby and Derbyshire council - why should those residents in those councils pay to benefit multiple occupants of Erewash
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Courtney Hodges	Response-00403	Acorn Way is a fast paced road, with no pavement which is incredibly busy throughout the day. Adding more traffic onto the road will make this unsafe for pedestrians and other road users
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Danielle Andrews	Response-01244	Hundreds of children use this road daily and the traffic levels are already high. Concerns with how the extra traffic flow would exit onto Morley Road
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	David Massey	Response-00575	Morely road has speed bumps to protect school children. Vastly increasing the number of vehicles is at odds with that
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	David Rees	Response-00566	Morley Road south of the Acorn Way roundabout is already a very busy road; it 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. The road has a 30mph limit, but many vehicles travel at much higher speeds despite the presence of anti-speed bumps. Road safety is therefore already a significant issue for vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists [there are no cycle paths on this road]. Road safety is most acute in the area of Lees Brook Academy; it is already at a dangerous level during peak periods and particularly during school opening/closing periods, when the road becomes virtually blocked with ?drop-off/collection? cars and school children randomly and unpredictably meander across the road. There can be no doubt whatsoever that an additional circa 800 more vehicles from the proposed 550-house development that would ingress/egress Morley Road from ?at least 2 vehicular accesses? would further reduce road safety.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Donna Pearson	Response-00441	Morley road and acorn away are used as race tracks adding more cars to this is crazy
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Douglas Chambers	Response-01235	The potential for for approximately 1200 further children added to the present school children exiting/crossing the roads is unacceptable
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Douglas Hunt	Response-00353	Traffic congestion already makes emergency vehicle access difficult at peak times without the increase in traffic from new homes
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Edward James Gregory	Response-00727	Acorn way is very busy, with bad visibility and drainage, and the site of many accidents. Further development will increase congestion, usage, danger and surface water run off
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Emma Daniels	Response-00349	No safe places to cross the road as it is on Morley road with all the congestion. Acorn way has one set of traffic lights but it is a dangerous road and speed limit with so many accidents already on this road without the extra load adding to it
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Gary Murfin	Response-00373	Increased traffic will lead to increased road safety concerns, especially in and around schools etc
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Gillian stillwell	Response-01364	The sheer amount of traffic will be an accident waiting to happen
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Glynn Booker	Response-00394	The additional road traffic and lack if foot path on the field side is a major safety concern.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Helen Walker	Response-00333	An accident waiting to happen if these houses are added to this road, there has already been accidents on this road and it is crazy how one half of the road is under one council and the other by a different council crazy all because of stupid boundaries!
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Iain Campbell	Response-01179	This will create more traffic, increasing the risks of RTA's as this is near a busy school, people also use this area for walking dogs.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	JACQUELINE LOUISE KELLY	Response-00327	Morley Road, Acorn Way and Nottingham Road are already overloaded with traffic, with the side roads being used as "Rat Runs" an extra 500 to 1000 plus vehicles from the extra houses will just compound the situation My own street Wilsthopre Road is used as a rat run to avoid the congestion on the main roads, and there are accidents, near miss accidents, speeding, and full on arguments and standoffs just about every single day .....how will another 1000 odd vehicles help that matter
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	James Birks	Response-00574	Morley Road has access to both Leesbrook school and cavendish close junior school, adding vehicles for 550 houses will make the school route extremely dangerous
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	James Hope	Response-00548	The intention for the development at Acornway to use the existing transport infrastructure would lead to a significant increase in what is currently serious traffic congestion on Morley Rd and the Acorn Way / Derby Road island. This congestion would impact the new population of Acornway as well as the existing local population. Morley Road, even without the addition of 550 homes is experiencing significant Traffic bottlenecks. The Acornway development will significantly enhance this problem particularly in the pupil route to Lees Brook school.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Jane Pitwood	Response-01366	Acorn Way is already a road with a high incidence of accidents, both major (fortunately not the majority) and minor. Increasing traffic on this road can only make matters worse unless there is a total rethink on this route.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Janette Glenn	Response-00421	Acorn Way is a fast 60 mph road which already struggles with traffic volume. Adding new junctions would be dangerous and exacerbate existing congestion issues at peak times.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Jason Reader	Response-00321	No info on traffic calming for acorn way.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Jeanette Kent	Response-00400	The dips and bends on this road frequently lead to accidents, some worse than others, with no room for overtaking, road is closed far too often due to an accident
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Jenifer Truckle	Response-00925	Cars often speed around this area, there are no speed safety measures on the top end of Morley Road and no safe pedestrian crossing areas, especially for school children walking to Leesbrook
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Karen Smith	Response-00636	Drivers drive too fast on this road and accidents are common
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Karl Barlow	Response-00756	I have seen numerous dangerous incidents on Morley Road. I am a Police Officer of over 20 years. I do not believe increasing the traffic, as this development would do, would be safe, particularly considering the school and two care homes on this stretch.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Kelsey Strachan	Response-00377	Acorn Way is an unlit road where may drivers already drive dangerously slow due to visibility issues. Increasing distractions along that road is dangerous moreso. Morley Road hosts many school kids and pedestrians, the extra traffic is guaranteed to increase road risks as it is windy and visibility poor.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Lewis	Response-00533	Too much congestion
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Liz Lockwood	Response-00464	The proposed access points are now on Morley Road - previously it was proposed that access be via Acorn way. Acorn way is currently derestricted and it would be inherently dangerous for access on to this road However Morley Road is a nightmare during term time and becomes gridlocked with parents and cars and the extra cars from this development would add to the traffic and back up into Chaddesden and Oakwood. The Oakwood Roundabout is also an issue as the traffic from Acorn Way use it as a slalom so any any traffic would cause tailbacks and possible accidents Any increase to the no of Cyclists on to this districted roadsdo not mix and it will be a hazard to both car users and cyclists if there is any increase in the no of cyclists There are no pavements at all on Acorn Way at present so it is hazardous to pedestrians although access is proposed in Morley Road there will be people who would Flooding - over the past year Acorn Way had been closed due to flooding
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Lou Davis	Response-00336	Acorn Way has experienced a number of serious incidents in recent years - including a fatality and also accidents which have closed the road for a significant time; it is a relatively narrow road with limited visibility - prone to flooding. Morley Road is traffic calmed by speed bumps but drivers accelerate between these - as a driver, a pedestrian and a cyclist - this is not a safe road.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Mandy Cooling	Response-00313	There must be significant concerns regarding road safety by introducing such a massive development in such a location
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Mandy Dickens	Response-00425	Accessing and exiting the new proposed site would be extremely hazardous and subsequently result in accidents
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Mark potter	Response-00378	Acorn way is a quick road that gets congested already so adding more traffic down a fast poor lite road will cause more accidents and more pedestrians messing about or crossing that already busy fast road again madness that?s why there are no houses on that road
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Mathew Lennox-Quinn	Response-01363	Single carriage way with no separate cycle lane, Morley road already got traffic calming measures, and congested due to amount of housing
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Melanie Arnold	Response-00573	Morley Road already with a number of schools nurseries leading off it. More y traffic will mean more congestion and road safety to both residents and pupils.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Natalie Peake	Response-00794	Building this many houses raises serious concerns about public safety and health. The increase in vehicle numbers will result in higher air pollution levels, particularly impacting children and young people walking to and from school each day, as well as local residents. The are no safe place for children and Residents to cross and I fear a rise in traffic related incidents due to the increase of vehicles on the surrounding roads.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Neville Chatterton	Response-01078	Morley Road at peak periods is already chaotic when children are leaving Lees Brook academy, traffic park along length of road making it difficult to drive through. Further increases in traffic will be a nightmare scenario particularly buses, ambulances, fire engines etc.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Nick Charles	Response-01370	See ?Traffic Congestion? above. Pedestrian access will be made worse with 550 new houses, as at present there is only a footpath on one side of the road, opposite the proposed site, the other side has a steep bank. This will make for dangerous conditions. The traffic will be greatly increased on Morley Road, which was not built for this volume of traffic and also at the Acorn Way junction with Morley Road, which at peak times is already slow moving.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Nicki Harries	Response-00541	Already regular accidents, especially Morley Road which people use as cut through to try and avoid hold-ups else where nearby. This will make it even more dangerous
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Nicola Olver	Response-00434	Lots of children cross this road to get to schools in Spondon. More traffic will reduce the safety of our children
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Oakwood Ward Councillors Eyre, Mulhall and Trehwella	Response-01358	The comments in our previous objection remain relevant.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Paul Burge	Response-00289	We already have speed bumps to control traffic flow but still get speeding motorists. With additional traffic from this estate this will only get worse.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Peter Marshall	Response-00526	This scale of development is unsuitable for the area and poses a real danger to road users and pedestrians. I urge the council to reject this application.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Robert Collis	Response-00355	The road floods quite regularly during heavy road along with the water flowing across the carriageway which is dangerous. Footpaths with exits onto major roads will no doubt be an opportunity for the footfall to take risks when crossing
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Robert Mee	Response-01579	I have significant concerns about road safety too, with everybody living in the new development needing to cross the busy Acorn Way in order to reach any facilities.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Robert Mee	Response-01508	I have significant concerns about road safety too, with everybody living in the new development needing to cross the busy Acorn Way in order to reach any facilities.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Scarlett Hamblin	Response-00395	Acorn way is already subject to speeding drivers by adding more this will increase the risk. As there is only one traffic light crossing it is very dangerous to add more cars.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Sharon Coward	Response-00360	Increased traffic on already busy roads will add to the dangers of road users & pedestrians.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Stephen oliver	Response-00391	Outrageous,too much traffic and noise goes through Oakwood already,even worse fast two surgeries in Oakwood you can?t get an appointment at anytime this will add further stress on the roads most have great potholes in them ,just see the ones near the co op in the main presink,,as a chronic asthmatic I suffer badly,more houses car pollution will increase my suffering,one other reason we now get frequent loss of electricity I am told like myself who have electric cars to charge.please build your homes elsewhere
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Sue Smith	Response-00376	More cars on the road will be more of a hazard to the local school children and other pedestrians
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Tanya Caldbeck	Response-00919	Major issue with this road with many RTAs. More traffic will cause more issues
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	Tom King	Response-00735	Adding any form of junction to acorn way would be a large safety hazard due to volume of traffic



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Road Safety	William Gregory	Response-00411	With the growing number of accidents on Acorn Way and Morley Road, (not all reported) it?s clear that the increased traffic?largely due to the significant rise in new housing developments?has already overwhelmed the area. Any further addition of properties would only exacerbate the existing issues, putting further strain on already dangerous roads. Moreover, the current infrastructure is not equipped to support the growing population. Local services such as doctors? surgeries, schools, and public transport are already under significant pressure. Without meaningful investment in infrastructure and safety measures, further development would be unsustainable and detrimental to the quality of life for existing and future residents.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Andrea Lambert	Response-00357	The current school in Oakwood can't cope with the residents it has now and parent have to travel to get children in schools out of the area. More houses will make the matter worse
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Andrea Wightman	Response-00358	Schools are full, ehat schools will the children go to, Heanor gate, kirk Hallam, stanley village primary etc... no there will be an expectation that the children are educated in Derby, our schools are full..
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Ashley	Response-00426	There is not enough school places .. we live on Morley Road in Oakwood and our children could not get into Oakwood school so it?s not difficult to work out you would need another school building ??
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	ASHLEY STOWER	Response-01183	Lees Brook School is extremely busy there is unlikely to be enough places even if some are sent to West Park. Again road congestion , pollution , air quality are all effected.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Callum Rhodes	Response-00371	The oakwood area is already at capacity for school places
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Cameron Coope	Response-00367	West Park & Lees Brook the 2 closest secondary schools are already nearly full in every year group. More families will make this worse.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Carl	Response-00386	Already at bursting point
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Cheryl Wilde	Response-00328	There aren't enough primary school places in Oakwood for the number of houses we already have and there is no secondary school in Oakwood so where are all the children going to go to school and how will they get there.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Chloe	Response-00508	You gonna build more schools or keep increasing g numbers in class? I don?t think you look at the bigger picture
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Clare Tomlinson	Response-00423	The local schools are oversubscribed - these schools are in the Derby City Council area and will not benefit from Erewash council tax. Although there are other schools - they are not within walking distance and this would add to traffic flow.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Courtney Hodges	Response-00403	Living in Oakwood now, we will struggle when our child is old enough to get into the one school that Oakwood has, meaning our child will have to go to a school in Chaddesden, taking a space from another child who lives in Chaddesden
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	David Massey	Response-00575	There isn't sufficient capacity in local schools for the current level of children given the class sizes are known to be too large. School times are already chaos with no clear strategy for controlling vehicles at those times. Again this seems to be at odds with protecting the children using speed bumps by increasing traffic
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	David Rees	Response-00566	The deletion of ?Financial contributions towards the provision of additional pupil capacity at appropriate schools in Oakwood and Chaddesden where necessary;? is unacceptable and exposes the dishonourable approach being taken by Erewash Borough Council [EBC] on this proposed development, which would be built on EBC land, but the EBC expects Derby City Council tax payers to pay for the impact on local infrastructure and facilities such as schools, whilst EBC enjoys the income from the 550 families in terms of council tax. Assuming the current birth rate in the UK [1.57/woman], 550 dwellings could be expected to contain 550 x 1.57 = 863 children; not all dwellings will contain children, therefore a number of, say, 550 children would be a reasonable assumption. Clearly, this number of children would not be able to be accommodated in the existing schools in Oakwood and Chaddesden, so for EBC to expect Derby City council [and its council tax payers] to pick up the tab for the costs of 500 additional school places is at best naïve and, at worst, disgracefully dishonourable. EBC must provide all necessary school facilities for its own residents.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Donna Pearson	Response-00441	As a mother of 2 children living in Oakwood I am disappointed that I could not get my children in to Oakwood school.So in order to cater for the new families you plan on brining to Oakwood i suggest you will need to build a new school!
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Douglas Hunt	Response-00353	Local schools are currently close to maximum capacity with no scope or funding to increase in size
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Edward James Gregory	Response-00727	Schools are already oversubscribed. Erewash does not provide schools in this area, so the development should not be considered
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Emma Daniels	Response-00349	Why have the provisions for extra school capacity been marked out? This is a pivotal point, how can another 550 homes be built without any additional school? Where are all the children supposed to go?
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Gary Murlin	Response-00373	More new schools will be needed, the junior school in Oakwood is already too small for the area
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Gemma	Response-00380	You continue to want to build more and more housed. But thete us no consideration of. Doctor capacity - cannot get an appointment due to the oakwood ward already bring under provided for School places - 550 house means more children and you won't contribute to extending / building a school to cater for yhe children who need places. Dentists / local shops, Are you building parks for children to play or just taking up.all the land for profit? traffic and amenities- its already impossible to get out of oakwood after 7.45. So adding even more traffic is a huge mistake. I strongly object
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Gillian stillwell	Response-01364	School places already too few, especially primary and infant places
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Glynn Booker	Response-00394	Additional pressure on schools will mean more children travelling further, All local schools are at full capacity so unless more schools are being built our children will not get the high standard of education we expect.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Helen Walker	Response-00333	Local schools won?t cope the extra pupils and it won?t be Erewash Schools it will be City Schools which will have to cope.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Iain Campbell	Response-01179	Morley gardens is currently a pickup area for school children, this site could cause an increase of congestion spoiling was is a quiet area. THE REASON WE MOVED HERE
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	James Birks	Response-00574	The local schools are already full how can they support 550 houses

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	James Hope	Response-00548	The addition of 550 homes will lead to an inevitable shortfall in available schooling places. as the extension of local schools to increase pupil capacity is not viable. This will result in a large number of children having to travel a significantly greater distance to their place of schooling than is expected or desirable.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	James Muldoon	Response-00338	Not enough schools and I cannot see the majority of people driving/travelling to schools in Ilkeston.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Jane Pitwood	Response-01366	Schools in this area are funded by Derby City Council and are already oversubscribed by children currently living in the Derby City area. I note that there is no provision for a new school (funded by Erewash) and the clause to provide additional funding to help the local schools has now been withdrawn. Where are any children moving to this proposed new development going to be educated and who will be expected to fund this?
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Jason Reader	Response-00321	Lack of info on additional school places.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Jeanette Kent	Response-00400	Schools in the area are already over subscribed and more houses would lead to even more. Derby would be expected to find places for them in this area, not Amber Valley schools and services
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Jessica	Response-00603	There are certainly not enough schools in this area to cope with the inevitable families that will be set to live in these houses. There would need to be additional schools built to facilitate this.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Karl Barlow	Response-00756	This is not the only development, with several others already confirmed. It is already impossible to get a primary school place in Oakwood and if this goes ahead, it should include a new primary school. Leesbrook is already full and will need to service the Derby City kids before this new development.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Kelsey Strachan	Response-00377	Leesbrook and West Park are highly subscribed schools already, the closest alternative is a significant travel commitment for parents who have to both work nowadays. Primary schools are few in the area also. There is no site for a new school and clearly no plans either so shocking choice to add hundreds more people here.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Laura	Response-00387	Subject: Objection to Planning for 550 Houses on Acorn Way and 160 Houses on Breadsall Hilltop Dear Sir/Madam, I am writing to formally object to the planning for 550 houses on Acorn Way and a further 160 houses on Breadsall Hilltop in Derby. I believe these developments are unsustainable and will have a significantly detrimental impact on the existing community and infrastructure. My objections are based on the following key concerns: 1. Misrepresentation of Target Residents and Increased Traffic: The proposal claims the development on Acorn Way will serve people who wish to live in Ilkeston, Long Eaton and Sandiacre, which is a fantasy. They are 20+ minutes away. The inevitable consequence of these 710 new households will be a substantial increase in traffic. Derby has high pollution levels and this will increase traffic further. 2. Over-Subscription of Local Schools: The schools in the areas surrounding both Acorn Way and Breadsall Hilltop are already over subscribed. The addition of these 710 houses will place an unsustainable burden on these educational facilities. 3. Over-Subscription of Local GP Surgeries: The GP surgeries in the areas surrounding both Acorn Way and Breadsall Hilltop are already over subscribed. The addition of these 710 houses will place an unsustainable burden on these healthcare services. 4. Increased Flood Risk at Breadsall Hilltop: In recent inclement weather, Breadsall village has flooded. Building 160 houses on the land at Breadsall Hilltop will cause further run off and increase the flood risk to Breadsall village and surrounding areas. In conclusion, I strongly believe that these planning applications for 550 houses on Acorn Way and 160 houses on Breadsall Hilltop are ill-conceived and fail to adequately consider the significant negative impacts they will have on the existing community and infrastructure of Derby. I urge the planning authority to reject these applications. A development of this scale in these locations is unsustainable and will severely compromise the quality of life for current and future residents of Derby. Yours faithfully, Mrs Lincoln
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Lewis	Response-00533	Is there even capacity at the already over filled schools for an extra 500 families ?
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Liz Lockwood	Response-00464	The financial support for schools has been deleted as per the amendment and is not acceptable. This is an Erewash development, however it is expected the Oakwood and Chaddesden schools should bear the increase in school admissions. Where is the nearest Erewash School. As far as I am aware the nearest primary School is on Oakwood and it is full, indeed the catchment area is so small that most of Oakwood is unable to use the school. Therefore it would not be able to accept pupils from this development. This means that both Oakwood and Erewash children would be competing for places in Chaddesden and Spondon schools. To note none of these schools are on bus routes so there would be an increase in traffic for drop off and collections of children
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Lorna Coope	Response-00365	The local schools are already overprescribed and occupants are having to send their children to schools further away. Not only does this contribute to traffic issues, but children are becoming isolated from being in schools in different areas to where they're living.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Lou Davis	Response-00336	The area in question would be part of Erewash - the local schools are part of Derby City. There is already inadequate provision of school places - an additional 500 houses would add to the pressure. These schools would not be funded to meet the demand and places would need to be located elsewhere.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Mandy Cooling	Response-00313	I couldn't see any plans for critical infrastructure to support the influx of hundreds more residents such as plans for doctors' surgeries (which are already groaning under the weight of thousands of patients), schools etc
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Mark potter	Response-00378	Oakwood has only 1 very small primary school so where will the children be going? again adding more traffic, pollution and dangers on the roads because people will have to drive to the school because none are being built for all these houses being built
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Melanie Arnold	Response-00573	Schools in the area are already over crowded. 550 new homes will put pressure on the schools.,
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Mr Stephen Langton	Response-00024	There is a clear principle that developments within Erewash borough should not be relying upon and using school facilities supplied and funded by the adjacent Derby City Council. Now that EBC have started to recognise this principle with the allocation of sites adjacent to existing settlements within the Erewash borough, the Acorn Way and all other proposed sites abutting Derby city conurbation should be withdrawn.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Nick Charles	Response-01370	You state in your revised documentation that you will no longer make ?Financial contributions towards the provision of additional pupil capacity at appropriate schools in Oakwood and Chaddesden where necessary?. So how will this help with providing education to the hundreds of children who will eventually live here and will all need places to be schooled. 550 houses, is basically the same as a small village, who would have at least a village school, yet you are suggesting that you will have NO responsibility for them.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Nicki Harries	Response-00541	How on earth will existing schools cope with the demand. Awful for young families
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Nicola Oliver	Response-00434	West Park is at full capacity now, developers say they will contribute money for expansion which is good but will they be able to find additional teachers and pay their salaries over the many years?
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Oakwood Ward Councillors Eyre, Muthall and Trehwella	Response-01358	The comments in our previous objection remain relevant. The removal of financial contributions to schooling in the immediate area will do nothing for future residents who would reside on this land, and will guarantee the schools status as car dependant. We assume this has come due to the disagreement between Erewash BC and Derby CC regarding schooling, which came from Erewash BC's continuous assumption that Derby CC would provide educational places for residents on this land, despite being repeatedly told that they would not, and despite Derbyshire CC having a duty to provide the places. We would like to know what schools financial contributions would be made towards.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Paul Burge	Response-00289	Leesbrook school is already at full capacity and with the leaving age going to 18yrs old this will only increase.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Pauline Shephard	Response-00483	People can't get their children into the local schools already and it has been the same for years. You can't just keep building houses without putting in the infrastructure.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Peter Marshall	Response-00526	Local infrastructure is already under considerable pressure. In particular, nearby schools are at or near full capacity. This development would increase the number of families needing school places, potentially resulting in overcrowded classrooms, longer commutes for children, or families being forced to seek education outside the local area.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Rachael Hinckley	Response-01166	Morley gardens is currently a parking area for school children now, this site could cause an increase of school traffic to the area
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Rich King	Response-00383	These are already at capacity without the additional development. It's unrealistic and too close to lees brook and west park to put a new school in as well as additional housing
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Robert Collis	Response-00355	Our understanding is that schools are already at capacity therefore where will the children go to school, hopefully the nearest Erewash school so as not to take over city spaces
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Sara Cotton	Response-00368	Schools in the area are at capacity
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Sarah Smyth	Response-00375	Schools are already at capacity in the area (we have had to send our daughter to an independent school as cannot get in proffered catchment school and class sizes too big in others) to add more houses without more schools is irresponsible and greedy
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Sarah willis	Response-00345	Lack of schools in the area to accommodate additional families requiring educational support in the local area.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Scarlett Hamblin	Response-00395	Park view is already oversubscribed with Breadsall hilltop not far behind. I myself was awarded my child's third choice school with my two local schools full. I have the make the journey to a chaddesden school twice daily. There are not enough school places to support these new children without moving further out of the catchment area.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Sharon Coward	Response-00360	Increased need for school places in the area which do not come under Erewash will severely impact other authorities in a negative way.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Sue Smith	Response-00376	The local schools are already at full capacity!!!! Where will all of the children from these new houses go to school????
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Tanya Caldbeck	Response-00919	No school space and no capacity
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	School Capacity	Tom King	Response-00735	Local schools already at capacity
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Andrea Lambert	Response-00357	Acorn Way suffers enough congestion without building more houses and causing more congestion
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Andrea Wightman	Response-00358	Acorn Way is already extremely busy, especially at the start and end of the day. It will be dangerous to have hundreds more vehicles using the road.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Arthur Boulton	Response-01097	Living on Morley rd I am well aware of the cogestion caused by traffic both to and from acorn way the suggestion only tinker with what will be major congestion problems in the area caused by this development
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Ashley	Response-00426	The infrastructures are not in place to accept the level of traffic that would come down acorn way the works being done at the roundabout at Nottingham Road near Asda are clear evidence of the trouble that will cause.. build the roads first .. don't let the developer build first
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	ASHLEY STOWER	Response-01183	We live on Morley Road & suffer from chronic road congestion due to it being used as a rat run into Derby to avoid Acorn way , Lees Brook School Parking and Cavendish school traffic.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Brendan Horgan	Response-00610	Morley Road is already a designated traffic sensitive route, with heavy congestion at certain times of the day. There are five schools in the immediate vicinity, which cause excessive traffic build up due to parents traveling to Lees Brook School, or on route to the other schools in the area. Morley Road , is simply not up to accepting increased traffic. The road construction along Morley road is substandard for its present use , as it was previously a simple country lane, and it was never envisaged that traffic volumes would be what they are today.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Carl	Response-00386	This road is always busy at peak times and will cause further problems with surround roads
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Cheryl Wilde	Response-00328	Acorn Way is a very busy road already and cannot support another 550 homes.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Chloe	Response-00508	One way out of spondon down willowcroft how you planning to control traffic and not make everyone late
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Chris copley	Response-01246	There is already a serious problem congestion in the area, especially at school opening and closing times. Morley road has speed bumps and cars often parked up blocking part of the road so there is poor natural flow of traffic

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Clare Tomlinson	Response-00423	Acorn Way and Morley Road are over capacity at Peak Times - the traffic noise from Acorn Way in particular is very bad. There are often delays exiting Oakwood at peak times - particularly towards Asda and Kings Corner
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Courtney Hodges	Response-00403	Too much traffic on an already busy road which is one of the only ways in or out of Oakwood. This will have a huge effect on peak rush hour traffic also
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Danielle Andrews	Response-01244	Morley Road already struggles to accommodate traffic flow to and from the school, there is no safe way to funnel traffic for upwards of 1000 extra people onto acorn way and the congestion on Morley Road will be significant. This road is full of speed bumps and cars parked on the roadside limit traffic flow further
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	David Massey	Response-00575	Morley Road is barely big enough to service the houses on it particularly at school times. It wasn't deemed important enough to be resurfaced properly and if it was decided it needed speed bumps due to the school why can it now be ok to add the volume of traffic from 550 houses.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	David Rees	Response-00566	The proposal to construct ?at least 2 vehicular accesses onto Morley Road? and, by implication, none on Acorn Way, is not viable, for the following reasons: 1. Morley Road south of the Acorn Way roundabout 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. 2. Morley Road south of the Acorn Way roundabout is a relatively narrow road with several bends and it only takes a very few vehicles parked on the road to result in traffic congestion; several vehicles are always parked on the road and, in the Lees Brook Academy area during school opening/closing periods, Morley Road becomes effectively blocked 200-300m either side of the school entrance. The road is so narrow that even cars partially parked on the path [soon to become forbidden] cannot be passed by a vehicle without that vehicle crossing to the ?oncoming? side of the road. 3. Construction of any new vehicular access on Morley Road south of the Acorn Way roundabout would have to comprise either a T junction or a roundabout: the former at least would require traffic lights to allow the large number of vehicles from the development access onto Morley Road; both would have to be built to the east of Morley Road, as the west side is fully populated by housing. Either option would be feasible at the northern end of the section of Morley Road where the land on the east side is the same level as that of the road, but not south of the White House Nursery because of the increasing elevation difference between Morley Road and the land to the east of it: either a T junction or a roundabout would require lower the approach road to that of Morley Road and this, together with the bend in the road in this part of Morley Road, would result in a blind junction. Any new vehicular accesses onto Morley Road would adversely impact traffic flow on Morley Road, particularly if traffic lights are necessary. 5. Widening Morley Road would not solve the congestion problems outlined above: widening would only be possible on the east side of the road, and only as far south as Morley Gardens, from which point existing dwellings occupy both sides of the road. 4. In summary, 550 dwellings in the proposed development would result in circa 800 more vehicles regularly using Morley Road; given the congestion problems highlighted above, Morley Road in its current state or potentially widened state would not cope with this additional number of vehicles. 5. A further point on traffic congestion: if the plan is for HGVs to access the site during the building phase via the ?at least 2 vehicular accesses onto Morley Road?, this would be totally untenable: currently no large HGVs use Morley Road, because it is too narrow; I understand that there is a weight restriction on Morley Road; the impact on Morley Road residents would be immense. 6. The plans should be further amended to remove ?at least 2 vehicular accesses onto Morley Road?, and replaced with ?at least 2 vehicular accesses onto Acorn Way?: Acorn Way is a wider road and would lend itself to widening and ingress/egress points far better than Morley Road, which is totally unfit for what the current proposal requires.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Donna Pearson	Response-00441	The traffic on Morley road and acorn way is already at breaking point.For every house you build there will be another 2 cars.Our roads can't cope as it is.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Douglas Chambers	Response-01235	The potential for additional vehicular traffic causing further major congestion on Morley is unacceptable. Under present conditions through traffic can be delayed for very long periods
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Douglas Hunt	Response-00353	Traffic congestion is already a major problem on Morley Road without extra traffic from new homes
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Edward James Gregory	Response-00727	Acorn way is very busy, with bad visibility and drainage, and the site of many accidents. Further development will increase congestion, usage, danger and surface water run off
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Emma Daniels	Response-00349	Traffic is congested enough through Morley road and Acorn way
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Gary Murfin	Response-00373	Traffic congestion is always bad getting in and out of Oakwood and this is bound to make it far worse and also increased pollution, especially as most houses tend to have 2 cars or more nowadays
			Gemma	Response-00384	Acorn way is already congested at peak times. Adding more homes around this area would just be absolute chaos
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Gillian stillwell	Response-01364	This area already suffers considerable congestion , particularly at the time leesbrook school finishes for the day. The area is impassable.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Glynn Booker	Response-00394	Morley road is in poor condition and not suitable for heavy traffic as the weight limit sign indicates as no through road to heavy traffic. The round about at the top of Morely road is over capacity as it is, without any additional vehicle traffic.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Helen Walker	Response-00333	Acorn way is a dangerous road already without adding in houses off it which have to come onto this already busy road, The traffic which uses this road is quite heavy and can be queuing without adding more traffic to it.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Iain Campbell	Response-01179	This will create a influx of traffic congestion with a possibility of 1100 cars with 2 cars per household being the normal now.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	JACQUELINE LOUISE KELLY	Response-00327	An extra 550 houses - just about every family has 1 to 2 cars, thats an extra 550 to 1000+ vehicles using Acorn Way and the neighbouring housing estate each day Acorn way is already extremely heavily congested at peak times with traffic causing mayhem, the traffic often building up around a bend and causing accidents, I myself have been shunted on Acorn Way due to traffic on the blind bend and I know of lots of accidents and fatalities on that road
			Jake	Response-01005	This should not be allowed to happen!

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	James Bellaby	Response-00340	Congestion is already bad on acorn way. The roundabouts at each end can't cope as it is.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	James Birks	Response-00574	How can Morley road support the vehicles to an extra 550 houses! The road is busy enough and during school times is sometimes impassable
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	James Hope	Response-00548	The intention for the development at Acorn Way to use the existing transport infrastructure would lead to a significant increase in what is currently serious traffic congestion on Morley Rd and the Acorn Way / Derby Road island. This congestion would impact the new population of SGA1 as well as the existing local population.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	James Muldoon	Response-00338	Acorn Way cannot sustain another 550 homes.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Jane Pitwood	Response-01366	This area already suffers from congestion at peak times. How can an additional 550 houses alleviate this problem? I can only see it getting worse.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Jason Reader	Response-00321	I live in Breadsall village which will see significant traffic increase from this development getting to the A38. Until I see plans from the developer to alleviate both the speed and volume of traffic in my village I will object. This isn't me being a NIMBY but developers should be held accountable for the effects of their development. I realise we need more houses they just aren't built sensitively.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Jeanette Kent	Response-00400	Acorn Way is a nightmare with heavy traffic leaving Oakwood already, if there is an accident on this road ( which happen frequently) there is no way to avoid a long detour
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Jenifer Truckle	Response-00925	Congestion on Morley road is a already an issue, this will make it worse
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Jessica	Response-00603	This plan for housing will be hugely detrimental to the traffic in Derby, which is already a nightmare in this area particularly. The current roads cannot cope with the foot traffic that will come from this.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	John Moffat	Response-01386	Once again, more houses = more cars with no thought put to the inevitable additional traffic in the surrounding area. Access to A52, M1 & Nottingham , not bad Access to A38, as usual, through Breadsall There was an opportunity to create a link from Bishop's Drive to the roundabout near McDonalds / Morrisons but this was missed.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Karen Smith	Response-00636	Acorn Way is an over subscribed road and is subject to flooding and frequent accidents
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Karen Webster	Response-00419	The roads cannot cope with the existing traffic and that amount of houses will make it even worse. Even with some access, it doesn't mean the roads have any more capacity.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Karl Barlow	Response-00756	Morley Road is already congested around school drop off and pick up times. Morley Road North of the roundabout by Acorn way and Morley Road is already congested at rush hours, with tailbacks from Kings Corner all the way to this roundabout. Further traffic will only make these issues worse. Traffic is already backed up the entirety of Acorn Way from 0730 each morning. Morley Road is a residential Road, but given the unique setup of Oakwood and Chaddesden, there are few interconnecting roads, so this is often busy. Adding a considerable number of houses will likely congest one of the two main points onto the Oakwood estate. In order to make the safe and effective, the entirety of Morley Road would need to be widened.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Kelsey Strachan	Response-00377	Acorn Way is already slow at peak times at the Asda roundabout due to being a single lane, but the main route towards Derby and A52/M1 to Nottingham for all of Oakwood. Equally Morley Road is incredibly busy at school periods with parking causing it to be essentially 1 lane at those times. Speed bumps reduce the traffic currently, but this would massively increase the volume and is not remotely capable of handling more.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Laura	Response-00387	Subject: Objection to Planning for 550 Houses on Acorn Way and 160 Houses on Breadsall Hilltop Dear Sir/Madam, I am writing to formally object to the planning for 550 houses on Acorn Way and a further 160 houses on Breadsall Hilltop in Derby. I believe these developments are unsustainable and will have a significantly detrimental impact on the existing community and infrastructure. My objections are based on the following key concerns: 1. Misrepresentation of Target Residents and Increased Traffic: The proposal claims the development on Acorn Way will serve people who wish to live in Ilkeston, Long Eaton and Sandiacre, which is a fantasy. They are 20+ minutes away. The inevitable consequence of these 710 new households will be a substantial increase in traffic. Derby has high pollution levels and this will increase traffic further. 2. Over-Subscription of Local Schools: The schools in the areas surrounding both Acorn Way and Breadsall Hilltop are already over subscribed. The addition of these 710 houses will place an unsustainable burden on these educational facilities. 3. Over-Subscription of Local GP Surgeries: The GP surgeries in the areas surrounding both Acorn Way and Breadsall Hilltop are already over subscribed. The addition of these 710 houses will place an unsustainable burden on these healthcare services. 4. Increased Flood Risk at Breadsall Hilltop: In recent inclement weather, Breadsall village has flooded. Building 160 houses on the land at Breadsall Hilltop will cause further run off and increase the flood risk to Breadsall village and surrounding areas. In conclusion, I strongly believe that these planning applications for 550 houses on Acorn Way and 160 houses on Breadsall Hilltop are ill-conceived and fail to adequately consider the significant negative impacts they will have on the existing community and infrastructure of Derby. I urge the planning authority to reject these applications. A development of this scale in these locations is unsustainable and will severely compromise the quality of life for current and future residents of Derby. Yours faithfully, Mrs Lincoln
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Lewis	Response-00533	Acorn Way already too busy with traffic especially at peak times. Leads to queueing at roundabout Morley road
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Liz Lockwood	Response-00464	Acorn way is a busy main road and carries the traffic from Oakwood/Chaddesden and further afield with people trying to avoid the city centre and get access to A52 as well as the Asda supermarket Acorn way is already at a standstill at the Asda Roundabout in peak times due to the amount of traffic for chaddesden and oakwood. A further 600 homes = at least 600 cars will add to the congestion. The access from the proposed estate onto the Morley Road especially around Lees Brook School will add to the traffic and the road is gridlocked at drop off and pick up times The proposal to provide multi use crossing on Acorn Way to access the footpaths is ludicrous - it is a derestricted road with poor sighting around the access points will make them accident spots

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Lorna Coope	Response-00365	With two routes out of the housing estates, one being via acorn way, there are already issues with congestion, traffic volumes and road safety.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Lou Davis	Response-00336	This development will need to utilise either Acorn Way or Morley Road for access and egress. Both of these roads suffer from the effects of traffic with Acorn Way in particular facing extreme congestion during rush hour periods. Morley Road is difficult to negotiate during school opening and closing times and more cars etc would add to this in a detrimental way.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Lucy Skeet	Response-00388	Again, this is already bad enough. The area is not meant for as much traffic as it gets now, let alone with more people
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Mandy Cooling	Response-00313	I have serious concerns about the impact of such a massive development on the creaking infrastructure. Acorn Way is currently a decent road to get traffic moving around Oakwood and surrounding areas. I envisage that this road will need to be slowed to a 30mph in light of the proximity to so many new residents and that it's envisaged that it will include crossings. That will all have an impact and likely result in further gridlock around this side of Derby
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Mandy Dickens	Response-00425	The amount of houses suggested for this site would mean an enormous increase to the traffic along Derby/Nottingham Road, Acorn Way and Raynesway. These roads are already suffer alot of congestion. Any further addition would simply gridlock these roads.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Mark potter	Response-00378	Acorn way gets very busy in the mornings with traffic backing up so adding more houses to cause more traffic flowing down acorn way is absolute madness and even adding a roundabout or traffic light would further add to the problem I think oakwood has had enough houses already build of the last 5 years time to move on
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Mathew Lennox-Quinn	Response-01363	Already area gets to busy with traffic, road also floods every year
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Nat	Response-00155	The volume of traffic will increase
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Natalie Peake	Response-00794	the proposed development of 550 new homes will put unbearable pressure on local roads, many of which are already congested. It is reasonable to expect that most households will have more than one vehicle, potentially adding over 1,000 additional cars to the local network. The stretch of Morley Road outside Lees Brook Academy becomes gridlocked on a daily basis, particularly where the road narrows and is obstructed by parked cars on both sides. This often prevents larger vehicles?including buses and emergency services?from getting through. Furthermore, Acorn Way is routinely closed due to traffic accidents and flooding, forcing traffic to be diverted through Oakwood or along Morley Road, compounding the congestion. The island at Acorn Way and Morley Road is already operating at 80% capacity and simply cannot accommodate the increased volume of traffic this development would generate.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Nathan Latymer	Response-00363	The traffic in this area is awful as it is, with no need for it to be made any worse by adding loads of houses. Also, adding more pedestrian crossings along Acorn Way will amplify this issue.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Neville Chatterton	Response-01078	Acorn way and Morley Road are already very busy roads mainly at peak periods and traffic congestion and road safety will be significant.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Nick & Jacqui McCrorie	Response-01361	As a resident of Morley Rd, we already notice worsening heavy traffic at peak rush hour culminating in frequent queues crawling past our house. This proposed development will make traffic much worse with increased volumes of vehicles accessing the new development. This increased traffic will also worsen air pollution in the area.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Nick Charles	Response-01370	Morley Road is narrower than many other roads in the immediate area and struggles to provide the space cars, buses and emergency vehicles need when the road is clogged with parked cars. The twice-daily, severe school parking issues with Lees Brook Academy, make the road dreadful to drive on, and almost impossible for buses and emergency vehicles. Side streets are clogged, with some residents trapped on their own driveways. The ?creation of at least two new vehicular junctions with suitable pedestrian access into Morley Road?, will only make matters much worse, especially as there is only a footpath on one side of the road from the Acorn Way Roundabout to Lees Brook Academy. 550 houses worth of new traffic, will clog Morley Road with traffic, much more than it is now, particularly at peak times. During the 5 year building timetable, the addition of heavy vehicles along Morley Road and the obstructions they will create, will be intolerable for most residents, particularly those living near the site.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Nicki Harries	Response-00541	The congestion and number of accidents has risen due the the 2 new estates already in the area, this will make it even worse and I don?t see how new junctions will help it?ll just cause even more hold ups
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Nicola Olver	Response-00434	Traffic is already horrendous in this area. Lots of accidents on Acorn Way over the years. Pollution from more traffic will rise drastically affecting people?s health. Other grey and brown belt land available to use in Erewash not Derby that can has the road infrastructure in place
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Oakwood Ward Councillors Eyre, Mulhall and Trehwella	Response-01358	The comments in our previous objection remain relevant.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Paul Burge	Response-00289	The amount of traffic leaving this development will cause issues. As it is at the moment school traffic almost closes Morley road which inhibits bus services.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Pauline Shephard	Response-00483	There is already high levels of traffic congestion in and around Oakwood
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Paul Roe	Response-00330	Traffic entering acorn way is disaster waiting to happen
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Peter Marshall	Response-00526	The local road network is already under significant pressure, and this development would lead to dangerous levels of traffic congestion.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Rachael Hinckley	Response-01166	This will create a influx of traffic congestion with a possibility of 1100 cars with 2 cars per household being the normal now
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Rebecca Styles-Jones	Response-00372	Already difficulties with sheer volume of traffic. Another 1,000+ vehicles will be bedlam.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Rich King	Response-00383	Traffic is bad enough on Nottingham road end since they put the cycle lane in and at Morley road in the afternoon and evening. This will make it worse.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Robert Collis	Response-00355	Traffic at peak times which are getting wider is already without any further developments causing congestion, tall backs, delays and accidents.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Sara Cotton	Response-00368	Acorn Way is busy and would not cope with extra traffic

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Sarah Willis	Response-00345	Traffic in the area is already very congested and the addition of this volume of houses will bring the flow of traffic to a standstill at peak times of day and increased concern of safety of pedestrians in the area, especially around school drop off and pick up times.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Scarlett Hamblin	Response-00395	There is already enough traffic with all the new houses from the two estates without adding more pressure to our already busy roads. Each morning traffic is tailing back all the way down Bishops Drive and all down hilltop. By increasing the number of homes the number of cars will increase. This will also have an effect on the local environment as well as increasing congestion.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Sharon Coward	Response-00360	Traffic congestion is already bad & the roads are not built for the level of traffic this development will add. The surrounding infrastructure not owned by Erewash will be impacted severely.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Shaun Cavanagh	Response-00416	Acorn Way & Morley Rd are already congested traffic bottlenecks.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Sue Smith	Response-00376	More houses obviously mean more cars on the road around that area. The traffic is already particularly bad at times throughout the day, this will clearly get worse.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Tanya Caldbeck	Response-00919	This road is already used as a major through road and can flood and become dangerous, more housing would cause more issues with traffic congestion around that area which already has a major congestion issue.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	Tom King	Response-00735	Traffic already high volume, adding so many houses will create huge issues.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Traffic Congestion	William Gregory	Response-00411	With the growing number of accidents on Acorn Way and Morley Road, it's clear that the increased traffic? largely due to the significant rise in new housing developments? has already overwhelmed the area. Any further addition of properties would only exacerbate the existing issues, putting further strain on already dangerous roads. Moreover, the current infrastructure is not equipped to support the growing population. Local services such as doctors? surgeries, schools, and public transport are already under significant pressure. Without meaningful investment in infrastructure and safety measures, further development would be unsustainable and detrimental to the quality of life for existing and future residents.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Type of Housing	Ashley	Response-00426	Poor quality houses being built in a rush.. if your going to build build some 5/6 bed roomed luxury houses
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Type of Housing	ASHLEY STOWER	Response-01183	It is unclear what is the type of housing, social housing brings crime & anti-social behaviour.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Type of Housing	Carl	Response-00386	Housing market is already broke due to labour increase in stamp duty
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Type of Housing	Chris Copley	Response-01246	The scale of build is too large, it will have a negative impact on the character of the area.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Type of Housing	Clare Tomlinson	Response-00423	Very little new build housing is affordable and the number of affordable houses is usually inadequate.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Type of Housing	David Massey	Response-00575	If they must be built then social housing should be a larger percentage with no possibility of them being sold off.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Type of Housing	Donna Pearson	Response-00441	As a home owner living in a lovely quiet area I would definitely object to any kind of social housing as this would devalue my property.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Type of Housing	Gary Murfin	Response-00373	More new housing if being built needs to be far more affordable, I thought that was the idea, the percentage of new builds be so called affordable is too low, and they aren't really affordable enough.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Type of Housing	Gemma	Response-00384	Oakwood has a relatively low crime rate with a tight knit community, by adding these homes you risk losing this.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Type of Housing	Glynn Booker	Response-00394	I have no objection to social housing being built as long as the right infrastructure is built as well.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Type of Housing	Iain Campbell	Response-01179	Who are these houses for?
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Type of Housing	James Birks	Response-00574	10% to social housing! Great lower the street value overnight.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Type of Housing	Jeanette Kent	Response-00400	Affordable housing should be built near Amber Valley services, not Derby, this is a way of them shifting monetary expenses away from themselves whilst still collecting council tax to them!
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Type of Housing	Liz Lockwood	Response-00464	The changes to the provision of affordable housing is lamentable. Only 10% and there is a get out clause for off-site affordable housing to be provided - this is what will happen as the builders will want max profit from the site. The question would be where would the off-site affordable housing be sited?
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Type of Housing	Lou Davis	Response-00336	In reality - these properties would offer very limited options for social housing - they would be over-priced and out of the reach of most.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Type of Housing	Mark Potter	Response-00378	Oakwood needs no more houses so the type of housing should be non.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Type of Housing	Nick Charles	Response-01370	Only ?10% of the homes provided to be for on-site affordable home ownership?, seems unfair, as there are many families who need housing, yet cannot afford the inflated prices of large houses. But as no plans are available at this time, it is difficult to comment further.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Type of Housing	Paul Burge	Response-00289	We'd rather not have any. But if this development gets forced through it should be to the high standard of the surrounding buildings.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Type of Housing	Robert Mee	Response-01579	If this site were to be developed, I believe that a 10% allocation to affordable housing is woefully inadequate.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Type of Housing	Scarlett Hamblin	Response-01508	If this site were to be developed, I believe that a 10% allocation to affordable housing is woefully inadequate.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Type of Housing	Scarlett Hamblin	Response-00395	New build houses are chucked up and are not built to last like houses of the past. New builds have been known to have multiple issues from the brickwork to the internal structure. We do not need or want these houses which will become dilapidated in a number of years. Also, the price of houses are out of reach to any first-time buyers. This is not helping our community it is hindering it.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Andrea Lambert	Response-00357	Will have an adverse effect on the wildlife.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Ashley	Response-00426	We have lots of animals and birds visit our garden on Morley Road this would be taken away.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	ASHLEY STOWER	Response-01183	The natural habitats for animals & plants will be taken away, there are better brown field sites that could be developed.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Carl	Response-00386	Already lots of wildlife being run over.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Cheryl Wilde	Response-00328	Where is all the wildlife living in those fields where the houses are planned going to go? It will upset the ecosystem.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Chris Copley	Response-01246	The local area has a wide range of animals I've seen many, including rabbits, lots of bats living in the trees, voles, foxes and a number of unusual butterfly species. The area has variety of grass and trees types that support biodiversity, especially in the nearby stream that also hosts a lot of wildlife that I've seen.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Clare Tomlinson	Response-00423	I have personally seen Foxes and Badgers. There are multiple birds of prey. The insect life is abundant - including butterflies etc There are some large trees and older hedgerows which support a range of wildlife.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Danielle Andrews	Response-01244	I disagree wholeheartedly with the scale of housing proposed for the green belt land, alongside increasing traffic and reducing safety on a school route, removing all green land is detrimental to both the environment and the general populace. Preserving areas for green space should be considered in any planning on this area to encourage biodiversity
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	David Massey	Response-00575	Talk is made of cycle lanes but not enough to make up for the additional traffic. The area has a major green corridor along the brook and building this number of homes will affect this.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Donna Pearson	Response-00441	Living in a fairly rural area with .My children love to watch the rabbits and birds.You are going to take this away from the younger generation.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Douglas Hunt	Response-00353	The development will undoubtedly destroy the existing wildlife habitat
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Edward James Gregory	Response-00727	This area should be left as open agricultural land, and not be developed / hard surfaced. It provides a natural green break from Chaddesden towards Oakwood and Spondon
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Gary Murfin	Response-00373	Obviously this will suffer here and in the area around Chaddesden wood
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Gemma	Response-00384	Oakwood is known for its wildlife and green belt and you want to destroy that for homes which could be built elsewhere, Saving our wildlife and saving our green belt.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Gillian Stilwell	Response-01364	Bound to suffer with further building
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Glynn Booker	Response-00394	This is was traditionally green belt/ farm land with an abundance of wildlife, don't the wild animals have a right to homes?
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Helen Walker	Response-00333	Just have no regard for the wildlife which lives in this area their natural habitats are been disturbed and destroyed we have to protect it not kill it
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Iain Campbell	Response-01179	There is a number of birds of prey within that area, I counted 7 the other day in the potential housing spot. This would be a huge impact and a potential a lose of the birds of prey as they use this area for feeding the young. This is a safe area for people to walk their dogs.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	James Bellaby	Response-00340	More concrete less habitats, less habitats, less echo system.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	James Birks	Response-00574	To destroy the fields to build more houses is ridiculous
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	James Hope	Response-00548	The site provides habitat for wide variety of bird and animal life including Rabbits, Hares, Badgers and Foxes. It also provides habitat for snakes (particularly Adders) and lizards. Bird life in the SGA1 area includes ?garden birds? as well as being a major hunting area for the local Sparrow Hawk and Buzzard populations. In addition, the removal of sections of tree belt for access from Morley Road will additionally reduce habitat in a similar manner to any other chosen access points Consequently, the proposed SGA1 development will inevitably have an adverse effect on the biodiversity of the area.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jane Pitwood	Response-01366	Again, reducing areas of green space will affect wildlife and biodiversity. The problem being that once this has been adversely affected it cannot be undone.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jason Reader	Response-00321	Building on green belt.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jeanette Kent	Response-00400	There is an ever decreasing amount of green wedge for wildlife to use, I have seen Cattle Egret and deer in these fields. These isn't enough of a corridor already, do not take what little is left for them.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Karl Barlow	Response-00756	You regularly see Kestrels, Buzzards and Sparrowhawks on the hillside. These fields link the wider countryside to the rest of Oakwood. We see Badgers, foxes and numerous other types of wildlife, which would be further pushed out of the area. The effect on the water and drainage would also likely be negatively impactful on the wildlife, and other sites, which would be less impactful are available.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Kelsey Strachan	Response-00377	Destroying this land would reduce the green space accessible to the public this side of Oakwood to near zero. Pushing more people to other areas which will become overrun during busier periods such as in summer. The space is also home to much wildlife and plants, which are wild compared to the cultivated green spaces around Oakwood otherwise. Acorn Way pens them in one side already, this development would destroy any remaining space they have. This development is objectively poorly thought out. The space is too small for further development whilst maintaining any consideration for current residents both human and animal/plant.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Lewis	Response-00533	Usual walks over fields and seeing wildlife will be ruined
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Liz Lockwood	Response-00464	The area on both side of Acorn Way is green wedge land to prevent the urban sprall This development will have a devastating affect on the wildlife in the area - we have foxes, badgers, rabbits and a whole host of bird life and butterflies etc which use acorn way and the surrounding fields as access corridors other areass, including Chaddesden Wood and the fields surrounding Chaddesden. The hedgerows and trees on Acorn way have already been removed, even though the planning permission had not been approved - the nesting birds and wildlife have already be disrupted!
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Lou Davis	Response-00336	I have seen foxes, badgers and birds of prey in the fields adjacent to Acorn Way. I have also seen bats and other wildlife. There is a stream which attracts wildlife and there are numerous insects which are visible in the area.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Lucy Skeet	Response-00388	This will always be my top priority, and in this case I feel like it would be terrible for wildlife in the local area. Just terrible all round and ridiculous.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mandy Cooling	Response-00313	This would appear to be a significant development on Green Wedge. It's particularly concerning at a time when there is so much talk about the environmental impact that we are making and it's disappointing that we aren't seeing any innovative proposals to regenerate and redevelop areas rather than destroying even more green spaces and natural habitat for birds and animals. We do not know the environmental cost of such further erosion of natural habitat.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mandy Dickens	Response-00425	This land has been farmed for many years and has a wide variety of wildlife which with the destruction of our very valuable greenbelt land we are in danger of losing with many of our native flora and fauna becoming extinct
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mark potter	Response-00378	Wildlife is slowly being taken away from Oakwood every bit of nice green land is being taken up by concrete buildings & estates causing wild life to find new places or die off there?s already road kill on acorn way now let alone another 550 cars going down it every day
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mathew Lennox-Quinn	Response-01363	Again removing green areas for wildlife it goes without saying
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Melanie Arnold	Response-00573	There is lots of wildlife and habitats within the proposed area that would be destroyed.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Natalie Peake	Response-00794	This area is a cherished and well-used green space by the local community for walking, dog exercise, and enjoying nature. A well-trodden path runs from Morley Road across Acorn Way toward Locko Road and is frequently used by residents seeking tranquillity and outdoor recreation. This space serves as a vital community asset and an important refuge for wildlife. The development will have a devastating impact on local biodiversity. The hedgerows that line this land are essential nesting grounds for bird species and provide crucial corridors for movement and shelter for a variety of wildlife, including badgers, foxes, and hedgehogs. The destruction of these habitats would be a significant loss to local ecology. Furthermore, this area contributes to natural water management. This proposed development is not only a threat to local wildlife and environmental health, but it also diminishes a valued green space that supports physical and mental well-being for residents.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Nick Charles	Response-01370	No comments, as plans for the development are unavailable at the moment. However, removing any of the trees or hedgerows, will have a detrimental effect on invertebrates, small mammals and birds, which rely on this habitat for their survival.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Nicola Olver	Response-00434	Our wildlife are being pushed further away from the city suburbs, ie deer in Spondon
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Oakwood Ward Councillors Eyre, Mulhall and Trehwella	Response-01358	We believe the comments in our previous objection remain relevant.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Paul Burge	Response-00289	Wildlife is bound to be effected.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Pauline Shephard	Response-00483	It is always sad when green spaces are taken from wildlife, but consideration must be made with regard to this alongside the rest of the impact of more and more development in the area.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Paul Roe	Response-00330	Land again being used for hard landscaping
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Peter Marshall	Response-00526	Developing this land would result in the loss of biodiversity and community-accessible green space.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Peter Williamson	Response-01458	There is no consideration for the reproduction of wildlife that currently call this site their home
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Rachael Hinckley	Response-01166	There is a number of birds of prey within that area, I counted 7 the other day in the potential housing spot. This would be a huge impact and potentially a lose of the birds of prey as they use this area for feeding the young
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Rebecca Styles-Jones	Response-00372	Already built up and wildlife will once again be moved on.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Rich King	Response-00383	Construction of the housing will affect the wildlife in that area which there is plenty of
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Robert Collis	Response-00355	Removing wildlife habitats will encourage them to further enter the urban environment as there natural environment has been decreased
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Sara Cotton	Response-00368	We need wildlife for our environment
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Sarah willis	Response-00345	Loss of habitat for wildlife in the area with the loss of fields, trees and bushes from the landscape
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Scarlett Hamblin	Response-00395	Lots of habitats have already been destroyed by building houses in the surrounding land we need to keep more green areas alive to allow biodiversity and habitat to increase. We have an abundance of wildlife in and around Derby and the surrounding areas I myself have seen woodpeckers, hedgehogs and other wildlife that is on the brink of extinction in this area. By destroying habitats these animals will be boxed in? into their small green areas and will no longer thrive. We cannot allow more habitats to be destroyed and ruin ecosystems!!
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Sharon Coward	Response-00360	The increase in housing will negatively impact the surrounding areas & the wildlife & biodiversity.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Shaun Cavanagh	Response-00416	Impacts on greenbelt.
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Sue Smith	Response-00376	Building on that site will obviously negatively effect the local wildlife
1.3	Acorn Way, Derby	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Tanya Caldbeck	Response-00919	Using Greenbelt land should not be done due to habitat of birds and animals. We need Greenbelt land for nature
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Air Quality	Cllr Simon Mabbott	Response-01480	1/. Harmful Impact on Air Quality from Cumulative Traffic Changes The combination of 1,000 new homes, a proposed 40mph bypass, and multiple new roundabouts will significantly degrade air quality in and around Kirk Hallam. Far from alleviating pressure, these changes will increase vehicle numbers, congestion, and harmful emissions in an already strained environment. 2/. More Traffic = More Emissions The bypass and additional housing will funnel thousands of extra vehicles onto the local road network. As seen daily at the Bulls Head roundabout, traffic already stalls in long queues. With two more roundabouts feeding even more cars, vans, buses, and HGVs into the same limited routes, idling engines will emit higher concentrations of nitrogen dioxide (NO?), carbon monoxide (CO), and fine particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5). 3/. Pollution on Residents? Doorsteps Many of Kirk Hallam?s homes, schools, and walking routes are located close to these busy roads. This puts vulnerable residents, particularly children, the elderly, and those with pre-existing conditions?at greater risk from increased air pollution. Long-term exposure to traffic emissions is well documented as a cause of asthma, respiratory illness, heart disease, and other chronic health conditions. 4/. Longer Journeys, Dirtier Air A trip to Ilkeston, just 1.3 miles away, already takes 20?25 minutes during peak times due to traffic congestion. With more development, new roundabouts, and added delays, journey times will only increase. That means more vehicles idling for longer, producing more exhaust and worsening local air quality across the board.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Air Quality	Daniel naylor	Response-01510	Obviously, more traffic, more air pollution. Dust from building sites in dry months would aggregate people locally with respiratory issues
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Air Quality	Debbie Launders	Response-01293	Already way to many cars / lorries etc in this area

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Air Quality	FAY SAXTON	Response-01409	Poor air quality, as measured at A6096/Bulls Head, needs urgent attention for the benefit of all residents. Matters of fairness and equality are vital to attend to especially when it is clear that people's wellbeing is suffering both physically and mentally through poor air quality and avoidable stress.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Air Quality	Fiona Turner	Response-01362	A large-scale housing development involving thousands of homes and the construction of an access road can have several negative impacts on air quality, both short-term (during construction) and long-term (post-construction). Here's a breakdown of those impacts: ? Short-Term Impacts (During Construction) 1. Dust and Particulate Matter (PM): ? Earthmoving, excavation, and demolition activities release particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5). ? Dust from uncovered soil, construction materials, and vehicle movement on unpaved roads can degrade local air quality. 2. Emissions from Construction Equipment: ? Heavy machinery (bulldozers, excavators, trucks) emit nitrogen oxides (NOx), carbon monoxide (CO), and diesel particulate matter. ? These emissions can cause localized air pollution ?hotspots,? especially if work continues over many months or years. 3. Vehicle Traffic and Idling: ? Increased movement of construction vehicles and trucks contributes to emissions, especially from diesel engines. ? Long-Term Impacts (Post-Construction) 1. Increased Traffic Volume: ? Thousands of new homes can lead to thousands of additional vehicles on local roads, significantly increasing NOx, CO, volatile organic compounds (VOCs), and PM2.5 emissions. ? If public transportation is lacking, car dependency will amplify the impact. 2. Worsened Urban Heat Island Effect: ? Replacing vegetation with buildings and roads reduces air filtering and increases heat retention, worsening ozone formation and reducing air quality. 3. Indoor and Residential Emissions: ? More homes mean more heating systems, fireplaces, cooking appliances, etc., which may add to local emissions?especially if gas or wood-burning systems are common. 4. Cumulative Impact: ? If nearby developments are also underway, or if the area already suffers from poor air quality, the cumulative effects can push pollution levels over health-based standards.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Air Quality	GARY MARK WOODHOUSE	Response-01451	Air Quality In the South West of Kirk Hallam at the Moment is very good due to it being green belt and large amounts of vegetation in this area, as soon as a development of 1000 houses and a heavily polluting 24/7 bypass with Lots of HGVs going along it is constructed the pollution level will increase dramatically, the new proposed development is also in danger by the bypass straight from the start of house building as it sits right next to the bypass, which from day one of opening will emit large quantities of carbon dioxide, carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons, nitrogen oxides, mobile source air toxins such as the really bad forever chemicals such as bpa.s benzene, formaldehyde , lead and may more toxins straight into their gardens and the older houses in kirk hallam, surely a poisoned environment waiting to cause all the ailments of these toxins to the public,
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Air Quality	Gregory Robin Watts	Response-01297	Air quality will be impacted due to the increased traffic flow from this new development
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Air Quality	John mainstone	Response-00967	Air Quality would be compromised for people of Kirk Hallam
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Air Quality	Josh August	Response-00090	Living outside of a town centre has its benefits due to the vast farmland/countryside, which means less vehicles driving around the area
			Lisa Attenborrow	Response-01367	With the increase of traffic reduces the air quality.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Air Quality	Margaret Bannister	Response-01190	3. Air Pollution and Public Health Current air quality measurements already show cause for concern. According to DEFRA and local monitoring reports, air pollution levels around Bulls Head Road and Kirk Hallam often exceed recommended levels for nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and particulate matter (PM2.5), particularly during peak traffic hours. This is exacerbated by prolonged idling traffic Increased traffic from new residents and ongoing HGV activity will further deteriorate air quality, directly affecting the respiratory health of children, the elderly, and vulnerable populations. Chronic congestion also increases & contributes to serious public health issues, including asthma, heart disease. Current air pollution levels are already exceeding healthy thresholds; Kirk Hallam register PM 2.5 at 7ug/m3 and up to PM10 at 13ug/m3 ? a clear sign that air quality is already compromised.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Air Quality	Michaela Hickinbotham	Response-00229	I live on Abbot Road and have to say that already with the school traffic, cars and buses at times we have to close our windows when parents are here now, if there is too be a new estate with 1000 houses there could potentially be upwards of 2000 more cars on our small roads and not to mention the extra commercial vehicles to Stanton Park.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Air Quality	Michelle Colliver	Response-01332	Air quality in the Kirk Hallam and Bulls Head areas is a growing concern, particularly due to heavy traffic volumes, including a high number of HGVs from nearby distribution centres. Referencing Derbyshire Times in 2024, Ilkeston Town was identified as one of the most polluted areas in Derbyshire, with an air pollution score of 1.05. This figure reflects elevated concentrations of harmful pollutants such as nitrogen dioxide, benzene, sulphur dioxide, and fine particulates (PM2.5 and PM10)?all of which are known to negatively affect respiratory and cardiovascular health. Although the area is not currently designated as an official Air Quality Management Area (AQMA), this data highlights the potential risks, particularly for vulnerable groups such as children, the elderly, and those with pre-existing health conditions. With the proposed 1,000-home development in South Kirk Hallam and the already heavy traffic volumes, there is a real risk that pollution levels could worsen, reinforcing the need for air quality monitoring and proactive mitigation measures. As of the latest data, Ilkeston's Air Quality Index (AQI) is, categorized as ?Moderate.? The primary pollutant is PM2.5 (fine particulate matter) at 11.2 µg/m³. This level is approximately 2.2 times higher than the World Health Organization's annual guideline, indicating potential health concerns for sensitive individuals.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Air Quality	Mr J Edwards	Response-01355	More cars on the road equals more pollution!

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Air Quality	Mrs Beverley Anne Harrison	Response-01118	Air quality describes how polluted the air we breathe is. This can be affected by many things including human-caused traffic emissions, industry and agriculture. Poor air quality reflects higher air pollutants, creating a health hazard to all. However those with respiratory, breathing and bronchial problems and heart and lung conditions are at increased risk from poor air quality. With this in mind, it is inevitable air quality reduction will increase levels of congestion around and through Kirk Hallam as a result of so many more vehicles due to: ? Large amounts of extra cars and HGV?s to the area?s new warehousing and industry ? The additional traffic due to the huge housing increase ? more cars accessing a route through both Kirk Hallam itself and via the proposed 40mph bypass Finally, with the building of so many houses and huge bypass road ecocidally annihilating the established beauty and biodiversity of the greenbelt, the protective pollution filtering effect given by so many lost trees and hedgerows will be eradicated ? again further increasing the chances of poor air quality.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Air Quality	Paul Wright	Response-01261	More houses, generate more traffic and therefore more noise and air pollution.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Air Quality	Rachael Baines	Response-01403	Air quality in poor due to excessive traffic, slow moving due to congestion Can be checked using Plume labs app
			Robert Mee	Response-01509	See my comments on Traffic Congestion
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Air Quality	Roger Tranter	Response-01323	The air quality will deteriorate more with the extra traffic.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Air Quality	Russell Bannister	Response-01360	3. Air quality The cumulative traffic changes proposed?including 1000 new houses, a 40mph bypass, and multiple new roundabouts?will have a direct and harmful impact on air quality in and around Kirk Hallam. Increased Congestion = Increased Emissions: The new bypass and additional housing will significantly increase the volume of vehicles using local roads. As already seen at the Bulls Head roundabout, traffic regularly queues in gridlock. With two more roundabouts funnelling more vehicles into the same limited network, idling cars, vans, buses, and HGVs will pump higher levels of nitrogen dioxide (NO?), carbon monoxide (CO), and particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5) into the air. Proximity to Homes and Schools: Many of Kirk Hallam?s homes, schools, and walking routes are close to the affected roads, meaning residents?especially children and the elderly?will be exposed to increased air pollution. Long-term exposure to traffic emissions is linked to asthma, heart disease, and respiratory conditions. Longer Commute Times = More Time in Traffic: The journey to Ilkeston, which should take just 8 minutes, already takes over 20?25 minutes during peak times. With more development and road restrictions, journey times will increase further, meaning more vehicles idling in traffic for longer, directly worsening local air quality. Loss of Existing Green Buffers: The area currently benefits from mature trees, hedgerows, and natural green buffers that help absorb pollutants and provide a degree of air quality protection. This development will destroy many of those green assets, removing one of the few natural defences the community has against pollution. No Bypass Benefit for Kirk Hallam: While bypasses are often promoted as a way to reduce through-traffic in residential areas, this scheme will do the opposite. It does not bypass Kirk Hallam?it feeds more traffic into the area via the A6096 and Sow brook Lane. Therefore, it fails to reduce local pollution and instead introduces new pollution hotspots at both ends of the bypass, right on Kirk Hallam?s doorstep.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Air Quality	Simon Reeve	Response-01081	The congestion up the Bulls Head island causes standing traffic queuing back in to Kirk Hallam to the petrol station on Ladywood Road, the emissions from trucks and cars has a clear effect on the air quality, removing fields and trees and adding more vehicles is not going to make this better is it? The government needs to make their minds up whether they're taxing us to death over emissions or making money out of us with a green con. The addition of more homes on green belt land brings more pollution and the removal of fields and trees less carbon capture and converting greenery. Use the dead town of Ilkeston where shops are closed and convert those in to homes, use some of the land around Stanton, these brown field sites go untouched
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Air Quality	Stephen Palmer	Response-00311	The air quality will surely suffer if more vehicles are using local roads .
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Air Quality	Stephen Syson	Response-00032	Too much pollution already, this will only increase.
			Steven Street	Response-01264	Terrible air quality loss with increase traffic flow Cutting trees down disaster
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Air Quality	Tracy Lee	Response-00988	Air quality is already poor in this area due to industrial traffic and the congestion that already exists, what you are proposing is going to double the amount of pollution in the air and reduce the number of oxygen generating plants.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Air Quality	William Moore	Response-01259	Obviously makes the air quality worse.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Bus Services	Cllr Simon Mabbott	Response-01480	<p>1/. Lack of Public Transport Planning Undermines the Development The proposed development is moving forward without a clear, credible plan to improve public transport for Kirk Hallam's current and future residents. Far from being expanded, vital services are actually being reduced leaving the community more isolated and dependent on cars. 2/. Withdrawal of the 21 Bus Service ? A Major Loss The cancellation of the 21 bus route, which provided direct links to Nottingham and the Queen's Medical Centre (QMC), has removed a critical public transport lifeline. This service was well used and vital for accessing employment, healthcare, and education. Its loss has left Kirk Hallam residents with fewer, less frequent travel options, particularly impacting those without access to a car. 3/. Existing Bus Services Are Unreliable and Infrequent The remaining services are already limited in frequency and increasingly unreliable, especially during rush hour. Delays caused by congestion at key points like the Bulls Head and Quarry Hill roundabouts make these services even less practical. With the added pressure from 1,000 new homes, reliability will decline further, pushing more people away from public transport altogether. 4/. No Defined Public Transport Strategy The development plans contain no clear or funded proposals for public transport. There are no confirmed agreements with bus operators, no integrated service strategy, and no indication of how increased demand will be managed. This lack of foresight and consultation risks leaving a growing population without viable travel options. 5/. More Cars, More Congestion, Less Sustainability In the absence of reliable and accessible bus routes, new residents will have little choice but to rely on private vehicles. This will inevitably lead to higher traffic volumes, greater emissions, and increased pressure on roads already operating at capacity. Rather than promoting sustainable transport, the development will deepen car dependency. 6/. Disproportionate Impact on the Most Vulnerable Those hardest hit by poor public transport include older adults, disabled residents, students, and those on lower incomes. The removal of direct access to critical destinations like Nottingham and QMC Hospital is particularly damaging for individuals who depend on public transport for medical care and essential travel. 7/. Conclusion: A Missed Opportunity for Sustainable Growth This development risks overwhelming an already fragile transport system. Without serious investment in reliable, frequent, and connected public transport, Kirk Hallam faces growing isolation, increased road traffic, and a decline in quality of life. Any responsible planning decision must factor in the urgent need for public transport reform?not simply add to the problem.</p>
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Bus Services	FAY SAXTON	Response-01409	It is important for Kirk Hallam residents to have access to a regular and frequent bus service from various points around the hilly village of Kirk Hallam, along with and of equal importance to those available on the A6096, so that equality of transport is extended, particularly to the elderly, disabled and incapacitated.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Bus Services	Fiona Turner	Response-01362	<p>There are many negative impacts to bus services: 1. Strain on Existing Services: ? Without investment or planning, a sudden population increase can overwhelm current routes, leading to overcrowding, delays, and declining service quality. ? Passengers in nearby areas may experience reduced reliability or longer wait times. 2. Poor Service Uptake Without Incentives: ? If new residents default to car use (due to infrequent or indirect bus routes), then increased demand may not materialize?and services may remain underutilized or be cut in the future. 3. Mismatch Between Need and Provision: ? Buses may not run at convenient times or to employment centers, schools, or healthcare facilities, limiting usefulness for residents. ? A poorly designed layout (e.g., houses far from main roads or without direct bus access) can discourage ridership. 4. Initial Gaps Before Services Are Upgraded: ? In many developments, bus improvements lag behind housing occupancy, leaving early residents without adequate transport options.</p>
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Bus Services	GARY MARK WOODHOUSE	Response-01451	bus services are nearly none existant in Kirk Hallam basically its the ilkeston flyer which passes through Kirk Hallam every 30 minutes to derby and ilkeston town , cars are the only way to really get anywhere which negates the enviromental sustainability of any new development solely reliant on car useage which the 1000 houses is purpose built for
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Bus Services	kimberley grabham	Response-00306	To get to QMC for work the buses (for which I'd need to get 3 for just one way to work) which takes 1.5 hours! having extra strain on those services, how an earth am I meant to gaurantee I could get to work in anything reasonably coming close to on time.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Bus Services	Margaret Bannister	Response-01190	5. Public Transport/Bus services The development will further strain already unreliable public transport services. Trent Barton buses, which serve the Kirk Hallam area, are frequently delayed and have become increasingly unreliable due to existing traffic congestion. These delays reduce accessibility to work, education, and medical services. Kirk Hallam has also lost the No. 21 Trent Barton bus service to Nottingham and QMC Hospital, which has significantly reduced access to essential healthcare and employment opportunities. Without adequate public transport, more residents are forced to use private vehicles, exacerbating congestion and environmental impact. Bus frequency reduction and routes cuts have made public transport less dependable, inevitably increasing vehicle usage. When the study for the housing development were carried out it was stated that the 21 bus service would easily be able to be accessible to the residents of the new development...this service no longer exists, so cannot be included in the section for transport.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Bus Services	Michaela Hickinbotham	Response-00229	Kirk Hallam already has a reduced bus service thanks to Trent and one of the regular services is just to Derby not to Nottingham. If your putting in bus routes for a new estate this with be for the new residents not the old ones. More traffic great smelly buses.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Bus Services	Michelle Colliver	Response-01332	Kirk Hallam is served by 3 bus routes, providing connections to Ilkeston, Cotmanhay and Derby. Services include Route 31, which runs between Ilkeston and Kirk Hallam with hourly buses. The Ilkeston Flyer also offers a link between Cotmanhay and Derby city centre via Kirk Hallam. Additionally, Route 14A, operated by Littles Travel under contract to Derbyshire County Council, connects Ilkeston Community Hospital to St Norberts drive and Godfrey drive Kirk Hallam, though it runs only once a day at 14:30 on weekdays. Public transport provision in Kirk Hallam is increasingly inadequate, particularly in light of the proposed 1,000-home development. The area suffers from limited and unreliable bus services, which are insufficient to meet the needs of both current residents and any future population increase. There are growing concerns about the adequacy of public transport in the area. Notably, the 21 bus service to Nottingham via Queen's Medical Centre (QMC) has been removed, despite still being referenced as an active and adequate transport link in the borough's Core Strategy Review. This has left a gap in access to key destinations such as Nottingham and Queen's Medical Centre, reducing the area's connectivity. While the existing services are vital, the current network lacks the flexibility and frequency required to fully support the needs of residents, particularly those commuting outside standard hours. The Core Strategy Review acknowledges the importance of commuting patterns between Ilkeston and Nottingham. The spatial portrait highlights that while Long Eaton is geographically part of the Nottingham conurbation, Ilkeston, including villages like Kirk Hallam, is a freestanding town with its own distinct identity. Erewash was placed in the Nottingham conurbation classification due to statistics showing a higher proportion of Erewash residents commuting to work in Nottingham. Despite this, the removal of the 21 bus service to Nottingham via QMC undermines the strategy's objective of promoting sustainable transport links between Ilkeston and Nottingham. This discontinuation may increase reliance on private vehicles for commuting, contradicting the Core Strategy's goals of reducing car dependency and enhancing public transport connectivity. Addressing this gap is crucial to align transportation infrastructure with the strategic vision for sustainable development in the region.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Bus Services	Mrs Beverley Anne Harrison	Response-01118	Strategic Policy 1.5 South West of Kirk Hallam page 58, line one states 'Kirk Hallam is well served by existing bus routes'. Quite simply, this is not true. There are just 3 services: ' the Ilkeston Flyer travels to Derby every 10 minutes only travelling through Kirk Hallam along Ladywood Road which, considering the estate size and hilly terrain from both sides of the estate makes it a lengthy walk for the fit and able or a costly taxi ride to the nearest bus halt for those only able to walk short distances from much of Kirk Hallam ' the 31 which covers more of the estate and is available from early morning until after 11.00pm but is only timetabled hourly ' the 14a/b which is only available from 9.45am to 5.45pm. Additionally, with no direct public transport available to Nottingham centre, to visit there involves a lengthy multi change, time consuming bus journey which may be very difficult and too costly for many. Therefore, given population size at the 2021 census for the Kirk Hallam and Stanton by Dale ward was 6,408, alongside the factor that the total amount of houses proposed within that ward is 2,000 (plus at least 250 more on added safeguarded land at Sowbrook Farm), the amount of public transport is dire - especially considering housing size and bedroom numbers via information as per EBC's viability report per 1000 houses could well increase population by approximately 250% to over 16,000.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Bus Services	Russell Bannister	Response-01360	5. Impact on Public Transport The proposed development is being put forward without a clear or viable plan to improve public transport access for existing and future residents of Kirk Hallam. In fact, the reality on the ground tells a different story?bus services are being cut, not expanded. Withdrawal of the 21 Bus Service: The 21 bus route, which previously served Kirk Hallam with connections to Nottingham and the Queen's Medical Centre (QMC), has been withdrawn. This service was widely used and was expected to support both the existing community and any new development. Its cancellation leaves residents with fewer, less frequent options?making it harder for people without cars to access jobs, education, healthcare, and essential services. Unreliable Existing Services: The remaining bus routes are already infrequent and unreliable, especially during peak hours. Congestion at key pinch points like the Bulls Head and Quarry Hill roundabout delays buses further, making them an unviable alternative for many residents. This problem will only worsen with additional traffic from 1000 new homes. No Clear Public Transport Strategy: The development proposal includes no detail on how public transport will be supported, funded, or improved. There are no confirmed commitments from transport providers, no integrated transport plan, and no apparent consultation with bus operators to ensure services meet the needs of the expanded population. Greater Car Dependency: With no dependable bus network in place, new residents will be forced to rely on cars, increasing road congestion and emissions and reducing the quality of life for both new and existing residents. Impact on the Most Vulnerable: Those most affected by the lack of reliable buses include the elderly, disabled individuals, students, and people without access to private vehicles. The loss of the 21 bus service to key destinations like Nottingham and QMC Hospital is particularly damaging for those who depend on public transport for medical appointments and essential travel. In short, the development will place greater strain on an already inadequate public transport system. Instead of improving sustainable travel, this proposal risks isolating those who rely on buses and pushing even more traffic onto an already overstretched road network.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Bus Services	Simon Frost	Response-00684	The area is already under serviced by bus services and with no proposal to increase bus provision in the consultation only foot links to the ilkeston flyer this is not sufficient to encourage people to use public transport and also only provides a link to Derby and the Ilkeston town centre. No links are available to Sandiacre/Long Eaton/Nottingham so people have no choice other than to drive. The distance from one end of the proposed area of development to the A6096 is far greater than most people would walk to catch a bus, cycling is not possible as buses do not accept people on bikes.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Bus Services	Simon Reeve	Response-01081	The bus services in the area are good, commuting links to Ilkeston, on to Nottingham or direct to Derby are good. The set fee of £2 is lunacy however as it's £2 to the top of Stanton Road (General Havelock) from Ladywood Road, Kirk Hallam (Asda Petrol), this is a 4 minute and 1.2 mile hour eye costing me 17p in my car....why would I ever use the bus to Ilkeston? So the council whack up the price to park in Ilkeston, so I stop using the shops like Stacey's and Ogden's; so they close and stop paying rates. So the council has less money coming in and more out of work. Well done, perhaps think through public transport and parking to make the situation make sense
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Bus Services	Stephen Syson	Response-00032	The bus services are ridiculous, if you live in the middle of either estate and are not in good health, you have a choice of 1 bus an hour or taxi. The ilkeston flyer, is more frequent but not in walking distance of many residents. But for those who work in Derby the first Sunday bus is 10 a.m. Last bus Monday to Thursday is 10.30 pm. There are no local buses to either Nottingham or the local cottage hospital
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Bus Services	Tracy Lee	Response-00988	What is the point of a bus service if the roads are so congested? Buses already back up and are late at certain times of the day due to congestion so cannot see how this would improve anything.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Cllr Simon Mabbott	Response-01480	1/. Flood Risk and Drainage Concerns The proposed development presents serious risks to local drainage systems and flood resilience in Kirk Hallam. Converting greenfield land into hard, impermeable surfaces such as roads, rooftops, and pavements will significantly disrupt natural water absorption and increase surface water runoff. 2/. Loss of Natural Drainage Capacity The open fields currently act as a natural drainage system, absorbing rainfall and slowing the flow of stormwater. Paving over this land removes that natural buffer, forcing excess water into an already overburdened drainage network. 3/. Increased Local Flood Risk The additional runoff generated by 1,000 new homes and a bypass could overwhelm existing drainage infrastructure, especially during periods of heavy rainfall. This not only heightens flood risk within the new development itself but also threatens existing homes, roads, and gardens in lower lying parts of Kirk Hallam. 4/. Impact Beyond Kirk Hallam Runoff from the site will inevitably flow downstream, potentially affecting other communities within the Erewash catchment area. The development could contribute to a wider regional flooding problem, with consequences for flood management efforts beyond the immediate site. 5/. Lack of Detailed Drainage Plans So far, no comprehensive or publicly accessible flood risk assessment or drainage strategy has been provided. There is no clear evidence that sustainable drainage systems, attenuation features, or effective runoff controls will be implemented or that they will be sufficient to protect both new and existing properties. 6/. A History of Drainage Issues Parts of Kirk Hallam have already experienced surface water flooding in the past. Residents remain concerned about the area's limited drainage capacity. This development could worsen those issues, especially around key roads and junctions that lie at natural drainage points. Conclusion: An Unacceptable Risk This proposal risks replacing natural flood defences with concrete and tarmac without any clear plan to manage the consequences. Unless a robust, fully funded, and enforceable flood mitigation strategy is presented, this development could put both existing and future homes at serious risk of flooding.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	David Cousins	Response-01303	The proposed new development and the relief road, plus the newly allocated and "safeguarded" areas, all appear to drain to the point on Sowbrook Lane which is already subject to flooding. Thereafter it all drains to the Erewash and then to the point in the middle of Sandiacre/Stapleford which flooded so catastrophically last year.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	FAY SAXTON	Response-01409	Dealt with under "Transport" above.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Fiona Turner	Response-01362	Strain on Utilities and Drainage ? Existing systems for water, electricity, gas, and sewage may not be designed for a significantly larger population. ? Risk of: ? Sewer overflows or backups. ? Water pressure drops. ? Increased surface water runoff and local flooding, especially if green space is replaced by impermeable surfaces.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Jon Watkin	Response-00414	A question? What provision will be made to deal with the increased sewage out turn? Severn Trent do not have a good record of dealing with floods and raw sewage. Will it be a case of more income for them with no investment done. I will not mention in detail what the increased income with no invest means to senior staff bonuses and investors dividends. The Gravy train will continue untill the govenment has to eventually more at huge expense to the country and are left with a with a business needing to recover from years of lack of investment.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Josh August	Response-00090	Building these houses along with the roads will eradicate all of these huge fields that currently collect and soak up a lot of rainfall. Without these, this will in turn cause more flooding as the natural soak aways are gone
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Lisa Attenborrow	Response-01367	With the earths weather changing so quickly we are experiencing floods with heavy rainfall. Sowbrook lane being a big part in that to which on a lot of occasions it is not passable. Also ladywood road has known to flood as well.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Margaret Bannister	Response-01190	9. Flooding Risks and Surface Water Management Kirk Hallam has a history of flooding, with major concerns highlighted by the 2019 Abbott Road Flood Alleviation Scheme. Despite these efforts, several areas remain vulnerable to flash flooding, especially during prolonged rainfall events. ? Nut Brook canal has recorded overflow incidents due to excessive surface water, affecting low-lying areas. ? The River Erewash at Ilkeston remains on flood watch, particularly during autumn and winter months. ? Existing drainage systems in Kirk Hallam are under strain, and further development will overwhelm this infrastructure. The greenbelt land earmarked for development currently plays a vital role in absorbing surface water and mitigating flood risk. Its destruction will increase the likelihood of flash flooding, property damage, and infrastructure failure. Recent studies and reports from the Environment Agency also indicate that nearby watercourses, including Nut Brook and the River Erewash, have shown elevated levels of phosphates and nitrates, and occasional detections of industrial pollutants like PAHs (polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons) and heavy metals such as cadmium and lead, linked to former industrial activity in the area. These substances are known to be toxic to aquatic life and potentially harmful to humans through indirect exposure. Pollution from abandoned mines beneath the proposed development site are leaching residues into nearby water courses also the area is known to be discharging pollutants from the industrial slag heap (tip) causing water degradation. These issues are linked to sectors of former industrial and mining sites in the local area. Even the Erewash borough councils consultation documents, specific concerns were raised about toxic water in areas designated for potential development ? for instance, in the area identified as SGA25 (SW of Kirk Hallam) it was noted: Toxic water can be found between the farm and Dallimore School SGA25. Prior to any future development ground survey will demonstrate whether the land is safe for new building?s, whilst water course or water bodies will also be subject to survey within the site. This underscores the necessity for thorough environmental assessments before proceeding with development in area with known contamination issues. This development could increase water surface runoff, potentially overwhelming existing drainage systems. Covering it with impermeable surfaces like road, pavements and buildings will significantly reduce the capacity of the ?natural sponge? effect increasing the likely hood of surface water flooding in surrounding areas. 10. Contaminated Land and Watercourse Pollution The River Erewash, which runs near the proposed development, has been subject to pollution from sewage discharges. In 2023, the Ilkeston (Hallam Fields) Wastewater Treatment Works discharged sewage into the river for a total of 2,856.6 hours, accounting for approximately 32.61% of the year. Such discharges can lead to the spread of harmful pathogens and degrade water quality, impacting both aquatic life and public health. Physical modifications and alterations to the natural flow and structure of the water bodies impact their ecological health.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Michaela Hickinbotham	Response-00229	Have any you in the council ever been in Kirk Hallam when it rains? You ought to try it stand at the bottom of Godfrey Drive and watch it run down Bulls Head and Ladywood Road, stand at the Kirk Hallam lake and watch the Nutbrook canal and lake merge so that the water is almost up to the lay-by on Godfrey Drive or try walking out of Kirk Hallam school when there?s water running over the drive from the lake and canal. These new houses won?t be the ones watching there gardens fill up with water, those residents won?t have to have built there garden up with 20 tons of aggregate and soil to stop flooding , which is what we have had to do now. Our green open spaces are our natural water defence.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Michelle Colliver	Response-01332	Kirk Hallam faces significant flood risk, particularly from the River Erewash and its tributary, the Sow Brook. While most of the area is officially designated as Flood Zone 1 (indicating low fluvial flood risk), this does not reflect the real-world conditions experienced by residents. Sowbrook Lane, in particular, is a known hotspot for flooding, with recurrent issues caused by surface water accumulation and overwhelmed drainage systems. The Erewash Borough Council?s own consultations acknowledge the high surface water flood risk behind Dallimore School and along Sowbrook Lane. The situation is further complicated by the performance of the Dale Abbey Sewage Pumping Station, which discharged sewage into the Sow Brook 12 times in 2022, totalling 35.8 hours. These discharges pose both environmental and public health risks. In flood conditions, this contaminated water is likely to spread across nearby land and roads, increasing exposure to harmful pollutants. Any large-scale development in this area, such as the proposed 1,000 houses, would exacerbate these flood risks. Urbanisation increases impermeable surfaces, which reduces natural drainage and accelerates surface runoff. Without comprehensive flood mitigation infrastructure, this would increase both the frequency and severity of flooding?placing current and future residents at greater risk.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Mr J Edwards	Response-01355	Building on greenbelt will mean more flooding for our communities
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Paul Wright	Response-01261	So many proposed new houses will only exacerbate the risk of flooding. Local authorities and Severn Trent are not keeping up with existing maintenance of drains and ditches, so how will they cope with such an expansion?
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Rachael Baines	Response-01403	More building will increase flooding risk, in the last few years the flooding has gotten worse and getting back into Ilkeston from working in Nottingham has been difficult
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Roger Tranter	Response-01323	The excess water run off caused by building so many houses will be immense. The area concerned is always badly affected by flooding. No matter how well a new 'suds' scheme is designed it will never relieve the current problems - it will just compound them.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Russell Bannister	Response-01360	12. Drainage and Flooding The proposed development poses significant risks to local drainage systems and flood management in and around Kirk Hallam. Transforming open green fields into hard, impermeable surfaces?such as roads, houses, driveways, and pavements?will disrupt natural water absorption and increase surface water runoff. Loss of Natural Drainage: The greenfield land currently acts as a natural sponge, absorbing rainfall and helping to manage storm water. Once paved over, rainfall will have nowhere to go except into man-made drainage systems, which are already under strain in parts of Kirk Hallam. Increased Flood Risk: Surface runoff from the new estate and bypass could overwhelm local drainage infrastructure, especially during periods of heavy rain. This increases the risk of flooding not only within the new development, but also in existing lower-lying areas of Kirk Hallam, including residential roads and gardens. Downstream Impact: More runoff entering local watercourses could cause flooding downstream, affecting communities further along the Erewash catchment area. This is a concern not just for Kirk Hallam, but for neighbouring settlements and local flood management authorities. Climate Change Pressures: With extreme weather events becoming more frequent and intense due to climate change, any additional strain on drainage systems will likely result in higher frequency flooding, erosion, and longer-term damage to infrastructure. Lack of Transparency on Drainage Planning: To date, no detailed, publicly available drainage impact assessment or flood risk mitigation plan has been shared. Without robust and enforceable solutions?such as SuDS (Sustainable Drainage Systems), attenuation ponds, or proper runoff controls?this development could leave Kirk Hallam residents facing serious consequences. Historical Flooding: Parts of Kirk Hallam have experienced surface water issues in the past, and residents are already concerned about drainage capacity. This development could bring those issues to the forefront, particularly around roads and junctions that sit at natural runoff points. In summary, the development risks creating new flooding problems while worsening existing ones?especially if existing green areas that currently soak up rainwater are replaced with buildings and roads. Without a comprehensive flood risk strategy, this proposal puts both new and existing homes in jeopardy.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Simon Reeve	Response-01081	It's a joke, the area already has issues along Nutbrook, the new housing on Quarry Hill floods as does the entire trail around Manor Flood, moreso now than ever in my almost 50 years in the areas. Taking away fields and trees and replacing with tarmac and concrete with drains to "lose the water" to another location simply overloads another area.....it can't continue
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Stephen Palmer	Response-00311	More houses would add extra flooding to Sandiacre/ Long Eaton.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Stephen Syson	Response-00032	The landscape as is allows for drainage naturally. However concrete over it and with the natural downward slope of the planned area flooding will become rife, as the natural flood plains will be built on. Even with maintenance it will eventually flood because of costs of maintaining the drainage
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Steven Street	Response-01264	Sowbrook will be a major river with the amount of tarmac concrete and roads being suggested
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Tracy Lee	Response-00988	Flooding is becoming a major issue due to climate change and lack of areas for run off water. When every thing is paved over it will lead to increased flooding of new and existing homes and premises. There is a lot of marsh land in the area and more filed dare needed to offset the flooding. I fear the outcome of a new housing estate and the impact it will have.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Green Belt	Cllr Simon Mabbott	Response-01480	1/. Destruction of Greenbelt Land: A Threat to Kirk Hallam?s Character and Environment The land identified for development lies within or directly borders, designated Greenbelt, which plays a vital role in protecting the countryside from unchecked urban sprawl and in maintaining the rural identity of communities like Kirk Hallam. 2/. Loss of a Valued Natural Landscape The south-west of Kirk Hallam currently offers expansive views, mature trees, thriving hedgerows, and vital wildlife corridors. It forms a distinct green boundary between our community and surrounding urban areas. The introduction of a bypass and a large housing estate would permanently destroy this landscape, replacing it with concrete, tarmac, and large-scale infrastructure. 3/. Undermining the Purpose of the Greenbelt A core function of Greenbelt land is to prevent the coalescence of neighbouring towns and to maintain clear visual and physical separations. This development would erode that buffer, risking a creeping urban merger between Kirk Hallam, Dale Abbey, and potentially West Hallam, especially if future plans for an additional 850 homes northwest of Kirk Hallam proceed. Such expansion sets a dangerous precedent for further encroachment into protected rural space. 4/. Irreplaceable Environmental Value This land is far more than empty space. It supports biodiversity, provides vital habitats for local wildlife and pollinators, and contributes to climate resilience by acting as a natural carbon sink. These environmental functions cannot simply be replaced or relocated once lost to development. 5/. Impact on Public Access and Wellbeing Residents regularly use this area for walking, recreation, and personal wellbeing. It provides a quiet, natural retreat from the increasingly built-up and congested surroundings. The area also holds historical significance, with a monastic footpath once used by monks traveling between Ilkeston and Dale Abbey?linking the community to its cultural heritage. Paving over this landscape strips the community of one of its last accessible green spaces. 6/. In Conflict with Planning Policy The proposal directly contradicts national and local planning principles that aim to protect Greenbelt land unless truly exceptional circumstances exist. No such justification has been provided here nor has any serious consideration been given to alternatives, such as building on brownfield or previously urbanised sites. Conclusion: Greenbelt Must Be Protected This development would irreversibly damage a vital section of Greenbelt, undermining the environmental integrity, visual character, and identity of Kirk Hallam. It fails to meet the threshold for exceptional circumstances and should therefore be rejected outright to preserve the area?s natural and historical legacy.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Green Belt	David Cousins	Response-01303	Many have protested long and hard, individually and via Green Squeeze, at the whole development west and south of Kirk Hallam. Those protests have evidently fallen on deaf ears and the cause is seemingly lost so I will not reiterate the argument, other than to say that the objections still stand. What is especially alarming in this Amendment is that, even before the scheme begins, the previous declaration and assurance that the "Relief Road" would represent a delineation or barrier to new development has already been discarded by the appearance of the triangular shaped area to the west of the "Relief Road" and adjoining Ladywood Road. Not only has this area been designated for development but it is referred to as a "Centre" to serve the whole of the development, and presumably passing traffic on the A6096 as well. The notion that a "Centre" is located at the extreme edge of the development, and that any residents using it would need to cross the (undoubtedly very busy) "Relief Road" seems ridiculous - so much for supposedly encouraging walking and cycling - and one can only assume that it is actually envisaged to serve, ultimately, an even larger area. It is painfully obvious to most of us that, once a road exists, the pressure to utilise the Green Belt land on the opposite side of it becomes ever stronger. I wholeheartedly object to ANY encroachment of development to the West or South of the "Relief Road", now or at any time in the future.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Green Belt	Debbie Launders	Response-01293	The green belt is there for a reason to help sustain the natural beauty of this area.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Green Belt	FAY SAXTON	Response-01409	An extension of Green Belt issues from "Number of Houses/Green Belt" above. There is great sadness at the proposed extensive destruction of so much of the historic Kirk Hallam/ Dale Abbey Green Belt that has been treasured over decades and centuries. This proposed development has shown a cavalier and unfair attitude to the importance and value of the Local Green Belt as evidenced by the out of all proportion Kirk Hallam housing allocation of c 1000 houses and inappropriate local centre unnecessarily destroying Green Belt even beyond the boundary with the dangerous Relief Road. This senseless destruction of Green Belt would be so far reaching that it is difficult to imagine and impossible to justify. I can only hope that the Council will restore fairness between the villages so that the Village of Kirk Hallam bears only its rightful share, so that our precious Green Belt can be saved for our families, our descendants and our visitors. I would request the Council to seriously review its allocations and carry out its role of custodian of the Green Belt in a just way so that we can continue to cherish and care for our beautiful "Jewel of Erewash".
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Green Belt	Fiona Turner	Response-01362	Erosion of Green Belt Purpose Green belts exist to: ? Restrict urban sprawl ? Maintain open countryside near cities ? Preserve the identity of separate towns/villages ? Support agriculture and biodiversity ? Provide recreational space for urban residents When housing is built in green belt land: ? These goals are weakened or undermined. ? It sets a precedent for future encroachment, known as ?salami-slicing? of the green belt. ? 2. Loss of Open Space and Natural Habitat ? Development replaces fields, woodlands, wetlands, and hedgerows with built structures. ? This leads to: ? Habitat destruction ? Loss of biodiversity ? Disruption of wildlife corridors ? Green belts often serve as buffers for nature reserves, so development on their edge can have indirect ecological impacts. ? 3. Agricultural Land Loss ? Many green belt areas contain productive farmland. ? Building over it can reduce local food production capacity and impact rural economies. ? 4. Urban Sprawl and Village Merging ? New developments can cause the merging of separate towns and villages, eroding their distinct identities. ? This risks turning rural or semi-rural settings into continuous suburban areas. ? 5. Increased Flood Risk ? Green belt land often includes natural floodplains and permeable surfaces that absorb rainwater. ? Housing developments introduce impermeable surfaces (roads, roofs), increasing surface runoff and potential for local flooding. ? 6. Infrastructure and Accessibility Challenges ? Green belt areas typically lack public transport, schools, and utilities scaled for large developments. ? New housing can place unsustainable pressure on infrastructure or result in car-dependent communities?counter to sustainability goals.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Green Belt	Gregory Robin Watts	Response-01297	The council should take a tough view on any development on green belt land and throw out the application
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Green Belt	Jane Woodbridge- Smith	Response-01263	The green belt should be sacred! There are plenty of brownfield sites available!
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Green Belt	John mainstone	Response-00967	Decent arable and food producing land would be lost and the green belt area that so many people love and use to the benefit of their health would be lost forever
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Green Belt	Josh August	Response-00090	Green belt land needs to be kept as that
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Green Belt	kimberley grabham	Response-00306	I moved here specifically to be near a green belt and enjoy the sounds of nature and diversity to see. I do not wish to look at a houseing estate instead!
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Green Belt	Lisa Attenborrow	Response-01367	During Covid more and more people appreciated and loved the land around us also known as the green belt. It is good for the mind and body as most of us lead a very busy and stressful life, so to be able to de-stress is an absolute tonic.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Green Belt	Margaret Bannister	Response-01190	8. Loss of Greenbelt, Farmland, Environmental Harm, and Impact on Wildlife The proposed development site lies within designated greenbelt land, serving as a vital buffer that protects the character and identity of Kirk Hallam. This land is not only valued for its open space and recreational use but also plays a crucial role in mitigating flood risk by acting as a natural sponge, absorbing rainfall and reducing runoff. The development would result in: ? The permanent loss of valuable arable farmland, diminishing local agricultural output and undermining food security. ? The removal of established native trees, many of which are decades old and provide habitats for diverse wildlife, including birds, bats, and pollinators. ? The destruction of hedgerows, vital ecological corridors protected under national regulations. ? A significant decline in biodiversity, directly contradicting national and local planning objectives. ? The urbanisation of a rural landscape, diminishing the area's natural beauty and ecological integrity. ? Disruption and destruction of habitats for foxes hedgehogs, amphibians, Butterflies and rare invertebrates that rely on the existing green spaces for foraging and breeding. Moreover, this area encompasses sections of the historic Monk's Way, an ancient footpath used by monks travelling between Kirk Hallam and Dale Abbey. This route is part of the region's cultural heritage, with remnants still visible and recognized in local walking guides. The development of the road and houses threatens to disrupt or obliterate these historic pathways, erasing tangible links to the area's monastic past.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Green Belt	Michaela Hickinbotham	Response-00229	Why not take it all up leave our children and grandchildren wondering what grass looks like.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Green Belt	Michelle Colliver	Response-01332	The proposed development would result in the removal of approximately 50 hectares of Green Belt land?the largest single deallocation within the Erewash Core Strategy Review. This loss threatens the environmental integrity of the area on multiple fronts. The Green Belt currently acts as a vital natural soakaway, absorbing rainwater and mitigating surface water runoff. Its removal would significantly increase the risk of flooding, particularly on the land and roads at the bottom of Sowbrook Farm?an area already prone to regular flooding. The reduction of these green spaces also impacts residents? well-being by removing access to natural areas that support mental health, relaxation, and community identity. The Stanton Ironworks slag heap, located near Kirk Hallam, has been associated with environmental concerns, particularly regarding the leaching of toxins into nearby water bodies. One such water body is Furnace Pond, situated adjacent to the former slag heap site. Local observations and reports suggest that contaminants from the slag heap may have entered Furnace Pond, raising concerns about water quality and ecological health in the area. The proximity of the slag heap to Furnace Pond and the potential for leachate to enter the water system underscore the need for thorough environmental assessments and remediation efforts. Addressing these concerns is crucial to ensure the safety and well-being of the local community and the preservation of the surrounding natural environment. Additionally, The nutbrook catchment , a tributary of the river erewash has been designated by the Environment Agency as having a ?bad? ecological status both in 2019 and 2022 due to dangerously high levels of toxic substances. These include Chromium (VI), copper, iron, phenol, and zinc?along with mercury compounds and polybrominated diphenyl ethers (PBDEs), which are known to harm both human health and aquatic ecosystems. The degradation of water quality in Nut Brook underscores the need for targeted environmental management and remediation efforts to restore and protect the ecological integrity of the waterway. Disturbing this land for development risks exacerbating pollution and spreading these contaminants further. Together, the loss of Green Belt, contamination, and increased flood risk present serious environmental and public health challenges that cast doubt on the suitability of this location for large-scale residential expansion.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Green Belt	Mr J Edwards	Response-01355	We should be protecting our green belt not building on it. We all need these areas for our health and wellbeing and for the good of the planet! We will soon be one big concrete jungle if this is allowed to continue.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Green Belt	Mrs Beverley Anne Harrison	Response-01118	Oss.org.uk describes greenbelt as ?a buffer between towns and between town and countryside. The green belt designation is a planning tool and the aim of the green belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; however there is not necessarily a right of access there.? This is such a perfect description for Kirk Hallam?s greenbelt which runs down the side of the Wirksworth Road and Godfrey Drive edge of Kirk Hallam (much of which is also on Dale Abbey Parish land) and represents less than 1% of total Erewash greenbelt and the last fragment of Kirk Hallam?s greenbelt. Known for decades as ?the jewel of Erewash? this stunning natural beauty - designated as a greenbelt area post World War II - represents a section of ancient woodland, much of which was converted into food producing arable and dairy farmland by the Monks at Dale Abbey many centuries ago. It even kept its historic heritage of well used monks footpaths which stretched from what has become the village of Kirk Hallam?s Grade 1 listed Church ? ministered by the Canons of Dale Abbey - across to the Abbey at Dale, sections of which to this day run across fields and hedgerows which are a large part of this precious greenbelt which would be undermined and lost by such a vast development. These still active footpaths and food producing fields, are well used by locals, visitors and farmers, providing food and essential physical and mental health support. The large areas of soft soil are mother nature?s natural sponge, soaking up stormwater and melting snow to protect lower lying areas from flooding and naturally soak into the water retaining soil to feed crops and other green biodiversity - which thrive so well in the area - to provide nourishment for its wildlife such as foxes, deer, badgers and many other animals, birds and insects for whom this stunning greenbelt is home. It?s essential this should continue. The Oxford languages dictionary definition of Ecocide is ?destruction of the natural environment by deliberate or negligent human action? which is exactly what is planned by the annihilation of (52 plus 8 safeguarded and 27 acres of deregulated greenbelt as in the amended Core Strategy update) a staggering total of 87 hectares or 215 acres of ?mother nature?s? historically established natural beauty - especially considering so much ex industrial, ?grey? local land has been transformed into contrived man planned conservation. For the sake of generations yet to be born, as temporary custodians of our precious countryside, such devastating destruction is something that must not be allowed to happen.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Green Belt	Nick Jackson	Response-01260	We need more green spaces just look how bad our nations mental health is.
	South West of Kirk Hallam	Green Belt	Paul Wright	Response-01261	No green belt should be sacrificed when there are so many empty houses and brownfield sites available.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Green Belt	Rachael Baines	Response-01403	We need to protect green belt, removing green belt land will decrease air quality Green belt is good for physical and mental health, the environment
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Green Belt	Rachel Brown	Response-00031	Green belt land should remain protected. This area is important for people in this area. Wildlife, history and beautiful countryside is being threatened. Allowing green let to be built on is setting a president for further development. We are already seeing this with 100 of hectors of land now being threatened to have solar panels added. Outdoor spaces and greenbelt should be protected for future generations. PROTECT THE GREENBELT!!
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Green Belt	Renars Letkovskis	Response-00951	why destroy green belt, the council is doing rewilding and keeps building on the green, which doesn't make sense

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Green Belt	Robert Mee	Response-01580	My main reason for objecting to these developments is that I do not believe that the criteria set out in the NPPF has been met justifying any encroachment into the Green Belt at this time. The Core Strategy and this Amendment are developed in order to meet the housing targets allocated to the council by central government. I do not believe that the number of houses required by government constitutes, in itself, the 'exceptional circumstances' which are required under the Framework. This is particularly so in view of there being no published objective basis for the numbers allocated to each authority. The term 'exceptional circumstances' does include 'instances where an authority cannot meet its identified need for homes'. The waiting list for social housing in the general area might suggest that this is the case, but I do not accept that these plans will go far to address this issue? the vast majority of the planned housing allocations are not even for affordable housing, let alone social housing. Additionally, I do not remember seeing evidence that Erewash has specifically quantified local (i.e. Erewash) housing needs. I also do not believe that much, if any, of the Green Belt selected for development would fit the definition of 'Grey Belt?'. As a concept, I can support the idea of Grey Belt as originally reported, i.e. pieces of land within the Green Belt which have previously been developed? indeed, I can think of a few locally, though they are all fairly small. I find the arguments that I have heard over distances between the edge of Derby and the edge of other towns, and how these distances will still be maintained, extremely spurious. The Green Belt in its entirety exists to prevent Nottingham and Derby from merging? while building on any of these sites does not immediately make the two cities any closer to each other, it does reduce the green space between the two cities, which is precisely what the Green Belt was established to prevent. The Green Belt is a regional initiative, covering two counties and several local authorities. With Erewash having such a high proportion of its land earmarked as Green Belt it is incumbent on the region as a whole to find a solution to the housing shortage, rather than to expect our authority to have to sacrifice its green spaces. the decimation of the landscape by this huge development is unacceptable. This is pure Green Belt (not a drop of Grey in sight)? as such, there will be a resulting impact on biodiversity in this area, not to mention the loss of amenity to the existing residents of Kirk Hallam.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Green Belt	Robert Mee	Response-01509	My main reason for objecting to these developments is that I do not believe that the criteria set out in the NPPF has been met justifying any encroachment into the Green Belt at this time. The Core Strategy and this Amendment are developed in order to meet the housing targets allocated to the council by central government. I do not believe that the number of houses required by government constitutes, in itself, the 'exceptional circumstances' which are required under the Framework. This is particularly so in view of there being no published objective basis for the numbers allocated to each authority. The term 'exceptional circumstances' does include 'instances where an authority cannot meet its identified need for homes'. The waiting list for social housing in the general area might suggest that this is the case, but I do not accept that these plans will go far to address this issue? the vast majority of the planned housing allocations are not even for affordable housing, let alone social housing. Additionally, I do not remember seeing evidence that Erewash has specifically quantified local (i.e. Erewash) housing needs. I also do not believe that much, if any, of the Green Belt selected for development would fit the definition of 'Grey Belt?'. As a concept, I can support the idea of Grey Belt as originally reported, i.e. pieces of land within the Green Belt which have previously been developed? indeed, I can think of a few locally, though they are all fairly small. I find the arguments that I have heard over distances between the edge of Derby and the edge of other towns, and how these distances will still be maintained, extremely spurious. The Green Belt in its entirety exists to prevent Nottingham and Derby from merging? while building on any of these sites does not immediately make the two cities any closer to each other, it does reduce the green space between the two cities, which is precisely what the Green Belt was established to prevent. The Green Belt is a regional initiative, covering two counties and several local authorities. With Erewash having such a high proportion of its land earmarked as Green Belt it is incumbent on the region as a whole to find a solution to the housing shortage, rather than to expect our authority to have to sacrifice its green spaces.
	South West of Kirk Hallam	Green Belt	Roger Tranter	Response-01323	The current green belt area will be reduced by this development
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Green Belt	Russell Bannister	Response-01360	10 Greenbelt Impact The area proposed for development lies within or directly borders designated Greenbelt land, which serves a critical purpose in protecting the countryside from urban sprawl and preserving the natural character of places like Kirk Hallam. Loss of Natural Landscape: The land south-west of Kirk Hallam currently provides open views, mature trees, hedgerows, wildlife corridors, and a clear green boundary separating our community from further urban development. The proposed bypass and housing estate would irreversibly destroy this landscape, replacing it with concrete, asphalt, and artificial infrastructure. Purpose of Greenbelt Undermined: One of the primary purposes of Greenbelt land is to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another. This development threatens to erode the physical and visual separation between Kirk Hallam, Dale Abbey, and possibly West Hallam if the future plans of a further 850 houses North West of KH goes ahead surrounding rural spaces?setting a dangerous precedent for future expansion. Irreplaceable Environmental Value: This land is not just open space?it contributes to biodiversity, local ecosystems, and climate resilience. It provides habitat for local wildlife, supports pollinators, and acts as a natural carbon sink. Once built over, these functions cannot be replaced. Public Enjoyment and Wellbeing: Many residents use this area for walking, recreation, and mental wellbeing. It offers a peaceful escape from increasingly congested roads and built-up areas. Paving over it for a development that brings no real benefit to Kirk Hallam strips the community of one of its last remaining natural assets. Also this land has an strong monastic link with a foot path that was used by Monks who walked from Ilkeston to Dale to the Abbey. Contradiction to Planning Principles: Proceeding with this development contradicts national and local planning policies that aim to preserve Greenbelt land except in exceptional circumstances. No compelling evidence has been provided to justify why this development cannot be located elsewhere, on brownfield or already urbanised land. In summary, this proposal would devastate a vital stretch of Greenbelt that protects the identity, air quality, and environment of Kirk Hallam?and should be rejected on that basis alone.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Green Belt	Ruth Allen	Response-01258	Green belt was designated as such for the excellent reason that people need green space around them for their mental and physical health; the vast numbers of people who use the footpaths in the area around Dale Abbey confirm this. Dale must not be swallowed up by Kirk Hallam.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Green Belt	Simon Frost	Response-00684	The green belt should not be built on in the area as the area is heavily populated and built upon already, the green belt is small and the pockets of green land are constantly being reduced. Urban sprall is having a negative effect on the environment and health of local people.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Green Belt	Simon Reeve	Response-01081	The fields between West Hallam Village and Kirk Hallam, Kirk Hallam and Stanton Village just like those between High Lane, West Hallam and Shipley/Heanor Road, Ilkeston support a diverse population of wildlife with open fields, woodlands, marsh land, lakes and streams/ivers. Removing any part of this environment for housing should be banned on this basis alone, there be no home for nature and "not cutting the grass verges" (to save money) won't make a difference.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Green Belt	Stephen Palmer	Response-00311	No greenbelt should be built on .
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Green Belt	Stephen Syson	Response-00032	There is plenty of brown field sites and abandoned houses that should be used, but you choose to use our countryside for no apparent reason other than its easier for you and for the developers and cheaper for them
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Green Belt	Steven Street	Response-01264	Loss of our green belt is theft Short term politics at its worst
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Green Belt	Sue Knott	Response-01268	Green belt land should be safeguarded - if we don't then future generations will pay the price . We should be protecting our planet not destroying it
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Green Belt	Sue Shaw	Response-00304	I think it's appalling that green belt and historic farmland is considered worthless enough to be built over and lost forever. The green belt should remain protected.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Green Belt	Tracy Lee	Response-00988	When green belt becomes grey it will never be green again, there is a massive amount of brown belt just down the road that could be built on with Stanton now being pulled down, why can you not build on this instead? Stop destroying the countryside for all to enjoy with this urban sprawl.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Green Belt	William Moore	Response-01259	Development should NOT be in green belt - the idea of green belt is to protect the countryside
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Cllr Simon Mabbott	Response-01480	1/. Unsustainable Pressure on Healthcare Services The proposed development of 1,000 new homes will bring a significant population increase to Kirk Hallam, placing unsustainable pressure on already overburdened local healthcare services. 2/. Existing Services Already Struggling Local GP practices and healthcare facilities are currently under strain. Many residents report long waiting times, difficulty booking appointments, and reduced access to face to face care. The system is already stretched to its limit and this development would push it beyond breaking point. 3/. No Provision for Additional Medical Infrastructure Despite the scale of the proposed development, there is no confirmed plan to expand or create new healthcare services. There is no mention of new GP surgeries, dental practices, pharmacies, or community health centres to support the influx of new residents. Without this, both new and existing patients will face even greater difficulty accessing basic care. 4/. Increased Burden on Hospitals With GP services unable to meet demand, more people will turn to A&E departments for routine care further straining already overstretched hospitals such as Queen's Medical Centre and Royal Derby Hospital. This creates a ripple effect, impacting emergency care for everyone in the region. 5/. Accessibility Challenges The recent withdrawal of the 21 bus service, which previously connected Kirk Hallam to QMC Hospital, has severely reduced access to essential healthcare particularly for those without a car. Elderly and disabled residents are especially affected. Meanwhile, increased traffic from the development will make it harder for ambulances and emergency services to reach those in need quickly. 6/. Growing Health Inequality A development of this size, without matching investment in health infrastructure, risks deepening health inequalities. Vulnerable groups including the elderly, families with young children, people with chronic illnesses, and those on lower incomes will be hit hardest. The result will be a community where timely, affordable care is no longer accessible to all. 7/. Conclusion: Health Provision Must Match Growth Without parallel investment in local healthcare infrastructure, this development will significantly worsen access to medical care and negatively impact the health and wellbeing of both new and existing residents. Planning decisions must prioritise the delivery of essential services alongside housing, anything less is short sighted and irresponsible.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Daniel naylor	Response-01510	Doctors,dentists and chemists are already a rare service givmven, without a further 1000+ homes to cater for
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	FAY SAXTON	Response-01409	Given the vast increase in population proposed for Kirk Hallam, it is vital that sufficient healthcare provision and funding are made available for all residents of Kirk Hallam.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Fiona Turner	Response-01362	There's been mention of a new school but I see no plans to build any new gp surgeries or dentists? These are two services that are already stretched to their limit. Dentists not taking NHS patients, gp surgeries full to capacity already- yes they will take on more patients but they don't have capacity to give you an appointment. Another factor of healthcare, take into consideration the elderly and vulnerable residents of Kirk hallam. Those who are lucky enough to stay at home to be cared for, will experience ongoing issues with their carers turning up late because of the congestion on the roads. This will have a negative impact on their healthcare. Waiting 8 hours or more for emergency services- congestion only adds to this and cause more disruption
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	John mainstone	Response-00967	As is common knowledge it's really difficult to see a doctor
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Josh August	Response-00090	Not just Kirk Hallam but Ilkeston as a whole, the current healthcare situation is horrendous. It is extremely difficult to get to see your GP. Then there are the hospitals close by, A&E waiting times are already at an unbearable waiting time
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	kimberley grabham	Response-00306	I already struggle to see a GP or practice nurse let alone the huge wait for repeat precriptions at the pharmacy. I have a chronic condition so I need access to nhs services, with extra people using these facilities I worry my level of care will be seriously impacted.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Lisa Attenborrow	Response-01367	Yet again not enough in the healthcare facilities. One doctors surgery and one dentist which is very hard to register with.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Margaret Bannister	Response-01190	7. Strain on Healthcare and Dental Services Local healthcare services are already under significant pressure: ? Old Station Surgery (including Kirk Hallam branch): approx. 15,500 patients ? Eden Surgery: approx. 4,100 patients ? Gladstone House Surgery: approx. 5,000 patients ? Little wick Medical Centre: approx. 15,356 patients (2016) not current data available Kirk Hallam Dental Practice is operating at full capacity. An influx of new residents will significantly strain both GP and dental services, increasing waiting times and reducing accessibility. Ilkeston Community Hospital is also at capacity: ? Urgent Treatment Centre: waits of 1.5 to 3+ hours reported ? Blood Tests: appointment-only; long waiting times ? Imaging (X-rays, Ultrasound, MRI): Delays due to equipment limitations ? Physiotherapy, podiatry and Consultant Clinics: Delays expected. Given the existing demand is already high, population growth will lead to longer waiting periods for these services. The proposed development would significantly increase the local population, increasing pressure on already stretched healthcare services and potentially leading to longer waiting times and reduced access to essential medical services.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Michaela Hickinbotham	Response-00229	1 docs and 1 dentist which of course as new residents they will get into straight away. I have benn at my docs in Ilkeston since birth and even now struggle to get an appointment, as previously having had cancer which has returned I am having to wait a week to get to see a Dr which will only get worse if there is a minimum of 2 persons per household that an extra 2000 patients trying to get in, to the very few doctors in Ilkeston district.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Michelle Colliver	Response-01332	The proposed development in Kirk Hallam is expected to place substantial additional pressure on already strained local healthcare services. GP surgeries in the Ilkeston area, such as Old Station Surgery, are currently operating at or near full capacity, regularly advising patients to seek alternatives due to high demand, staff shortages, and limited appointment availability. Similarly, dental services such as mydentist in Kirk Hallam are only able to accept new NHS patients when availability permits, reflecting limited capacity. Ilkeston Community Hospital, while having recently reopened additional beds to improve patient flow, is primarily a community facility with limited resources. The addition of thousands of new residents will likely exacerbate wait times, reduce appointment availability, and increase the burden on urgent care and rehabilitation services. Without corresponding investment in new GP practices, expanded dental provision, and enhanced hospital infrastructure, the healthcare system will struggle to meet rising demand, leading to poorer health outcomes and reduced access to essential services for both existing and new residents.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Mr J Edwards	Response-01355	More strain on doctors, dentist and hospitals which are already working to capacity!
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Mrs Beverley Anne Harrison	Response-01118	Whilst Kirk Hallam struggles with a doctors surgery which is often limited for appointments and could benefit from an update, it is perfectly sited in its central estate location of the current village centre which ensures easy accessibility by residents (especially as many bungalows occupied by the elderly or disabled are situated nearby on both sides of Ladywood Road) and is supported next door by the local Pharmacy. Within this popular and well established centre there is also an established dentist which provides both private and NHS treatment, a local post office and large Nisa supermarket
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Paul Wright	Response-01261	Not enough capacity at the moment for GP and dental services, so where will all the additional new residents go?
	South West of Kirk Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Rachael Baines	Response-01403	Difficult to get appointments already dentist, Dr etc
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Russell Bannister	Response-01360	7. Impact on Healthcare Provision The proposed development of 1000 new homes is expected to bring a substantial increase in population, placing unsustainable pressure on already overstretched healthcare services in the Kirk Hallam area. Existing Services Under Strain: Local GP surgeries and healthcare facilities are already struggling to meet current demand. Many residents report difficulty in securing timely appointments, long waiting times, and reduced access to face-to-face consultations. No Additional Health Infrastructure Proposed: Despite the scale of the development, there is no clear commitment to build new healthcare facilities or expand existing services such as GP practices, dental clinics, pharmacies, or community health centres. Wider Impact on Hospitals: An increase in local population without adequate GP support will lead to more residents turning to A&E or urgent care centres for routine health concerns, further straining hospitals such as the Queen's Medical Centre and Royal Derby Hospital? facilities that are already facing heavy pressure. Accessibility Issues: With the loss of the 21 bus service (which previously served QMC Hospital), residents will face reduced access to hospital care, especially the elderly, disabled, and those without access to private transport. Increased traffic congestion from the development will also make emergency vehicle access slower and more difficult. Health Inequality and Community Impact: Without proper health provision, the development risks creating inequalities in access to care, particularly for vulnerable groups such as the elderly, children, people with chronic conditions, and low-income families. This undermines the principles of a healthy, sustainable community. In summary, the development will seriously exacerbate existing healthcare pressures in the area unless significant investment in medical infrastructure and services is delivered alongside housing. Failure to address this will directly affect the health and wellbeing of both new and current residents.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Simon Frost	Response-00684	Ilkeston already has surgeries working at capacity as it is impossible to obtain an appointment another few thousand residents with no addition surgery, dentist etc will further make the issue worse.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Simon Reeve	Response-01081	The ability to get a doctor's appointment is a bit of a joke, the doctors surgeries are all over prescribed, chemists are too busy trying to pick up the slack and dentists are near impossible to get in to, we travel 40 minutes away to a dentist. There simply cannot be more pressure through new housing on a breaking system
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Stephen Palmer	Response-00311	Seeing a Doctor is difficult now thats before a population explosion . We cannot possibly be expected to share !!!
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Stephen Syson	Response-00032	All GPS services are oversubscribed, there are no NHS dentists whatsoever A walk in centre that is only open from 8 to 8
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Tracy Lee	Response-00988	Doctors appointment are already hard to get and GPs are reducing this would put an even bigger strain on the system.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	William Moore	Response-01259	Over load?s services
		Landscape	Andrew Corban	Response-01496	This would spoil the beauty of the place and ruin a piece of greenbelt land

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Landscape	Cllr Simon Mabbott	Response-01480	1/. Irreversible Damage to the Landscape and Identity of Kirk Hallam The proposed construction of 1,000 homes, a 40mph bypass, and multiple roundabouts would have a profound and permanent impact on the landscape surrounding Kirk Hallam. 2/. From Rural Countryside to Urban Sprawl The south-west edge of Kirk Hallam is currently defined by open fields, hedgerows, mature trees, and uninterrupted rural views. This distinctive landscape not only separates the community from neighbouring areas but also gives Kirk Hallam its unique semi-rural identity. The proposed development would transform this peaceful setting into a sprawling extension of the urban area?dominated by dense housing, road networks, traffic infrastructure, and artificial lighting. 3/. Destruction of Visual Amenity Residents and visitors who currently enjoy the natural beauty and visual openness of the area will instead face a landscape filled with rooftops, vehicles, and concrete. The scenic countryside that offers relief from the built environment will be lost, replaced by an urbanised horizon that undermines the character of the area. 4/. Noise and Light Pollution A bypass and large-scale housing scheme will bring with it increased noise from construction and traffic, as well as light pollution from streetlights, vehicles, and homes. These changes will significantly alter the area's quiet character, especially for those living on the southern edge of Kirk Hallam who currently benefit from its rural setting. 5/. Permanent Loss of Landscape Character Once this development goes ahead, the existing character of the land cannot be restored. The natural boundaries that mark the edge of Kirk Hallam will be erased, and the community's connection to its surrounding countryside will be permanently severed. 6/. Erosion of Local Identity Kirk Hallam's identity is closely tied to its position at the fringe of open countryside. It is not designed to be part of a high-density conurbation. By removing this rural boundary, the proposal threatens to absorb the community into an indistinct urban sprawl, diminishing what makes the area special. Conclusion: A Lasting Loss This proposal would do more than build houses?it would erase the very landscape character that defines Kirk Hallam. Once lost, this setting cannot be recovered. The development should be rejected in order to preserve the area's distinct identity and valued countryside surroundings.
	Kirk Hallam	Landscape	Debbie Launders	Response-01293	It will soon be back to back housing from ilkeston to Spondon - who wants that
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Landscape	FAY SAXTON	Response-01409	Recent proposals for development across Erewash will, if implemented, change our landscape and Green Belt forever. I would request the Council to show a serious intention to develop policies which will preserve rather than destroy our landscape.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Landscape	Fiona Turner	Response-01362	Building an access road through a nature reserve is highly intrusive and typically considered ecologically destructive. Here?s how it could affect the landscape: 1. Habitat Destruction and Fragmentation ? Trees, vegetation, and wildlife habitats will be lost to make way for the road and housing. ? The access road will fragment the reserve, isolating wildlife populations and disrupting natural movement corridors. ? This can lead to species decline, especially for birds, amphibians, reptiles, and small mammals. 2. Visual Intrusion ? Natural, scenic landscapes will be replaced by roads, street lighting, buildings, and parked cars. ? The area will lose its rural or untouched visual character, particularly where the development meets or enters the nature reserve. 3. Noise and Light Pollution ? Traffic, construction, and residential activity will introduce constant noise and artificial lighting. ? This negatively affects nocturnal species (bats, owls, insects) and can permanently change animal behavior and breeding success. 4. Pollution and Runoff ? Increased air pollution from cars and water pollution from road runoff (oil, chemicals, litter) can contaminate nearby streams, wetlands, and soil. ? The loss of vegetation reduces the land?s ability to filter and absorb water, raising erosion and flood risks. 5. Soil Compaction and Erosion ? Construction and road use compact the soil, reducing permeability and damaging the delicate balance of the reserve?s ecology and hydrology.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Landscape	Gregory Robin Watts	Response-01297	Obviously the housing will have a large effect on the landscape as green fields are covered over with housing and roads. The tranquillity will be reduced in the surrounding countryside by increased traffic noise and reduced greenery.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Landscape	Josh August	Response-00090	Building these houses will completely ruin the landscape between Kirk Hallam, Dale Abbey and Stanton By Dale. There?s currently gorgeous walks through the farmland/countryside that are great for families and dog walkers. This will all be ruined
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Landscape	Margaret Bannister	Response-01190	This development will completely change the landscape around the Kirk Hallam area. I am an avid walker and have walked around the area of the proposed development for my entire life. The views are spectacular and watching the wild life helps my mental well being. Once we lose this beautiful land to development we will never be able to regain it. It is the Jewel of Erewash.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Landscape	Michelle Colliver	Response-01332	The landscape surrounding Kirk Hallam is steeped in historical and cultural significance, characterized by its gently undulating arable fields, ancient hedgerows, and historic pathways that have shaped the community's identity for centuries. One notable feature is the ?Monks Walk,? a historic route believed to have been used by monastic communities, reflecting the area's rich ecclesiastical heritage. These elements collectively contribute to a landscape that is not only aesthetically pleasing but also deeply rooted in the region's history. The arable fields around Kirk Hallam have been cultivated for generations, supporting local agriculture and maintaining the rural character of the area. These open spaces provide habitats for various wildlife species and offer residents opportunities for recreation and connection with nature. The preservation of such landscapes is crucial for maintaining biodiversity and the well-being of the community. Erewash Borough Council has publicly declared a climate emergency, pledging to reduce carbon emissions and promote environmental sustainability. However, these commitments starkly contradict their current actions, particularly in supporting a proposal that would result in the destruction of significant areas of greenbelt and arable land in Kirk Hallam. This ecocidal approach not only removes valuable carbon sinks but also erodes local biodiversity, damages essential agricultural land, and increases flood risks?undermining the very principles of climate resilience the declaration aimed to uphold. The loss of these natural assets in favour of large-scale development highlights a troubling inconsistency between stated climate goals and on-the-ground decision-making, calling into question the credibility and integrity of the council's environmental agenda.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Landscape	Nick Jackson	Response-01260	We need more green spaces not less
	South West of Kirk Hallam	Landscape	Rachael Baines	Response-01403	Protect the landscape

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Landscape	Robert Mee	Response-01509	the decimation of the landscape by this huge development is unacceptable. This is pure Green Belt (not a drop of Grey in sight) ? as such, there will be a resulting impact on biodiversity in this area, not to mention the loss of amenity to the existing residents of Kirk Hallam.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Landscape	Russell Bannister	Response-01360	11 Landscape The proposed development of 1000 houses, a 40mph bypass, and multiple roundabouts will have a drastic and irreversible impact on the landscape surrounding Kirk Hallam. From Open Countryside to Urban Sprawl: The south-west of Kirk Hallam currently offers open green fields, hedgerows, mature trees, and long-range rural views. This forms a distinctive landscape that separates the community from neighbouring settlements and provides a sense of place, openness, and identity. The development would replace this with dense housing, tarmac roads, traffic infrastructure, and artificial lighting?transforming a tranquil, semi-rural setting into an extension of urban sprawl. Loss of Visual Amenity: Residents and walkers who currently enjoy open views across fields and countryside will instead be confronted by rooftops, roadways, and traffic. The peaceful character of the landscape will be lost?along with the visual relief it provides from the built environment of Kirk Hallam. Increased Noise and Light Pollution: Introducing a bypass and large housing development will bring with it vehicle noise, construction noise, and light pollution from streetlights, cars, and housing estates. This will fundamentally alter the quiet character of the area, especially for those living on the southern edge of Kirk Hallam. Irreversible Character Change: The scale of the development means that once built, the character of the landscape cannot be restored. The natural boundaries that define the edge of Kirk Hallam today will be blurred or eliminated, and the community?s relationship with its surrounding countryside will be permanently damaged. Loss of Identity: Kirk Hallam is defined in part by its landscape setting?on the edge of open fields, not surrounded by high-density development. Removing this distinct boundary will strip the area of its rural edge and make it feel absorbed into a much larger, less defined urban sprawl. In summary, this development would not just build on the land?it would erase the very landscape character that defines Kirk Hallam and makes it a valued and distinctive place to live.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Landscape	Ruth Allen	Response-01258	Dale Abbey used to be regarded as the jewel in Erewash?s crown; it is of huge interest historically and emotionally to discerning visitors, of which there are thousands using the footpaths and bridleways each year, appreciating the peace and quiet. It must not be encroached upon by traffic and noise.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Landscape	Simon Frost	Response-00684	The area would lose the last gap in housing and the the landscape would suffer.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Landscape	Simon Reeve	Response-01081	We have a beautiful landscape, any changes to the natural environment will shatter the beauty of the area, you can't keep adding more and more homes and solar farms on the countryside. Especially when there's so much dead town centre which will never recover and should be changed from retail to housing for example the lower half of Bath Street Similarly every shop, home and all the new factories in Stanton should have solar panels on the roofs and as canopies to the car parks adding addition benefits of sheltering vehicles before any consideration to rip up the countryside.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Landscape	Stephen Palmer	Response-00311	A toxic slag heap is only 100 metres from the proposed new build housing . Power pylons will be close to homes. And there is a risk of flooding to the new homes and Sandiacre/ Long Eaton. There is a disused rifle range made from toxic furnace slag.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Landscape	Stephen Syson	Response-00032	Destruction of the natural beauty of the landscape due to build up of conurbations
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Landscape	Steven Street	Response-01264	All our landscape will be tarmac roofs And solar given the current labour control
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Landscape	Tracy Lee	Response-00988	The question is concrete or green food producing fields. Green is so much better for people?s mental health and the environment. The development would destroy this beautiful landscape.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Number of Houses	Cllr Simon Mabbott	Response-01480	1/. Overdevelopment Without Justification The proposed scale of development is excessive, disproportionate, and unsuited to a community like Kirk Hallam. The plan to build 1,000 new homes, alongside an additional allocation of ?safeguarded? land for a further 350 raises major concerns about overdevelopment, infrastructure capacity, and the long-term sustainability of the area. 2/. Hidden Expansion Through ?Safeguarded? Land Labelling land as ?safeguarded? is, in practice, a step toward eventual development. This means the true scope of the proposal could reach 1,350 homes, a figure that would dramatically increase the local population and place overwhelming pressure on already-stretched roads, schools, healthcare facilities, drainage systems, and public transport. 3/. No Phased Growth or Infrastructure Strategy There is no evidence of a structured, phased approach to managing this level of expansion. Without a clearly coordinated plan to deliver essential services and infrastructure in parallel with new housing, the community will likely face significant disruption and shortfalls in public provision from the outset. 4/. A Development Out of Proportion Kirk Hallam is a modest, relatively self-contained settlement with limited connectivity. An influx of up to 1,350 new homes could nearly double its size, fundamentally altering the character of the area without offering proportional benefits to current residents or demonstrating a genuine need based on local housing demand. 5/. Ignoring the Cumulative Impact This proposal cannot be viewed in isolation. Taken alongside other recent or planned developments across the borough, the combined effect on public services, infrastructure, and the environment is severe. The wider implications of such unchecked growth have not been properly assessed or addressed. Conclusion: Unsustainable and Unbalanced Growth This level of development is not only excessive it is poorly timed, insufficiently supported, and strategically unsound. Kirk Hallam lacks the infrastructure to absorb such rapid expansion, and the proposal represents a clear case of unsustainable planning that prioritises housing numbers over community wellbeing. Driven by financial gain rather than community.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Number of Houses	Emma	Response-01265	The number of houses is monstrous, the footfall of human traffic will drive animals away and ruin their habitats. The human litter and pollution will deeply affect our beautiful green belt.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Number of Houses	FAY SAXTON	Response-01409	<p>NUMBER OF HOUSES/GREEN BELT (these catagories overlap) The housing allocation of c1000 houses for the village of Kirk Hallam is totally unfair and unreasonable. Kirk Hallam is a village on the Erewash Green Belt, along with all the other Green Belt villages and should take an equal share of the development allocation, not be dumped with a massive proportion. The Inspector on examining the maps at the last Core Strategy Review could see that Kirk Hallam is a village. Yet all BUT Kirk Hallam are treated for planning purposes as villages, for no cogent reason. Kirk Hallam's church of All Saints is the nearest Grade 1 Listed Church to the Abbey of Dale Abbey and the close relationship between the two villages is well documented. We know that the Canons of Dale Abbey ministered as priests to the people of Kirk Hallm. To this day, visitors (and locals) take what is known locally as the "Monks Path" from the church and Abbey of Dale to Kirk Hallam and its Church. The Abbey at Dale owned and farmed the land that we now call our Green Belt, including Kirk Hallam. This history is a valued heritage asset to Erewash and likely to be so into the future. Expecting Kirk Hallam to take c 1000 new homes when the amounts to be taken by other villages vary from c 50 to c 280 is grossly unfair and needs to be halted. Kirk Hallam has been used over the years as a dumping ground for unwanted development. It should not be up to developers to choose what land they want to build on. At Kirk Hallam, the land proposed for development is within the Dale Abbey Parish. Many Kirk Hallam residents come under Dale Abbey for Council Tax. Kirk Hallam's ties to Dale Abbey are indisputable. Virtually all of the villages have some council houses, Kirk Hallam has many too but also many houses built for workers by Stanton Ironworks, people whose tireless work assisted in building the wealth of the Ilkeston area for many years. Many residents are descendants of those workers, some of whom are still alive, some of whom died of lung conditions due to tending the furnaces. In this way Kirk Hallam presents to Erewash a further historical heritage value, later in time, but one that should be respected. In reality, the village of Kirk Hallam has been denigrated as low value, and robbed at an unknown time of its value as a village without its consent, despite valiant ongoing efforts by a life-long Kirk Hallam villager to untangle its planning history. The village of Kirk Hallam should not be expected to take on any more than its fair share of the development in Erewash. The Council should re-visit their figures and indeed the way in which land is selected for development so that overarching fairness and common sense are the primary criteria, and the Green Belt treated as the treasured asset of Erewash that it is, long known to locals as "The Jewel of Erewash". Forcing development on the Kirk Hallam and surrounding areas is short sighted and unrealistic. It is apparent to anyone living in the area that this part of Erewash is already full to overflowing, experiencing traffic conditions which have no realistic way of being resolved by what is presented and certainly not by a so called Relief Road that creates further problems throughout the area, as discussed in "Transport" above. The housing allocations the Council have made when considering options across the Borough concern me greatly. Why overload and stifle Kirk Hallam and surrounding areas when there are clearly other options av</p>
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Number of Houses	FAY SAXTON	Response-01409	<p>ailable? SA2025 UPDATE SITES ASSESSED (REJECTED) BOROUGH SOUTH shows considerable areas of land in the region of Hopwell CP that have been offered but rejected, indeed a representative of the owner of this land was present at the last Core Strategy Hearing. All we are presented with is a map showing the area, with no explanation whatsoever as to why a portion of this land could not be used to restore fairness to the village of Kirk Hallam to reduce its c 1000 house allocation, why it could not play its part in eliminating the £10 million cost of the so called Relief Road and removing the need for this road altogether, why it could not play its part in ending the daily headache for school children and commuters in the deadlock that increases day by day at A6096/Bulls Head? The land is not far at all from the high employment areas of Erewash - it is within under an hours walking distance from Kirk Hallam, it could support a primary school cost £4 million, with money to spare after eliminating the cost of the Relief Road. Beyond the points system, it makes sense, its logical, its fair, and it can reduce the congestion. Please respect the people of Kirk Hallam and be willing to reconsider and widen your perspectives to find solutions where solutions are desperately needed - and available. A steady increase over the years to an allocation of c 1000 houses at the village of Kirk Hallam is vastly out of all proportion both to the current size of Kirk Hallam itself and massively so to the size of each of the surrounding Green Belt villages. The character of the villages should be maintained, balanced and not destroyed or encroached upon by unsuitable development. None of the villages want to become small towns or satellites of Ilkeston. They should be able to remain inviting and interesting for visitors who come to the Green Belt for health giving recreation as they do at present. In particular, the c 1000 house Kirk Hallam development represents a considerable encroachment towards the historic village of Dale Abbey to which it will be in sight and sound. Of important concern is the placement of what is termed a "Local Centre" (dealt with here as it is part of the proposed new development whilst not a "house"). The Local Centre is proposed to be built on what was and should remain Green Belt land beyond the Dale Abbey side of the Relief Road and adjacent to the A6096. Whilst the Council claim the so called Relief Road "will create a defensible Green Belt boundary as well as a landscape buffer between the Green Belt and housing allocation" (CORE STRATEGY REVIEW AMENDMENT DOCUMENT; P. 36, 3RD PARA FROM BOTTOM), the proposed setting of this Local Centre entirely breaks that boundary and provides a stepping stone for more new development towards Dale Abbey. This is totally unacceptable. Such a siting, being across the Relief Road in the direction of Dale Abbey, will sooner or later lead to developers digging deeper into the Green Belt to the detriment of both Kirk Hallam and Dale Abbey. Indeed, there seems to be no other reason for such a siting given its presence at the furthest point away from Kirk Hallam old and new, which would involve residents and their children crossing the busy and dangerous Relief Road with its cars, heavy vehicles and HGVs from both existing and forthcoming heavy traffic from other delivery depots such as West Hallam. Such a crossing cannot be made safe without a pedestrian bridge. The equality issues flowing from this</p>



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Number of Houses	AT SAXTON	Response-01409	Local Centre are rightly insurmountable, given that the Local Centre would be virtually inaccessible to the elderly and disabled and extremely dangerous for children - a dash for a ball into the road or a dare could prove fatal. This proposed development adjoining the A6096 would be more accessible to motorists from other parts than to the residents of Kirk Hallam new and old. Such a building would act like a motorway service station, an eyesore to the historic rural area, and as inappropriate and unwanted an intrusion as is possible to the character of the area. It risks becoming a hub for criminality/drugs aimed at the housing development via the many exits proposed on the unpoliced Relief Road. Kirk Hallam already has a Village Centre that could be refurbished/extended if required and there are also additional local shopping facilities at the supermarket in the garage at Kirk Hallam and at nearby Ilkeston and West Hallam. In addition, the proposal for a Local Centre supplanting the existing Village Centre represents a shocking and unnecessary exploitation of Green Belt Land that needs to be prevented, and a violation of the Councils own description of the Relief Road as a "defensible Green Belt boundary."
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Number of Houses	Fiona Turner	Response-01362	A development of this size is equivalent to building a small town, and its impacts on existing communities and infrastructure can be major: 1. Traffic Congestion and Road Safety ? A typical 1,000-home development could generate 1,500?2,000 extra vehicles. ? Local roads may become overburdened, leading to congestion, delays, and an increased risk of accidents, particularly near schools and junctions. 2. Pressure on Public Services ? Local GP surgeries, hospitals, schools, and emergency services may not have capacity for the population increase. ? This can lead to longer waiting times, overcrowded classrooms, and reduced service quality. 3. Impact on Community Identity ? Smaller villages or rural communities may feel overwhelmed by the scale of development. ? The development could dilute local character and disrupt the social cohesion of the area. 4. Environmental Degradation ? The loss of green space, trees, and natural features contributes to: ? Reduced air quality ? Urban heat island effects ? Declining mental well-being of local residents 5. Visual and Physical Landscape Change ? Fields, hedgerows, and open land will be replaced by rooftops, tarmac, and dense housing layouts. ? This can permanently alter sightlines, skyline profiles, and the general feel of the area. 6. Housing Market Pressures ? If houses are high-end, it may price out locals. ? If poorly integrated, it could lead to transient populations or increased social tension. ? Cumulative Effects ? Combined, the impacts of the access road, 1,000 houses, and associated infrastructure (schools, shops, car parks) will have a profound and permanent effect on both the natural and built environment. ? Particularly when built into a sensitive site like a nature reserve, the cumulative damage may be irreversible.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Number of Houses	GARY MARK WOODHOUSE	Response-01451	the housing allocation will increase Kirk Hallams population from 5966 residents by 40% plus that is far too large an increase for Kirk hallam to Take
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Number of Houses	Kimberley Dawson	Response-01345	Aside from it eroding the green belt, Kirk Hallam cannot possible sustain this number of properties being built.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Number of Houses	Lisa Attenborrow	Response-01367	The total amount of houses proposed to be built in Kirk hallam is scandalous. Erewash is a very big borough and you can't tell me that we have to take the majority of it. It should be distributed evenly then perhaps you wouldn't have so many objections. Everyone knows the government have set you a figure but it doesn't mean you can just choose one area which hasn't got the infrastructure to accommodate that many houses. One relief road which won't be a relief road it is a cut through to an already congested part by Stanton.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Number of Houses	Margaret Bannister	Response-01190	This proposed development is disproportionately large for one area. We recognise the need for housing but I feel that the area of kirk Hallam and lack of infrastructure makes this development unsustainable. Not only have we got to endure an increase in population which in course will put more pressure on our already bursting infrastructure, but we have also got to live with the ever growing distribution centres at New Stanton Park.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Number of Houses	Michaela Hickinbotham	Response-00229	1300 ridiculous 1000 ridiculous Kirk Hallam is a small community with I believe less than 7500 residents and you want to put that many houses up there. West Hallam our posher neighbour how many houses for them less than 200 🤔🤔🤔
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Number of Houses	Michelle Colliver	Response-01332	Kirk Hallam currently consists of approximately 2,619 households, supporting a population of around 5,966 residents. The proposed development of 1,000 new homes would increase the number of residences by nearly 40%, representing a dramatic expansion of the village. Such a large-scale development risks overwhelming the existing infrastructure and engulfing the current residential areas, fundamentally changing the character of Kirk Hallam. Rather than a gradual or balanced growth, the scale of this proposal would significantly diminish the village's close-knit identity and rural feel, replacing it with a much denser, urbanised environment that many fear would erode the community's existing cohesion and charm.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Number of Houses	Mr J Edwards	Response-01355	This area is not in need of new housing! The massive build on American adventure is struggling to sell the houses - just a ploy for government targets!!!! There is also the development near bennerly viaduct - also struggling to sell!!!! No one believes these are actually needed. We do not need in excess of 3000 houses - just imagine what this will do to Ilkeston and Kirk Hallam. Total carnage for roads, schools, services and wildlife!

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Number of Houses	Mrs Beverley Anne Harrison	Response-01118	Initially, core strategy allocations were shared fairly over Erewash. However, there genuinely were a few areas it made sense to remove allocations. Shamefully, on seemingly political preferred choice former majority EBC deleted many own constituency village allocations (siting excuses which also fit chosen locations) as many houses were unfairly reallocated to ?preferred? target areas. Between 2020 and 2022, Kirk Hallam (originally given around 400) and the then newly ?preferred? Spondon Wood site were targeted as victims to absorb West Hallam storage depot?s 1000 house allocation. In addition, when the 600 allocation at Cotmanhay was reduced to 250, Kirk Hallam was again targeted as ?preferred?, thus eventually increasing their allocation total to 1300 (over 3 times the original figure), equating to a nearly 50% housing increase in Kirk Hallam plus, just a short walking distance within the Kirk Hallam and Stanton by Dale ward, adding a further 1000 on brownfield land. This means (as stated in the bus services section) the population of 6,408 could drastically increase to well over 16,000. Finally, though Kirk Hallam?s allocated total was reduced to 1000 by the inspector in June 2024?s hearing, this review advocates safeguarding a further 8 hectares (the equivalent size of over 11 full sized football pitches!) of dairy food productive greenbelt farmland - which by coincidence roughly equates to the final remaining 7.2 hectare discarded Cotmanhay 250 house allocation - and means Kirk Hallam?s already struggling, overintensified, community is worse off than before that hearing. This review also deregulates a further 27 hectares of greenbelt in the area ? for who knows how much more future development!!!
	South West of Kirk Hallam	Number of Houses	Nick Jackson	Response-01260	There are far far better places to build.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Number of Houses	Paul Wright	Response-01261	Far too many houses proposed for this site, with house sizes shrinking by the year. Not good for the mental health of potential residents being squeezed into too little space.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Number of Houses	Roger Tranter	Response-01323	The proposal of 1000 houses is still far too many in my opinion.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Number of Houses	Russell Bannister	Response-01360	9. Number of Houses The scale of the proposed development is excessive and unjustified for an area like Kirk Hallam. The current proposal for 1000 houses, plus the designation of additional ?safeguarded? land for a further 350 homes, raises serious concerns about overdevelopment and long-term impacts on infrastructure, services, and the character of the area. Creeping Expansion: The inclusion of ?safeguarded? land is essentially a green light for future expansion, meaning the real total could reach 1350 new homes. This will dramatically increase the population and put unacceptable pressure on roads, schools, healthcare, drainage, and public transport. No Phased or Managed Growth Plan: There is no clear strategy for how this number of houses will be phased or integrated with the provision of services and infrastructure. This makes it likely that housing will be delivered well in advance of any meaningful support systems, causing immediate strain on the community. Out of Scale with the Area: Kirk Hallam is a relatively small, self-contained community with limited connectivity. Adding up to 1350 houses risks doubling the size of the settlement, with little benefit to existing residents and no clear justification based on local housing need. Cumulative Impact Ignored: The impact of 1000+ houses cannot be assessed in isolation. When combined with other recent or proposed developments in the borough, the cumulative strain on public services and the environment becomes even more severe. In short, the proposed number of houses?combined with the strategic positioning of additional land for future development?is excessive, poorly planned, and unsustainable for Kirk Hallam and its surrounding infrastructure.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Number of Houses	Simon Reeve	Response-01081	Already too many without adding more
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Number of Houses	Stephen Palmer	Response-00311	No houses should be built because of the high level of soil toxins .
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Number of Houses	Stephen Syson	Response-00032	1000 houses too many
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Number of Houses	Steven Street	Response-01264	To many not needed none in long Eaton
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Number of Houses	Tracy Lee	Response-00988	Far too many houses are being built in this area for the benefit of who? Bring buildings back into use instead of destruction.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Number of Houses	William Moore	Response-01259	We need less people not more houses
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Other	Cllr Simon Mabbott	Response-01480	As the newly elected County Councillor for Ilkeston South and Kirk Hallam, I?ve had to come up to speed quickly on the issues affecting our area. What has stood out most is the strength of feeling and deep rooted pride within the local community, a community that now faces the real risk of losing its identity if this development goes ahead in its current form. Residents are not opposed to all development. They understand the need for growth and are willing to engage constructively. But development must be proportionate, sustainable, and respectful of the character and capacity of the area. It cannot come at any cost. I urge you to ensure that a meaningful and thorough consultation takes place with the people I represent. I would welcome the opportunity to meet, listen, and work together to find a solution that meets future needs without sacrificing the integrity of this community.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Other	David Harrison	Response-01429	I wish to put forward my objection to the Core Strategy and its review amendment. It is the worse possible thing which could happen on every point above to an already struggling yet amazing and beautiful place . It will destroy the greenbelt and both the homes of the wildlife and biodiversity, the heritage of the people and the monastic history which made Kirk Hallam the amazing place and community it is whilst also shattering the physical and mental health giving characteristics of the greenbelt. The plan will further over intensify the population and massively increase the already heaving regular congestion and pollution whilst creating social division and further crippling an already overstretched infrastructure beyond all limitations. The current population haven?t been given due consideration and will once again - as has happened on so many occasions to this community - not properly been given proper thought which is disgraceful. The allocations should be democratically shared fairly and equally across the whole of Erewash without disdain or disrespect towards just a small of percentage of Erewash residents.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Other	Fiona Turner	Response-01362	1. Increased Traffic and Congestion ? More residents typically mean more cars on local roads, leading to: ? Longer travel times. ? Congestion during peak hours. ? Increased risk of accidents. ? Rural or small-town road networks can be ill-equipped to handle a sudden rise in vehicle numbers. ? 2. Pressure on Local Services and Infrastructure ? GP surgeries, hospitals, schools, and public transport can become overstretched. ? Local residents may face: ? Longer wait times for medical appointments. ? Difficulty getting school places. ? Reduced availability of social services. ? This is especially problematic when infrastructure is not upgraded in parallel with housing. ? 3. Noise, Dust, and Disruption During Construction ? Extended construction periods can bring: ? Persistent noise from heavy machinery. ? Air pollution from dust and diesel engines. ? Vibration that may affect nearby properties. ? Early morning and weekend work can disturb residents? quality of life. ? 4. Strain on Utilities and Drainage ? Existing systems for water, electricity, gas, and sewage may not be designed for a significantly larger population. ? Risk of: ? Sewer overflows or backups. ? Water pressure drops. ? Increased surface water runoff and local flooding, especially if green space is replaced by impermeable surfaces. ? 5. Loss of Green Space and Visual Amenity ? Natural or undeveloped land being built over can: ? Reduce access to nature for existing residents. ? Impact mental well-being, particularly in rural or semi-rural communities. ? Change the character of the area?loss of views, openness, and tranquility. ? 6. Overdevelopment and Urban Creep ? Residents may feel the development causes: ? Loss of village identity or community feel. ? Merging of formerly separate settlements (urban sprawl). ? Increased littering and antisocial behaviour, especially if the population grows rapidly without social integration plans. ? 7. Rising House Prices and Rents (or Sometimes Falling) ? Depending on the location: ? New, expensive homes may push up prices, making the area less affordable for locals. ? In some areas, a large influx of homes can saturate the market and reduce resale values of existing properties. ? 8. Impact on Privacy and Light ? New buildings, especially if taller or denser than surrounding properties, may: ? Overlook gardens or windows. ? Block sunlight, particularly in winter months. ? 9. Increased Pressure on Recreation Areas ? More people using parks, footpaths, and green belts can lead to: ? Overuse, erosion, litter, and disturbance to wildlife. ? Reduced enjoyment for existing users. ? 10. Social Friction ? Large developments can lead to a sudden demographic shift, which may: ? Disrupt local social dynamics. ? Create tension between new and long-standing residents if integration is poor or local concerns are ignored.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Other	Gregory Robin Watts	Response-01297	There will be increased demand for water which is increasingly a scarce during long periods of dry weather that we are experiencing more frequently. No new housing should be built before we can ensure an adequate supply of water throughout the year.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Other	Joan Polak	Response-00979	My objection covers all the boxes, as per my statement below. We knew we were doomed the day a posse of council members descended onto the Kirk Hallam area in the civil parish of Dale Abbey and proceeded along the historic "Monks' footpath." They had come to pillage the picturesque landscape which provides food, e, g. crops, a natural habitat for wildlife and serenity, tranquility and exercise for humans. It was one dull day they came, and they were blind to the natural beauty and usefulness of the area, as they were intent on building on land that wasn't at their back door. We were not forewarned about the planned housing in an already densely populated region that is already above the ability of the existing infrastructure. The KH by-pass route is absurd; it will primarily serve heavy-duty vehicles from the new Stanton Park, and heavy-duty vehicles aren't allowed through KH in the first place, only for access. This implies that additional traffic will turn right and pass by homes and a school along Ladywood Road towards Ilkeston! Which will make it worse for KH residents! More pollution, noise, congestion and danger to pedestrians Floods will occur in the valley due to the concreting over of the fields. The land is also close to a grassed-over area that was used to tip thousands of tons of waste from Stanton Ironworks... Has this been checked for toxicity?
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Other	Josh August	Response-00090	I would like to know why someone/people believe that we need to build this many houses. There clearly isn't a housing crisis as portrayed in the media as our local housing association have hundreds of empty houses that are ?hard to let? so they are sat there not being used. Look to use what is already there, rather than building new houses and ruining the beautiful countryside we currently have. Once it is gone, it will be gone forever
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Other	Kimberley Dawson	Response-01345	The focus should be on getting empty/unoccupied homes back into use within the borough before building new ones
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Other	Margaret Bannister	Response-01190	Formal Objection to Proposed Housing Development on the Outskirts of Kirk Hallam I Margaret bannister, am writing on behalf of myself, the local residents of Kirk Hallam and as the former Chair and now administrator of kirk Hallam Green Squeeze Campaign group, to formally object to the proposed housing development consisting of 1,000 houses a safe guarding for a possible further development of 350 house plus a new 40mph road on the outskirts of our community. Below are the key grounds for our objection: Conclusion I am writing on behalf of the local residents of Kirk Hallam to formally object to the proposed housing development consisting of 1,000 houses and a new 40mph road on the outskirts of our community. This development, if approved, will have severe and irreversible impacts on our infrastructure, environment, and the well-being of current residents. It will significantly increase the volume of traffic to already heavy laden roads, exacerbating further delays and gridlocked traffic This proposed development will cause widespread harm to the community of Kirk Hallam. It endangers our environment, health, safety, and infrastructure. We urge the planning authority to reject the application in full and prioritize sustainable, community-focused development that protects both people and place. It is also deeply concerning that the people of Kirk Hallam have had little to no help or representation from our elected councillors throughout this process. Furthermore, there are still many local residents who are unaware of the proposed development and its scale, raising serious concerns about the adequacy of public consultation. We recognise the need for housing, but this proposal is disproportionately large and unsustainable for the area. It fails to address the severe and compounding impact on traffic, air quality, public services, education, healthcare, flood risk, toxic pollution and environmental impact plus the loss of 50 hectares of historical greenbelt classed the ?Jewel of Erewash? which local Erewash residents have walked for generations. I also respectfully request that my opposition be personally reviewed by Planning Inspector Kelly Ford. Margaret Bannister (Mrs)

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Other	Michelle Colliver	Response-01332	In conclusion, I object to the proposed 1,000-house development in Kirk Hallam that is wholly unsuitable and poses unacceptable risks to the existing community, environment, and infrastructure. The issues raised?ranging from severe traffic congestion, flood risk, toxic land and water contamination, overwhelmed health and education services, lack of public transport, and failure to meet the needs of an ageing population?highlight a development that is both unsustainable and irresponsible. The impact on local biodiversity, heritage landscape, and the existing identity of Kirk Hallam would be irreversible. This deeply unpopular proposal has now dragged on for over five years, exhausting and frustrating residents who have had to repeatedly submit objections without meaningful engagement or action. Throughout this time, there has been a noticeable lack of support or representation from local councillors, despite the community?s clear and consistent concerns. Over 3,000 formal objections have already been lodged against this development, and this submission builds upon that strong opposition with updated environmental data, flooding statistics, service capacity information, and new evidence on the damage to public health and well-being. I request that this objection, and all new information contained within it, be formally submitted to Government Inspector Kelly Ford for consideration. It is time for the voices of Kirk Hallam residents, to be heard, respected, and acted upon. As well as the residents, the wildlife?whose habitats are also at risk?should be heard. This is not just about housing; it is about protecting the integrity, identity, and sustainability of our community. This development MUST be rejected.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Other	Mr J Edwards	Response-01355	Listen to the residents and actually work for them which is what you are paid to do!!!! Nobody wants this monstrosity of a development
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Other	Mrs Beverley Anne Harrison	Response-01118	Having spoken to several concerned residents, it?s essential to point out that close-by to a large part of the lower section of proposed development South of Kirk Hallam - including the recent safeguarded area ? there?s a sizeable ?slag? heap. ResearchGate.net describes such slag as ?Steel slag is a waste material produced during the process of steel making. For many years a large amount of Steel slag was deposited in slag storing yards, occupied farmland, silted rivers and polluted the environment?. From childhood I was told the heap resulted from the tipping of (ferrous) metal and steel waste by-products from the former local iron and steelworks, Stanton and Staveley (then owned by British Steel Corporation). The craggy mound has existed for several decades and over many years has, both by nature and council planting, been covered by grass and trees in an attempt to naturalise, beautify and conceal its presence. It co-exists under constraint of all weathers. Thus when it rains or when snow melts, resulting surface water run off flows through its mass into the ground, leaching out possible hidden substances, nutrients and contaminants and depositing them ever deeper into soil layers and groundwater allowing them to be spread like an ecosystem damaging infection across a large, underlying part of the area. For many years, revelations around the dangers and tragedies resulting from toxic and other pollutive contaminants often found over time within similar waste have been revealed and more recently tv dramas and documentaries like ?toxic town? based around the true stories of such hazards have been produced. It?s even been recounted locally that as far back as the late 1960?s, Dallimore School stopped growing vegetables for the school canteen when a teacher protested due to concern of toxin contamination from the nearby sited slag heap. In addition, considering work at Stanton involved use of blast furnaces, please note information on documentation found on ?patents.google.com? includes:- DE3911982A1 ? Disposal of Harmful Waste ? by burning it in a blast furnace in region where blast air is supplied, the introduction abstract of which states ?The method enables the disposal of harmful waste material. The material is injected by a pipe into a blast furnace in the region where air is supplied to the furnace. The waste material may be in solid, liq. or gaseous form and may be supplied with or without a transport medium. The transport medium may be a gas or a gas mixture, a liq. or a container. The temp. of the blast furnace in the region of its air inlet lies between 2000 and 2,500 deg.C and thus ensures that the waste material is completely burned. USE - Disposal of harmful waste material.? - Examples of disposal according to the registrations are: dioxins, uranium hexafluoride, biological or chemical warfare agents, oily metal shavings, Contaminated soil, sludge, or similar. One resident has revealed a relative who died in 2003 that had worked on Stanton blast furnaces had described how officials under government licence would dispose of dangerous materials in the hot furnace gas. Questions we need to ask are, How was this procedure carried out? How does that affect the area (and surroundings) where the slag was disposed? What contaminant hazards could this have on the area or anyone living close by? and, Is it dangerous and/or irresponsible to allow residential development so close to such a slag heap? Regarding any decision for developm
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Other	Mrs Beverley Anne Harrison	Response-01118	ent around the area, surely it must be paramount for long term public health and safety that thorough, careful and accurate soil and groundwater testing be conducted. Finally, given aforementioned concerns and the existence of such a closely sited slag heap to new homes it?s not unreasonable to ensure developer?s must inform potential house buyers of the nearby slag heap, alongside the developer?s provision of a liability insured guarantee the area is free from dangerous contaminants
			Nick Jackson	Response-01260	There are over 7,000 empty property available. Yes we need to build but there is more appropriate places to build.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Other	Russell Bannister	Response-01360	13 Conclusion and Final Comments Community Involvement and Consultation Fatigue The Core Strategy process leading to this proposed development has been a long and exhausting journey for the residents of Kirk Hallam, stretching back to 2019/2020. Over several years, residents have been repeatedly called upon to engage with review periods and consultation exercises?often needing to re-state their objections and navigate complex planning systems, with little sign that their views were truly being heard. A particularly difficult moment came in 2022, when residents were asked to respond using a lengthy and highly technical form, written in planning jargon and largely inaccessible to the general public. This process proved to be time-consuming, confusing, and emotionally draining, especially for people without expertise in planning or legal frameworks. Despite these barriers, a small and committed local campaign group?Kirk Hallam Green Squeeze (KHGS)?stepped in. Composed of residents from Kirk Hallam, Ilkeston, and Dale Abbey, the group voluntarily dedicated their time and energy to complete and submit responses on behalf of the wider community. They then rallied a group of residents they called the ?Foot Soldiers?, who knocked on every door in Kirk Hallam, raising awareness and offering people the chance to object using simplified, pre-prepared forms. Through this effort, over 3,000 objections were collected and personally delivered to Erewash Borough Council. Before this, another local group?Kirk Hallam Housing Opposition?had also made efforts to mobilise residents, successfully collecting over 1,200 signatures of objection through door-to-door engagement on a smaller scale. This level of effort highlights the depth of concern within the community, but it also reveals a broader truth: the process has taken a significant emotional and mental toll. Many residents have become understandably apathetic?not because they don?t care?but because they feel unheard and unsupported. The prolonged nature of the process, with constant consultations and shifting information, has left people drained. Critically, this all took place during a time when people were also trying to cope with the COVID-19 pandemic, which consumed their attention and energy. As people struggled to protect their health, hold down jobs, and care for their families, they had little capacity left to track or respond to planning proposals?some of which were progressing under the radar while communities were focused on survival. Moreover, residents have felt largely abandoned by their elected councillors, receiving little to no guidance or practical support throughout this drawn-out process. This has only deepened the sense of frustration and resignation. People may not always appear engaged, but that is a result of years of battle fatigue, not indifference. It is essential that this history of grassroots mobilisation, exhaustion, and emotional disengagement be properly acknowledged. The people of Kirk Hallam do care deeply about their area, and they deserve to be recognised, respected, and truly listened to. This development and bypass proposal do not address traffic issues?they compound them. They reduce access, compromise safety, and ignore the real-world experiences of those who live in Kirk Hallam. I urge the planning committee to reject this proposal or substantially revise it with proper infrastructure plans, road safety assessments, and meaningful consultation with local reside
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Other	Russell Bannister	Response-01360	nts. This proposed development represents a significant overreach for an area like Kirk Hallam?an established community already under pressure from limited road access, unreliable transport, stretched healthcare, and over-subscribed schools. The overall housing figure of 1000, plus "safeguarded" land for 350 more, is excessive and appears to be an underhanded attempt at creeping development with no guarantee of phased infrastructure improvements to match the expansion. Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) traffic is already a major issue for Kirk Hallam, particularly along the A6096 Quarry Hill road. The situation is set to worsen further with the ongoing development at New Stanton Park, which will dramatically increase HGV movements through our community?adding to congestion, safety risks, and noise pollution. In summary, this proposal would irreversibly change Kirk Hallam for the worse. It prioritises housing quantity over quality, profit over people, and long-term harm over sustainable growth. Local infrastructure?roads, schools, buses, healthcare, and drainage?simply cannot cope with such a sudden and large-scale expansion. Without major rethinking, this development will create a legacy of congestion, environmental degradation, and community fragmentation. We therefore strongly object to this proposal in its current form, and urge Planning Inspector Kelly Ford to reconsider its suitability, sustainability, and the long-term interests of the Kirk Hallam community. I would like to express that my objection be seen personally by the government inspector Kelly Ford
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Other	Simon Reeve	Response-01081	Just stop it, look at the many brownfield sites in Ilkeston, Derby, Stapleford, Long Eaton, Nottingham and regeneration of those sites will deliver the homes without irresponsible damage of natural environment
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Other	Stephen Palmer	Response-00311	The proposed site should have soil and waterways tested . This to reassure the public that the area is safe. Remember Kirk Hallam has a history of steel making like Corby.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Other	Stephen Syson	Response-00032	All in all this interrupts the peace and tranquility of the country side as it currently is.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Other	Steven Street	Response-01264	Houses not needed farm land and green belt is Short term politics for tick box rules not for the real people of this country enjoy the next two years because it will be your last the people will vote
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Road Safety	Andrew Corban	Response-01496	The roads linking to this site are not suitable for this development causes many accidents

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Road Safety	Cllr Simon Mabbott	Response-01480	1/. The Bypass and Development Pose a Serious Threat to Road Safety in Kirk Hallam The proposed development and bypass stand to significantly worsen road safety in and around Kirk Hallam. The area is already burdened by multiple high-risk traffic points, and this plan offers no meaningful measures to reduce those dangers. Instead, it intensifies existing hazards while introducing new ones. 2/. A6096 Roundabout ? High-Speed Danger Zone The proposed roundabout on the A6096 (Ladywood Road) would channel fast-moving traffic from Derby straight into Kirk Hallam. Drivers exiting from the community would be forced to yield to this flow, greatly increasing the risk of collisions?especially during peak times or poor weather. The speed differential and lack of controlled entry make this an inherently unsafe design. 3/. St Norbert Drive / Godfrey Drive ? A Known Hazard Worsened Located near the Cat & Fiddle pub, this junction is already recognized as an accident black spot, plagued by limited visibility and frequent near-misses. Increased traffic from the A6096 roundabout would lead to longer queues and further impair safety at this vulnerable intersection?for both drivers and pedestrians. 4/. Bulls Head / Quarry Hill Roundabout ? A Gridlock Turning Dangerous This key roundabout is already overwhelmed by school traffic, heavy goods vehicles, and commuter congestion. With the bypass funnelling even more vehicles into this point, the risks multiply: driver frustration, unsafe merging, and poor lane discipline all contribute to a higher likelihood of accidents. 5/. Sow Brook Lane Roundabout ? An Ill-Equipped Conflict Point The second proposed roundabout, at Sow Brook Lane, adds yet another junction where residents must yield to bypass traffic. This road is not built for high volumes and lacks any form of signal control or pedestrian protection. As a result, the risk of collisions will rise significantly, especially at busy times.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Road Safety	Daniel naylor	Response-01510	Traffic going into Ilkeston up quarrey hill road is very heavy at peak times already, without an extra 1000+ new homes,all with vehicles adding to it. Bulls head area is an accident waiting to happen already with school pupils walking this route at peak times alongside heavy traffic. This needs to be addressed now, without the new development, let alone with it added. The relief road would need to incorporate derby road to alleviate this already ongoing issue
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Road Safety	FAY SAXTON	Response-01409	The roads in Kirk Hallam and surrounding areas cannot be made safe until the Council stops loading them with unrealistic numbers of new residents most of whom are likely to own one or more cars. It does not make sense to add to a current traffic crisis in the area which is at risk of standstill. The Council needs to implement a common sense policy of fairly sharing out housing throughout Erewash and treating our Green Belt as rare and precious as it is, an overarching policy above and beyond their points systems. No-one has to drive very far in Erewash to get to work and many prefer to live in quieter areas. There is no need for a traffic crisis that is unnecessarily undermining road safety.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Road Safety	Fiona Turner	Response-01362	My daughter attends Dallimore primary school, which is already under great pressure from passing traffic. During school drop off and pick up times (peak times) the traffic flying past is dangerous. Children?s lives are at risk due to this. Crossing patrol is in place but their safety is too, at risk. Causing more disruption to build said access road, will increase the traffic flow along Dallimore road, and increase a danger to the children who go there. Parking is already bad enough from parents coming in from surrounding areas. Road visibility is already restricted without having additional lorries and work traffic coming past. Before adding to these pressures, this should be looked at first. Stopping this traffic coming through from sowbrook lane and into Kirk Hallam. Which they do to avoid the congestion up on quarry hill and bulls head. Which has temporary traffic lights all the time which cause even more congestion. Which was created when they stopped access to midland storage (or whatever it?s called now) from west hallam.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Road Safety	GARY MARK WOODHOUSE	Response-01451	Road safety in Kirk Hallam is terrible especially School hours for dropping off and picking up children, it is a notoriously difficult time, monstrous amounts of traffic on the junctions of St Norberts road / Spondon rd / Ladywood rd / Godfrey drive all fighting to access the main road, another junction, Godfrey Drive / St Norberts / Little Hallam Hill is also as bad, Kirk Hallam has two of the three secondary schools in the whole of the Ilkeston area. Children cross at the notorious Bulls Head Junction daily with no pedestrian crossings in that area its only time before a child gets killed crossing, thousands more cars will make things even worst
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Road Safety	Gregory Robin Watts	Response-01297	Increases in traffic volumes especially in the neighbouring villages and Kirk Hallam itself will necessarily increase the risk of accidents as it becomes more difficult to cross these busy routes. Cyclists will be deterred from using these routes because of increased perceived risk of collisions with passing vehicles
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Road Safety	Jon Watkin	Response-00414	The Proposal states that a Relief Road will be built joining the A6096 and Sowbrook Lane. It makes no reference to the junctions at both ends , there required style and size. The junction to the A6096 is on a rise in the road and there could be a road safety issue about the siting of the junction and the view of the road coming from the estate onto the A6096. The road is clearly meant to carry a significant amount of heavy traffic increasing as the industrial development of the former Stanton site is realised . The road from the relief road to Twelve Houses Junction along Sowbrook Lane is not mentioned for an upgrade. The junction at Twelve Houses is not mentioned but critical to the completion of the relief road. There is some future promise that the development suggested for houses on the former Stanton Iron works site will fund a Junction / roadabout at the junction. However this development is not certain and is unlikely to be started before the Kirk Hallam site is completed so there will be a significant delay in work done on the junction while the Industrial site and Kirk Hallam site will be finnisied and fully functioning. At the moment if tyhe plans go ahead there is only good intentions for the Twelve Houses Junction . urther necessary and essential site surveys are needed before any plans can be made and the number of houses possible can be confirmed. This makes the funding of the junction improvmnts doubtful .
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Road Safety	Josh August	Response-00090	There are lots of children that live in Kirk Hallam. The roads are already dangerous enough with limited off road parking throughout Kirk Hallam, which in turn makes it dangerous for people to cross the streets, as often all roads are double parked. More traffic in and around Kirk Hallam will cause more danger, especially to children
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Road Safety	Lisa Attenborrow	Response-01367	Increase of traffic will only increase the risk of accidents due to lack of road safety.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Road Safety	Margaret Bannister	Response-01190	2. Road Safety The proposed new 40mph road and the significant increase in vehicle movements on our current roads pose a serious threat to road safety in and around Kirk Hallam. Schools, pedestrian crossings, and residential streets will all be affected by heightened traffic volumes and faster-moving vehicles. Children walking to school, cyclists, and elderly pedestrians will be particularly at risk. Increased HGV traffic raises the likelihood of serious accidents, particularly on narrow or residential roads ill-equipped to handle such loads. The existing infrastructure is not designed to absorb this volume of traffic without introducing new risks to public safety. The roads around Kirk Hallam including Ladywood Road, Godfrey Drive, St Norbert Drive and its surrounding neighbouring roads, were not designed to accommodate the traffic load that they are having to endure now, let alone more traffic from the impending development and Distribution site at New Stanton park. All traffic is routinely caught in long queues, which not only disrupts schedules like buses and appts. But also puts a greater risk on drivers and passengers from minor collisions or near misses due to the stop start nature of local traffic. The local roads already have poor visibility at junctions and on Bulls head narrow pedestrian pathways and inadequate crossing points especially for elderly an Children on their way to school. All these issues will only become more dangerous with added traffic with the overdevelopment of proposed houses in this area.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Road Safety	Michaela Hickinbotham	Response-00229	If you care to look at Ladywood Road there are currently only 3 crossings, 1 at the top of Godfrey Drive junction 1 near the School and 1 at the bottom of Ladywood Road the other Godfrey Drive junction. There are no roundabouts no traffic light systems in place for Kirk Hallam residents to be able to get out of the side roads onto Ladywood Road and this will increase our frustrations if the new estate is built.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Road Safety	Michelle Colliver	Response-01332	In addition to congestion, road safety around Kirk Hallam and the Bulls Head area is a growing concern. The combination of high traffic volumes, large numbers of HGVs, and outdated road layouts creates a hazardous environment for both drivers and pedestrians. Narrow roads, worn signage, and limited visibility at key junctions increase the likelihood of accidents?especially during busy periods when driver frustration and impatience are heightened. A recent example highlighting these risks occurred on January 22, 2025, when a serious collision led to the closure of both Ladywood Road and Cat and Fiddle Lane, causing significant disruption and delays between Dale Abbey and Ilkeston. Incidents like this not only illustrate the dangers present but also the impact such accidents have on local travel and emergency response access. Residents have voiced concern over the safety of children walking to school, cyclists navigating tight lanes, and the difficulty emergency services face reaching certain areas. Without targeted safety improvements, the risk of collisions and delays for first responders will continue to grow, making it essential that road safety is prioritised alongside any future developments or transport plans.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Road Safety	Mr J Edwards	Response-01355	This proposed development will lead to traffic congestion and dangerous roads- a disaster waiting to happen!
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Road Safety	Mrs Beverley Anne Harrison	Response-01118	Considering traffic congestion, road safety and difficulty crossing the intertwined thread of often heavily congested, pollutive roads is a knock on problem. This is not just due to the regularity, volume or intensity of traffic but also the fact that, as Kirk Hallam is home to 2 of Ilkeston?s only 3 secondary schools, (with a daily ?exodus? of 11-18 year olds from as far away as Cotmanhay) the safety of many who walk or cycle to and from school on a daily basis alongside these busy routes will be affected. Safety will also be adversely affected for those who walk (via personal choice or due to frequency or limited public transport availability) around the area as there are many pedestrian routes to, from and within Kirk Hallam which are regularly used by many locals (many with children in buggies as well as cyclists or the disabled on mobility scooters)
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Road Safety	Nick Jackson	Response-01260	With an extra 2,000 cars, there will be road accidents.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Road Safety	Paul Wright	Response-01261	The road network is under great pressure already, with surfaces not being maintained and pot holes multiplying by the week. Local authorities are clearly failing to maintain the existing infrastructure so adding more traffic is total madness!
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Road Safety	Rachael Baines	Response-01403	School children use these roads, in many places no safe crossing areas
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Road Safety	Robert Mee	Response-01580	The location of the proposed ?local centre? is rather problematic, being on the ?wrong? side of the new relief road, adding to road safety concerns.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Road Safety	Robert Mee	Response-01509	The location of the proposed ?local centre? is rather problematic, being on the ?wrong? side of the new relief road, adding to road safety concerns.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Road Safety	Roger Tranter	Response-01323	Increased traffic flow will lead inevitably to more accidents.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Road Safety	Russell Bannister	Response-01360	2 Road safety The proposed development and bypass will have a serious and negative impact on road safety in and around Kirk Hallam. The area already struggles with several known risk points, and this proposal would exacerbate those dangers without offering any practical mitigation. A6096 New Roundabout: The proposed roundabout on the A6096 (Ladywood Road) would funnel high-speed traffic from Derby directly into the Kirk Hallam area. Residents attempting to exit onto this roundabout will have to give way to fast-moving vehicles, creating significant collision risks?especially during rush hour or in adverse weather conditions. St Norbert Drive / Godfrey Drive Junction: This junction near the Cat & Fiddle pub is already an accident black spot, with poor visibility and frequent incidents. Increased queuing from traffic backing up from the A6096 roundabout will make this dangerous junction even more hazardous for both drivers and pedestrians. Bulls Head / Quarry Hill Roundabout: This key roundabout is frequently gridlocked. With the additional traffic being directed from the bypass, it risks becoming overwhelmed, creating a higher likelihood of accidents due to driver frustration, poor lane discipline, and inadequate gaps for safe merging. Sow brook Lane Roundabout: The second proposed roundabout on Sow brook Lane would introduce another conflict point where Kirk Hallam residents must yield to bypass traffic. This junction is not currently equipped to handle high traffic volumes, and its expansion without signal control or pedestrian safety measures increases the risk of collisions. Increased Pressure on Residential Roads: As delays worsen at all key junctions, frustrated drivers may begin diverting through residential roads within Kirk Hallam to avoid traffic. This will endanger pedestrians, children walking to school, cyclists, and other local road users, turning quiet streets into rat runs with elevated accident risks. Emergency Vehicle Delays: All of the above congestion points?particularly the Bulls Head roundabout?already cause significant delays for emergency vehicles. Adding to this with more traffic and choke points could result in life-threatening consequences if ambulances or fire engines cannot pass quickly through the area.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Road Safety	Simon Frost	Response-00684	Excessive traffic adding to an already heavily congested area with large numbers of HGV movements will obviously increase potential risks.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Road Safety	Simon Reeve	Response-01081	The roads are not safe, the volume of traffic and outdated roads networks are dangerous without plainly stupid ideas of putting convenience stores at the Bulls Head or adding more homes, it is simply ridiculous. The roads simply aren't built for the traffic we already have without adding more homes with more cars; I grew up in West Hallam (High Lane East) in the 80s, spending time in West Hallam Village, Kirk Hallam all around Ilkeston. There were approximately 1 car for every 2 homes thinking back to friends and neighbours in the areas, now theres 2 or more per house and many more houses. The present roads infrastructure is woefully inadequate with too much traffic on Ladywood Road and frequent accidents at the junctions for top and bottom of the estates in Kirk Hallam. The traffic getting in to and out of Ilkeston up to the Bulls Head island is horrific backing up to the lower estate junction multiple periods each day; also backing up to White Lion Square coming back to Kirk Hallam. The road past Quarry Hill is good but again at the Bulls Head end and also at 12 Houses the roads are unsafe and smashed kerbs evidence of too much heavy traffic for the road. The Kirk Hallam estate creates a lot of cut through traffic to 12 Houses already trying to avoid the jams yet causes more dangers on an unsafe corner junction. The recent over development of the old Stanton site has chaos and danger both towards Ilkeston and Sandiacre as the roads were simply not built for this level of traffic. Whilst I don't agree withuch of Maggie Throup's ideas the J25a at Stanton was a needed investment to take traffic away from Sandiacre, Kirk Hallam and Ilkeston. Adding more homes and potentially another 400 cars is sheer lunacy.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Road Safety	Stephen Palmer	Response-00311	Greater traffic numbers through Kirk Hallam .
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Road Safety	Stephen Syson	Response-00032	Speeding traffic during normal times make crossing the roads hard at the best of time, the cameras never work and frequently the few crossing are abused by driving running red lights.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Road Safety	Steven Street	Response-01264	The idea for a community centre opposite the relief road is crazy needing a crossing lights close to the junction with Ladywood Road and creating a precedent to build on other side of the relief road Also there are numerous footpaths over relief road causing numerous crossings slowing road traffic up
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Road Safety	Tracy Lee	Response-00988	With the congestion and proposed increase in traffic from the developments in this area it is an accident waiting to happen and already has with 2 RTCs in close proximity to each other but at different times. There is limited safe crossing points and with a bypass it is storing up trouble for the future



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	School Capacity	Cllr Simon Mabbott	Response-01480	1/. Inadequate Education Provision for a Major Housing Development The proposed construction of 1,000 new homes will place unsustainable pressure on school capacity in Kirk Hallam and the surrounding area. Without a full and forward thinking education plan, the development risks overwhelming local schools and disrupting families. 2/. Junior School Alone Is Not Enough While the developer has pledged to build a new junior school, this addresses only a fraction of the educational need. No provision has been confirmed for secondary education a serious oversight given the number of families and school age children expected to move into the area. 3/. Local Secondary Schools Are Already Full Secondary schools in and around Kirk Hallam are already operating at or near capacity. Many are among the largest and most sought-after in the borough. A significant number of students already travel in from out of area most arriving by car, placing further strain on school resources, infrastructure, and nearby roads during peak hours. 4/. Increased Travel, Increased Congestion Without local secondary school options, families will be forced to send children to out-of-area schools, relying heavily on cars or school buses. This will compound congestion along already overstretched routes, including Ladywood Road, Quarry Hill, and Sow Brook Lane adding more traffic to roads already under daily strain. 5/. Disruption to Family Life and Community Ties A lack of nearby secondary provision could lead to children being placed in schools away from their friends or siblings. Parents may be left to juggle multiple school drop-offs, long commutes, and logistical headaches. These disruptions not only increase daily stress but weaken community cohesion and support networks. 6/. A Serious Gap in Long-Term Planning The proposal to build a junior school may seem like a positive step, but it falls short of what is needed. A development of this scale requires a full education strategy, one that includes secondary and post 16 (sixth form or college) education. Without this, the plan is incomplete and puts long term educational access at risk. 7/. Conclusion: School Infrastructure Cannot Support the Strain While the junior school proposal is acknowledged, the development remains critically under-supported in terms of educational infrastructure. Kirk Hallam already accommodates a large and growing student population. Without new secondary school capacity, the area simply cannot absorb additional demand without significant consequences for education quality, traffic flow, and family wellbeing.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	School Capacity	Daniel naylor	Response-01510	Secondary school places in the area are already at a small scale. An extra 1000+ houses would make some children have to travel miles to get to school due to limited places. Some children already have to travel miles out of town to attend the nearest available school with places available.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	School Capacity	Devan Meehan	Response-01406	It's not just primary school spaces that are needed, nursery and secondary school space too
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	School Capacity	FAY SEXTON	Response-01409	It is important that children in the Kirk Hallam area should be able to take up school places in their home area and that sufficient funds are made available for this to happen.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	School Capacity	Fiona Turner	Response-01362	The plans state the provisions to build a new school, but will it? The local schools are already great pressure as they are full. Not only are local schools of Kirk hallam, taking capacity up with local residents children but also children out of the area. This is because schools out of the area, are not so sort after or already full themselves. Teaching staff is also another worry. It's ok promising to build new school, if it happens, but who will staff them?
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	School Capacity	GARY MARK WOODHOUSE	Response-01451	kirk hallam Community Academy children aged 11-18, pupil capacity 1202 , it has 814 enrolled atm Ladywood Primary School children aged 3 - 11, pupil capacity 270, it has 321 enrolled atm, it is OVERSUBSCRIBED Saint John Houghton children aged 11-16, pupil capacity 606, it has 685 enrolled atm, it is OVERSUBSCRIBED Dallimore Primary and Nursery School aged 2-11, pupil capacity 315, it has 353 pupils atm, Oversubscribed, as you can see from these figures all accept one are oversubscribed the 1000 houses development would mean a massive influx of students to the Kirk hallam area exasperating the availability of school places with also the developers under no obligation to build any new secondary schools making it unsustainable or viable to build all these 1000 houses
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	School Capacity	John mainstone	Response-00967	School places are already oversubscribed
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	School Capacity	Josh August	Response-00090	Schools already have classes that have too many children per teacher. Plans to build a new primary school but what about once they leave there and go on to secondary schools. The education of the children is already being hindered by class sizes, they don't need more
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	School Capacity	Lisa Attenborrow	Response-01367	Not enough school spaces in the village. 2 primary schools and 2 high schools. The 2 high schools serve surrounding areas as well.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	School Capacity	Margaret Bannister	Response-01190	6. Impact on Local Schools Local schools are already oversubscribed: ? St John Houghton Catholic Voluntary Academy: 685 students enrolled as of 2023, with a high occupancy rate and limited capacity for additional students.( Capacity 606) ? Kirk Hallam Community Academy: Approximately 814 students aged 11?18, with a student-teacher ratio of 13:1. ? Dallimore Primary & Nursery School: Approximately 353 students aged 2?11, with a pupil-teacher ratio of 21.7. Operating near full capacity ? Ladywood Primary School: Approximately 340 students aged 3?11. An influx of families would place even greater strain on educational resources, risking overcrowded classrooms and reduced quality of education. I understand there are plans for a junior school on the site, but is way down the development and before that residents of the new housing development will require places in our current local schools. Plus there are no plans for senior education and our schools are already part of other areas catchment area in including the proposed development at Spondon...which results in more traffic volume with school commuter traffic.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	School Capacity	Michaela Hickinbotham	Response-00229	There are 2 junior schools and 2 secondary schools, yes there will be a junior school? And I presume the secondary schools will have places for the students which equals more traffic on Abbot Road and Godfrey Drive because heaven forbid the little darlings won't want to walk down or up a hill.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	School Capacity	Michelle Colliver	Response-01332	Kirk Hallam is served by several educational institutions catering to various age groups. Below is an overview of their capacities and current enrolments: Kirk Hallam Community Academy: This secondary school serves students aged 11 to 18. It has a capacity of 1,202 students, with 814 currently enrolled, operating at approximately 68% of its capacity. Ladywood Primary School: Catering to children aged 3 to 11, this primary school has a capacity of 270 pupils. Currently, it is over-subscribed, with 321 pupils enrolled, equating to about 119% of its capacity. Saint John Houghton Catholic Voluntary Academy: A Roman Catholic secondary school for students aged 11 to 16. The academy has a capacity of 606 students, with 685 currently enrolled, operating at approximately 113% of its capacity. Dallimore Primary & Nursery School: Serving children aged 2 to 11, this primary school has a capacity of 315 pupils. It is currently over-subscribed, with 353 pupils enrolled, equating to about 112% of its capacity. A major concern in the revised Core Strategy Review (CSR) is the removal of financial contributions previously allocated for education provision. This decision is particularly alarming given that all but one school in Kirk Hallam are already operating at or above capacity?before accounting for the significant influx of pupils that a 1,000-home development would generate. Removing funding for school expansion or new educational facilities will place unsustainable pressure on existing institutions, leading to overcrowded classrooms, reduced quality of education, and increased stress on both staff and students. Without proper investment, the development risks severely compromising the educational opportunities for both current and future residents, making it fundamentally incompatible with the principles of sustainable and inclusive community planning.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	School Capacity	Mr J Edwards	Response-01355	Locals schools are at capacity now - this will be a massive strain on school places
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	School Capacity	Mrs Beverley Anne Harrison	Response-01118	Kirk Hallam currently has 2 primary schools ? Ladywood and Dallimore. Having seen the Government?s Website of school information (at 3/5/2025) both primary schools are currently oversubscribed. In addition, Kirk Hallam is home to 2 of the only 3 secondary schools in Ilkeston ? Kirk Hallam Community Academy and St John Houghton Catholic Voluntary Academy. Information for the 2023/24 school year shows St John Houghton has now become oversubscribed by over 13%, (606 capacity ? 685 students) whereas KirkHallam Community Academy has some available spaces. However, it appears both these schools had an increased number of pupils over the previous year. The third Ilkeston Secondary School (not located in Kirk Hallam) ? the Ormiston Ilkeston Enterprise Academy is also oversubscribed. Kirk Hallam secondary schools take children from all Ilkeston from as far away as Cotmanhay in addition to children from Kirk Hallam families who occupy many of the existing around 2,700 homes. Given another 1,250 family houses in Kirk Hallam itself plus 1,000 houses just a short walk away at the New Stanton brownfield site and possibly some from Spondon Wood, how can these schools feasibly cope with additional children from more homes than already exist on the estate (which equates to a population that could possibly increase from around 6,400 to in excess of 16,000) plus other local Erewash locations without significantly increasing the number of classes, class sizes or affecting the quality of education provided?
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	School Capacity	Rachael Winfield	Response-01539	Primary school is needed and great idea to build one, but what about senior school? Kirk Hallam Community academy is already over subscribed, but is under funded, no equipment. Maybe fund the schools already there rather than build brand new one?
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	School Capacity	Rachel Brown	Response-00031	Why is capacity for secondary age kids no longer been included in this plan.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	School Capacity	Russell Bannister	Response-01360	6. Impact on School Capacity The proposed development of 1000 new houses will place significant pressure on school capacity in Kirk Hallam and surrounding areas. Junior School Provision Only: While the developers have stated an intention to build a new junior school, this only addresses part of the problem. There is no confirmed provision for secondary school places, which will be essential given the scale of the development and the number of families expected to move in. Secondary Schools Already Overburdened: Local secondary schools are already operating at or near full capacity. Kirk Hallam and the immediate area host some of the largest and most in-demand schools in the borough, and many students from outside the area already travel here?primarily by car?adding to morning congestion and increasing pressure on school infrastructure and nearby roads. Longer Travel, Greater Congestion: Pupils travelling to out-of-area secondary schools will likely rely on cars or school buses, contributing further to traffic congestion?especially along key routes like Ladywood Road, Quarry Hill, and Sow brook Lane, which are already overstretched. Disruption to Families: A lack of local secondary options could lead to children being separated from their peers or siblings, and parents having to juggle complicated school commutes. This adds stress to daily life and undermines community cohesion. Lack of Forward Planning: Simply providing a junior school does not address the full educational needs of an expanded population. There must be a comprehensive, long-term plan for all age groups, including secondary and sixth form education. In conclusion, while the junior school proposal is noted, the development remains inadequately supported in terms of overall education infrastructure, particularly at secondary level. Kirk Hallam already accommodates a high number of students, including those from outside the area, and cannot absorb additional demand without significant negative impacts on access, traffic, and education quality.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	School Capacity	Simon Reeve	Response-01081	There simply isn't enough resource for the children already attending school in the area. There hasn't been needed investment and it's only getting worse with needs for investment in SEND taking investment from the mainstream; they cannot cope with the demands already. Schools are already struggling and letting children down; we drive 40 minutes each way to a school for our daughter as the local schools are poor due to already being overstretched and under invested in
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	School Capacity	Stephen Palmer	Response-00311	The schools cannot cope now .
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	School Capacity	Stephen Syson	Response-00032	The 3 senior schools we have are already over subscribed , where are those from the new primary school going?
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	School Capacity	Steven Street	Response-01264	Need more schools for huge population explosion
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	School Capacity	Tracy Lee	Response-00988	We have just three secondary schools left in-this area, by building more dwellings in this area it will overburden the capacity that we have.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	School Capacity	William Moore	Response-01259	Over loads schools

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Christopher Chambers	Response-00173	A development of 1000 houses is likely to bring around 1500 vehicles. How is the local authority anticipating the integration into the existing road networks without substantial consequence to road users? Ladywood Road to Spondon is nose-tail at peak times, the village of Ockbrook and the cut-through to A52/M1 is already in a terrible state due to existing traffic flow at one end and Stanton Road/ Hallam Fields is virtually impassable at the other end. This development can only be considered with serious and substantial investment in the surrounding road network. The inclusion of a school, whilst admirable, will need to provide capacity for at least 1000 pupils and is likely to be under-subscribed due to the popularity of other existing schools (which will have negative impacts on traffic flow in the area).
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Cllr Simon Mabbott	Response-01480	1. The Bypass Will Not Reduce Congestion - It Will Shift It Rather than easing congestion, the proposed bypass will simply divert traffic to the already overwhelmed Bulls Head/Quarry Hill roundabout. This key junction is used by vehicles accessing Ilkeston and is already a known congestion point. Adding more traffic will only exacerbate existing delays without providing any meaningful relief for local residents who already face daily gridlock. 2. Kirk Hallam Residents Have Limited and Worsening Access to Ilkeston Kirk Hallam residents primarily rely on Quarry Hill Road to reach Ilkeston a journey of just 1.3 miles that should take about 8 minutes. However, due to heavy congestion and inefficient junctions, this trip now often takes 20?25 minutes or more during peak times. The only alternative is a 4.7-mile detour through West Hallam, increasing time, fuel costs, pollution and inconvenience. As Ilkeston is the nearest hub for shopping, healthcare, public transport, and schools, this restricted access directly affects the daily lives and well-being of the Kirk Hallam community. 3. A6096 Roundabout Will Create New Delays and Hazards Introducing a roundabout on the fast-moving A6096 (Ladywood Road), which carries significant traffic from Derby, will: Force Kirk Hallam drivers to yield to high-speed vehicles, Create longer wait times when exiting the area, Increase the risk of accidents in a location ill-suited for frequent stopping and merging. 4. St Norbert Drive / Godfrey Drive ? A Known Accident Hotspot The junction near the Cat & Fiddle pub is already an accident-prone area. Increased queuing and traffic from the new A6096 roundabout will worsen safety risks and further raise the likelihood of collisions at this location. 5. Bulls Head / Quarry Hill Roundabout ? Already Gridlocked This roundabout currently suffers from regular gridlock due to high volumes of car traffic, school runs, and HGVs. It causes: Significant delays for residents, Disruption to public transport, Dangerous delays for emergency services. Feeding additional traffic from a new bypass and development into this congested hub will only compound the problem. Also planning has recently been granted for 5 residential flats and a shop which is only going to make the situation worse. 6. Sow Brook Lane Roundabout ? Yet Another Obstacle The proposed roundabout at Sow Brook Lane presents another barrier for Kirk Hallam residents. It will require them to yield to faster-moving bypass traffic, with no lights or priority system to ensure fair access. This adds to the difficulty of entering and exiting the area. 7. The Cumulative Impact ? Kirk Hallam Boxed in by Congestion With multiple new roundabouts and bottlenecks planned at every major exit, Kirk Hallam faces the risk of being completely surrounded by traffic congestion. Road access is already strained, and these developments would isolate the community further making even routine journeys increasingly difficult and stressful.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Daniel naylor	Response-01510	A by pass for kirk hallam doesn't go far enough. All this does is divert traffic from upper ladywood road to where 12 houses are. A by pass would need derby road including in it and going much further than 12 houses towards Sandiacre. Sandiacre and stanton by Dale are already busy traffic routes, this development would gridlock those 2 areas at peak times.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Debbie Launders	Response-01293	Traffic is already congested through Kirk Hallam so any additional housing will increase congestion.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Devan Meehan	Response-01406	The a6096 is already full of traffic, adding a junction will make it a lot worse
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Emma	Response-01265	The area is comprised of narrow small lanes that see around 3 overturned vehicles per year. Adding 1000 houses to this area without the correct road infrastructure would be catastrophic and a danger to life. The roads are not gritted in winter and they are not cared for with numerous huge potholes. The lanes are single car and you often need to pull into passing spaces. The pollution from the cars will damage the green belt.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Traffic Congestion	FAY SAXTON	Response-01409	The people of the village of Kirk Hallam and surrounding areas experience severe traffic congestion every day, leading to a great deal of stress, time wasted and real safety issues, underlined by a recent accident on the A6096 towards Bulls Head roundabout. Many of the users are children going to and from school, giving rise to an urgent need for clear measures to protect their safety. There are plans for new homes and a retail outlet at Bulls Head roundabout, both opening onto this totally overwhelmed location. Further, the plans for c 2000 new new homes at Kirk Hallam and Stanton will massively and unreasonably add to an already impossible situation. The worst thing the Council can do is to simply add to the gridlock by allowing these new developments. It is unreasonable for the Council to expect local people to tolerate the situation as it is, let alone knowingly add such an unthinkable number of homes, many with several vehicles, to the problem. The Council consider that creating a Relief Road around Kirk Hallam will solve the problem. Local people know it will not. Joined by an increasing number of HGVs already existing and certain to increase exponentially as the previous Stanton Ironworks develops and with thousands of new occupants/workers from the new housing developments, the congestion problem will not only continue but worsen. Both new vehicles and existing vehicles will vie for places at the new roundabout at Sow Brook in order to access the Relief Road. The Council choose to play down how busy and potentially dangerous that road will be by labelling it a Relief Road, whilst instructed consultants SYSTRA call it for what it will be, a By-Pass, with all the dangers from HGVs, traffic and fumes that entails. The Council refer to multiple exits for new residents along the Relief Road, but getting their cars out to go to work in the morning will involve considerable difficulty, and who would relish squeezing in between HGVs, let alone risking their safety on a bike, or their children's safety? Crossing such a road to the inappropriately located so called "Local Centre" which is neither Local nor a Centre, is in fact only accessible by crossing the dangerous busy Relief Road itself. It can only safely be accessed by motorists, not residents. Then there is the proposed new roundabout junction at Sow Brook which reliably floods every winter, and with all the new developments, the only outcome will be complete standstill. The developers will claim to be able to stop the flooding, but we all remember when even Ilkeston Train Station was under water together with much of the locality resulting in a Climate Emergency being declared on 26.10.23. And when drivers reach the other end of the Relief Road, having met HGVs from other delivery businesses such as the depot at West Hallam coming in the opposite direction, where will those drivers actually go and what impact will they have? Previous MP Maggie Throup called the Relief Road "A road to nowhere." I believe it will be a "a road to chaos". The choices will be return to the A6096/Bulls Head queue, head through Stanley residential village with parked cars causing little road width and having suffered badly with potholes till recently resurfaced, head through Ockbrook, another residential village with parked cars, with an amazing proliferation of potholes, until recently resurfaced also, or through Spondon Village to reach the A52, unsuitable for HGVs with only the smallest of roundabouts.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Traffic Congestion	FAY SAXTON	Response-01409	uts. Please do not forget our rural roads where our farming tradition continues - where people used to get lost until the advent of Google Maps. Dale Abbey residents are rightly worried about the impact of so much residential development giving rise to numerous cut throughs at speed, already a problem but likely to be vastly increased, causing potential real dangers not only to farmers with their machinery but to residents and their children, walkers, horse riders, cyclists and the many visitors who come to enjoy this beautiful area. SYSTRA have looked only at wider road networks, but what impact assessment has the Council requested as to the impact on the people who actually live on these streets and lanes, the people and the farmers who live around the Green Belt? The outlook is bleak for those who live and work in this area and will be until people are listened to and their concerns acted upon. Will people really actually want to come and live in such an area that is quite literally stuck? What happened to growth, prosperity and quality of life?
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Fiona Turner	Response-01362	The congestion of traffic is already under a lot of pressure. Monday- Friday the area is congested beyond belief. I work in the local community and getting from Kirk hallam into Ilkeston mon-fri, takes 25 minutes, weekends takes 8 minutes. This is purely due to the congestion created by work traffic, school traffic. Let alone the disruption the road works would create. The roads are dangerous as they are, they aren't fit for purpose due to all the pot holes and the congestion and road works only will make this worse. Before adding to these pressures, this should be looked at first. Stopping this traffic coming through from sowbrook lane and into Kirk Hallam. Which they do to avoid the congestion up on quarry hill and bulls head. Which has temporary traffic lights all the time which cause even more congestion. Which was created when they stopped access to midland storage (or whatever it's called now) from west hallam.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Traffic Congestion	GARY MARK WOODHOUSE	Response-01451	Traffic volume is increasing weekly if not also at a daily rate in the Kirk Hallam area, gridlock occurs every day as far as The Cat and Fiddle public house to the Little Hallam Hill junction with Quarry Hill Road and Stanton Road numerous times throughout the day causing substantial queuing and holdups, Heavy Goods Vehicles ( HGVs) are now a major part of the problem due to the areas development of New Stanton Park which is just around the corner, this will increase traffic congestion massively over the next 10 years, the proposal to build a new bypass to the south west of Kirk Hallam is just going to send more traffic to this area with the massive housing development of 1000 houses at the side of this road / bypass with 1000s more cars added to this area surely common sense would say no to the South West of Kirk Hallam Development and further gridlock
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Gregory Robin Watts	Response-01297	The proposed housing will put massive strain on the already inadequate road network especially in conjunction with the development of the industrial site at New Stanton. Traffic flows will increase through Stanton by Dale and Dale Abbey as drivers search less congested routes to Jn 25 on the M1. This will lead to increase pollution and noise for residents who live a matter of metres from these routes.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Jo	Response-01257	A6096 already has had RTA including fatal pedestrian and equine. The relief road won't take off this road. The junctions at cat and fiddle lane and into Dale abbey are not suitable now, never mind with increased traffic. They need cameras lower mph,proper boxed areas. Turning right is risky, with large verticals passing both sides. The Nursery exists onto a single lane with no markings so two cars cannot safely pass meaning if you're waiting to turn into the nursery, making a right turn, and someone comes out, your stuck waiting in a 50 mph road! Try it. It's not nice, especially when a bus comes gets on flying. Already traffic will be increased from the houses on the loco Estate. Pedestrians getting to a bus stop have nowhere safe to cross. Who should be crossing a 50mph road? No-one, but what choice do we have? In winter after 4pm, you are doing it in the dark. You may not think many cross this road,but consider all the footpaths, bus stops, horse riders and cyclists, cross at least two points. That's just not going to be possible with more traffic. Pegasus crossings are used in other areas.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Traffic Congestion	John mainstone	Response-00967	Traffic congestion in Kirk Hallam is already a big issue a by pass road would do nothing to alleviate this because of the sheer numbers of houses in the development
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Jon Watkin	Response-00414	There is a problem with traffic congestion and safety at the 12 houses junction . As the Kirk Hallam relief road is built and the 1000 houses built along with the finalisation of the commercial development on the former Stanton site there is no plan in place to build a new junction at Twelve Houses . There is only a possible intention for funding from the development of houses on the Stanton site. These plans are at the moment intentions with no assurance the development can and will take place . If it is eventually realised how long after the completion of the other sites? There is no guarantee that the eventual development of houses at Stanton will be able to fund the required road development. This could mean the need for junction improvement then goes into another queue for funding and that queue is a long queue with waiting times going into years while the has to be lived with , and to authorities hope road users will find their own way to avoid the site! Not a pro-active decision .
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Josh August	Response-00090	Traffic within Kirk Hallam is horrendous already. We do not need more houses especially over 1000 more, that will average 2 cars per household. Kirk Hallam and surrounding areas cannot cope with it
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Traffic Congestion	kimberley grabham	Response-00306	The traffic trying to leave kirk hallam whether trying to get to Nottingham or Derby is already horrendous. I moved 3 miles to live in Kirk Hallam but have added on an extra 35 minutes to the same journey to work! with additional houses and cars I could be up to 1 hour +. As a nurse that works shifts you would add on an extra 2+ hours to my day!
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Lisa Attenborrow	Response-01367	Kirk hallam is already congested at peak times although it seems to happen all the time now.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Margaret Bannister	Response-01190	. Traffic Congestion and Mental Health Impacts Our roads are already experiencing extremely high levels of congestion, particularly at peak times, resulting in long queues of vehicles across, Kirk Hallam, Bull Head Road and Ilkeston Increased vehicle volume and HGV usage will make our local roads more dangerous and less accessible, with greater risks of accidents and fatalities. These conditions directly affect public health. Prolonged exposure to traffic fumes contributes to respiratory issues, especially among children and the elderly. Noise pollution from traffic and HGVs disrupts sleep and contributes to chronic stress and elevated blood pressure. Daily commuting stress and long travel times reduce quality of life and negatively impact mental health increasing anxiety and reducing overall wellbeing. Adding 1000 houses to the area of Kirk Hallam will only lead to further significant increase of vehicles, exacerbating delays and gridlock. The loss of time and accessibility of services, such as health care, employment and education due to traffic delays further worsens quality of life for local residents. All of the above is especially burdensome for working people, carers and those with school runs or medical appointments, including emergency service users trying to negotiate standing traffic when trying to attend an emergency call, which could result in being delayed and possible loss of life. For a community that is already dealing with high volumes of traffic, the addition of hundreds of more vehicles daily due to the proposed developments will only amplify the frustration which we already have to endure.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Michaela Hickinbotham	Response-00229	Having lived in the Village of Kirk Hallam all my life I have witnessed the increased traffic that we get through our one main road (Ladywood Road). From 07.30 until 09.30 traffic is increased due to the 4 schools already in Kirk Hallam and also from 14.00 until 17.30/18.00 (approximately) with queuing traffic as far back as Ladywood School going up Bulls Head. Traffic also queues on Abbot Road and Godfrey Drive and at times as been joined in the middle on Godfrey Drive going either way with traffic trying to get out onto Ladywood Road. Your traffic surveyor years ago when this was being planned choose to walk the length of Ladywood Road with her iPad taking pictures showing hardly any traffic, this is because it was done in the school holidays ( convenient).
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Michelle Colliver	Response-01332	Traffic congestion around the Bulls Head junction and through Kirk Hallam has become increasingly frustrating for local residents and commuters, with long delays especially during peak hours. The bottlenecks near Little Hallam Hill, Quarry Hill Road, and Hallam Fields Road are notorious, with vehicles often queuing for extended periods due to poor road infrastructure and high volumes of traffic. Adding to the problem is the significant number of heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) using these routes daily, largely due to two major local distribution centres operating nearby. These large vehicles contribute to slower traffic flow, increased wear and tear on the roads, and added noise and air pollution. These daily delays aren't just an inconvenience?they're taking a toll on people's mental health. Regular exposure to heavy traffic can lead to increased stress, anxiety, and a sense of helplessness, especially for those trying to get to work, appointments, or pick up children from school. Many locals report a rise in road rage and feelings of burnout simply from navigating their own neighborhood. The proposed development of 1,000 new homes in South Kirk Hallam would only worsen the problem, funneling hundreds of additional vehicles onto already overburdened roads. While a 40mph bypass road has been proposed to ease the pressure, it offers little real relief, as it simply redirects traffic back to the Bulls Head junction from a different direction?failing to resolve the root of the congestion and potentially shifting, rather than reducing, the problem. Without a comprehensive traffic management solution, the area faces worsening gridlock and growing impacts on residents' wellbeing.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Mr J Edwards	Response-01355	The traffic congestion is terrible through Kirk Hallam and quarry hill/bulls head. How this can even be contemplated is beyond me. Ilkeston is gridlocked even without this development - it will be catastrophic!!
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Mrs Beverley Anne Harrison	Response-01118	In recent years Kirk Hallam has become perhaps the most congested area in Erewash on a daily basis with heaving, time consuming, bumper to bumper, traffic queues to/from Ilkeston through and around Kirk Hallam. The bypass can't relieve this as it increases traffic around and within Kirk Hallam, with the 'relief' road becoming what a former MP referred to as a 'road to nowhere?'. Add to the bypass adjoining roads with 'more roundabouts than a funfair' and traffic light control reacting against each section of road, causing longer delays and congestively clogging the area whilst, within the current estate. Thus:- 'those dropping kids off at Kirk Hallam's two of only 3 Ilkeston secondary schools; 'both current and hugely expanded amounts of new residents vehicles; 'traffic gaining access through the area and massively increased HGV and 'New Industry work traffic will all struggle to escape the unhealthy, congestive, pollutive and enraging entrapment. Add too a proposed future Junction 25a to the motorway as well as the 'relief' road and roads to and from Ilkeston all look set to become little more than a perpetual 'rat run' through an area whose already struggling infrastructure simply cannot safely cope. Also, with so many homes remaining to be assigned from updated Erewash allocations, if the 'shelved' former SGA23 is revived down the border of the Godfrey Drive side of the estate, around 850 more houses plus a relief road extension towards Straws Bridge at Derby Road would effectively result in creating an encircling fast track bypass around Kirk Hallam.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Nick Jackson	Response-01260	You are bringing an extra ++ 2,000 cars on to our congestion roads.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Paul Wright	Response-01261	The A6096 through Kirk Hallam is already at capacity. Accessing along the road towards Little Hallam Hill to gain access to Ilkeston is extremely congested with many HGV's that are unsuitable for the roads, creating noise and pollution for residents en route. An additional 1000 houses will add to congestion via the extra vehicles entering and leaving the proposed new site.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Rachael Baines	Response-01403	The roads are at capacity
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Rachael Winfield	Response-01539	Whilst the relief road is needed, this won't help with congestion, already Stanton Road, Quarry Hill are busy especially peak times. With the building on Stanton will make even more traffic, especially larger vehicles.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Rachel Brown	Response-00031	The road from Kirk Hallam to Ilkeston is congested every morning and evening. The island at the old Bulls head is inadequate. These roads are not suitable for the increased traffic that the additional housing will bring.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Renars Letkovskis	Response-00951	We already can't get to Ilkeston, it's too busy everywhere, pollution in Kirk Hallam is awful, and the air is not as fresh as it used to
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Robert Mee	Response-01580	The creation of the new link road will only go to increase traffic congestion at the junction with Ladywood Road and also at Twelve Houses (and also at Spondon and in West Hallam, as it will be used as an alternative route, particularly when there are problems on the trunk roads). The amount of traffic that is likely to use this road will affect air quality in the area.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Robert Mee	Response-01509	The creation of the new link road will only go to increase traffic congestion at the junction with Ladywood Road and also at Twelve Houses (and also at Spondon and in West Hallam, as it will be used as an alternative route, particularly when there are problems on the trunk roads). The amount of traffic that is likely to use this road will affect air quality in the area.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Roger Tranter	Response-01323	There will be a huge increase in traffic movement in an already overcongested area.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Russell Bannister	Response-01360	1.CONGESTION 1. Bypass Will Not Alleviate Congestion ? Only Displace It Contrary to what may be intended, the new bypass will not reduce congestion. It will simply reroute traffic to an already heavily congested junction?the Bulls Head / Quarry Hill roundabout?for vehicles trying to access Ilkeston. Rather than improving flow, this risks intensifying pressure on a known bottleneck, without offering any practical relief for the daily gridlock experienced by local residents. 2. Kirk Hallam Residents Have Limited Access to Ilkeston Kirk Hallam residents rely almost exclusively on one main route into Ilkeston? Little Hallam Hill or Quarry Hill Road, which already struggles with volume and delays and both takes residents to the Bulls Head junction/ roundabout. The direct route to Ilkeston is just 1.3 miles, and should take around 8 minutes. In reality, due to traffic congestion and poorly managed junctions, this journey now takes 20 to 25 minutes or more during peak hours. The only alternative route is via West Hallam, which is approximately 4.7 miles, adding significant time and fuel costs to every trip. Ilkeston is our nearest town for shopping, healthcare, public transport connections, and schools. Making this access more difficult undermines the well-being of the entire Kirk Hallam community. 3. Increased Congestion from A6096 Roundabout The A6096 (Ladywood Road) is a fast-moving, 50mph route with significant traffic coming from Derby. Placing a roundabout here will force Kirk Hallam drivers to give way to high-speed traffic. Cause long delays exiting the area. Increase the risk of collisions at a location not suited for increased stopping and merging. 4. St Norbert Drive / Godfrey Drive ? Accident Black Spot The junction of St Norbert Drive and Godfrey Drive, near the Cat & Fiddle pub, is already an accident black spot. Increased congestion and queuing from the proposed A6096 island will worsen safety at this location and increase the likelihood of accidents. 5. Existing Gridlock at Bulls Head / Quarry Hill Roundabout This roundabout already experiences regular gridlock due to a high volume of cars, school traffic, and HGVs. It causes: Severe delays for residents. Disruption to public transport. Risky delays for emergency vehicles. Adding even more vehicles from a new development and bypass into this system will only make the situation worse. 6. Sow brook Lane Roundabout ? Another Bottleneck The second roundabout, planned for Sow brook Lane, will further restrict residents trying to leave Kirk Hallam. Again, we would be forced to give way to faster traffic using the bypass, with no traffic-light control or priority system. 7. Cumulative Effect ? Kirk Hallam Trapped in Congestion With multiple roundabouts and bottlenecks forming at every exit point, Kirk Hallam is effectively being encircled by congestion. The community is already stretched to its limit in terms of road access and traffic volume. These developments would result in Kirk Hallam residents being boxed in, with even basic daily travel becoming increasingly frustrating and time-consuming.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Simon Frost	Response-00684	This end of Ilkeston and Kirk Hallam already contains many roads and junctions which are running at capacity and the influx of more housing would further exacerbate this problem. The Bulls head roundabout is a prime example as well as the junction at twelve houses. The new developments at the former stanton iron works is further adding traffic and congestion to the area. Between Merlin way and Twelve houses the road is not adequate in scale or construction to handle the current levels of traffic. The new relief road proposed will do little to reduce the traffic in the area as it would only be used by residents of the proposed new area or as a cut through which would then mean the twelve houses junction becomes even more congested at peak times. This proposal does very little to solve the capacity problems in the area or add sufficient infrastructure.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Simon Reeve	Response-01081	The roads simply aren't built for the traffic we already have without adding more homes with more cars; I grew up in West Hallam (High Lane East) in the 80s, spending time in West Hallam Village, Kirk Hallam all around Ilkeston. There were approximately 1 car for every 2 homes thinking back to friends and neighbours in the areas, now theres 2 or more per house and many more houses. The present roads infrastructure is woefully inadequate with too much traffic on Ladywood Road and frequent accidents at the junctions for top and bottom of the estates in Kirk Hallam. The traffic getting in to and out of Ilkeston up to the Bulls Head island is horrific backing up to the lower estate junction multiple periods each day; also backing up to White Lion Square coming back to Kirk Hallam. The road past Quarry Hill is good but again at the Bulls Head end and also at 12 Houses the roads are unsafe and smashed kerbs evidence of too much heavy traffic for the road. The Kirk Hallam estate creates a lot of cut through traffic to 12 Houses already trying to avoid the jams yet causes more dangers on an unsafe corner junction. The recent over development of the old Stanton site has chaos and danger both towards Ilkeston and Sandiacre as the roads were simply not built for this level of traffic. Whilst I don't agree withthuch of Maggie Throup's ideas the J25a at Stanton was a needed investment to take traffic away from Sandiacre, Kirk Hallam and Ilkeston. Adding more homes and potentially another 400 cars is sheer lunacy.
	South West of Kirk Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Stephen Palmer	Response-00311	Why are you proposing a 40 mph road when Ladywood Road is only 30 mph. How would animals cross the road safely.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Stephen Syson	Response-00032	More congestion due to school run etc, travelling from Derby to Ilkeston at rush hour can take up to 1 hour from Kirk Hallam to Ilkeston town centre, more pollution from the extra traffic, relief road may be used by boy racers like Chalins way is.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Steven Street	Response-01264	The relief road is pointless as it will massively increase traffic through Ockbrook and Spondon no one will use it for Ilkeston as that's gridlocked Most days Lorrie?s will still go to sandiacre as best route to A52 and M1
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Sue Knott	Response-01268	Roads are busy enough without extra traffic in a built up area
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Sue Shaw	Response-00304	The congestion on Ladywood road is, at times, ridiculous, in particular when there are road works, so a proposed ongoing development will create havoc. Ah, a relief road...how long would that take to be built? Will we still be allowed cars by then?
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Tracy Lee	Response-00988	Congestion is already a major issue in the area of Derbyshire with the raids backing up daily and making it difficult to get anywhere on time thus increasing pollution and poor air quality. With this comes the potential for accidents, and the ability for those with mobility issues. To add traffic from the proposed development and the existing developments nearing completion is madness and counter productive and costly to the council.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Traffic Congestion	William Moore	Response-01259	Encourages more traffic
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Type of Housing	Aubrey Bacon	Response-01181	The 10% affordable housing, 'if viable', needs to be explained. It is seen by the general public as a 'get-out-of-jail free card' to be played when no actual affordable housing is included once the build is completed. The criteria should be clearly explained up front not hidden away in legal jargon elsewhere. A council member should champion this and hold the developer's feet to the fire to ensure that it happens and the get-out-of-jail card is not played.. Developers who default should be debarred from tendering for future business.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Type of Housing	Cllr Simon Mabbott	Response-01480	1/. Failing to Meet Local Housing Needs The proposed development of 1,000 homes does not align with the genuine housing requirements of the Kirk Hallam community?falling short in affordability, accessibility, and demographic relevance. 2/. No Provision for Accessible or Senior Friendly Homes The plan fails to include bungalows or single-storey homes, which are vital for older residents and those with mobility challenges. Kirk Hallam has a growing elderly population in need of safe, accessible housing within their existing community. Instead of offering suitable downsizing options, the proposal prioritises larger, less accessible family homes that are often unaffordable or impractical for those most in need. 3/. Inadequate Commitment to Affordable Housing The suggested provision of just 10% affordable housing, contingent on financial viability which offers no real guarantees. This minimal and uncertain commitment does little to support young people, key workers, and lower income families who are already struggling to find secure, affordable accommodation in the area. 4/. Focused on Developer Profit, Not Community Need The emphasis on high cost, market rate housing serves developers far more than the local population. Rather than addressing the regional housing crisis, this approach risks pricing out existing residents and undermines efforts to build a diverse, inclusive community. 5/. Missed Opportunity for a Balanced Housing Mix A development of this scale should include a broad range of housing types and tenures?such as affordable family homes, social rent properties, accessible units, and shared ownership options. This is a chance to create a community that supports people at all stages of life. Failing to plan for a varied housing mix raises serious concerns about social exclusivity and long-term sustainability. Conclusion: A Community Left Behind The current proposal overlooks the real housing priorities of Kirk Hallam. Without a clear, inclusive strategy to deliver genuinely affordable and accessible homes, the development risks serving investors, not residents. To meet the true needs of the community, a more thoughtful and balanced approach is essential.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Type of Housing	Devan Meehan	Response-01406	New builds nowadays are too small with tiny gardens, not good enough housing attracting undesirable people

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Type of Housing	FAY SAXTON	Response-01409	The majority of houses proposed are closely constructed with small gardens. There will be little scope to create biodiversity from destruction of Green Belt unless green areas with plants, trees and hedges are plentiful, and even then any biodiversity would be minimal in comparison with the natural Green Belt they would replace. There would need to be plenty of provision of green areas for children to play locally and safely. Careful regard needs to be paid to the houses being of sufficient quality to provide resilience to increasing climate change. Only 10% of the houses are proposed to be affordable housing and only if viable. If indeed there is a local housing need as the current administration claim as opposed to Angela Rayner's broadcast statement that Britain has "plenty of houses" and despite local estate agents having a variety of homes for sale, then it would be important for a 10% commitment to be upheld. There are concerns that any new houses would in reality be let out for landlord profit both in the UK and abroad which would lead to an unsettled and ever changing community and would inevitably be disruptive and unsettling for the residents of the current village of Kirk Hallam and for those occupying the new houses. In addition, such occupation would lead to a greater likelihood of crime, inherent with large settlements anyway, to be vastly increased. The lack of a settled community would also have health implications for residents stressed about their personal safety and security and that of their children.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Type of Housing	GARY MARK WOODHOUSE	Response-01451	No Bungalows for the elderly no nursing homes or social centres not enough affordable housing for the local community all big 3, 4, and 5 bed houses out of the reach of locals bringing in outsiders and creating a new social divide with existing locals
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Type of Housing	James William Allen	Response-01281	Only making 10% of this development affordable seems a ridiculously low target, and smacks of pandering to developers wishes. Given that Kirk Hallam is characterised by relatively affordable housing already - in contrast to West Hallam and Dale Abbey - this percentage should be increased to a minimum of 40%.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Type of Housing	Margaret Bannister	Response-01190	There is no mention of Bungalows on the proposed development ...with an aging apopulation I think they should be part of any proposed developments.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Type of Housing	Michelle Colliver	Response-01332	The proposed development in Kirk Hallam, as outlined in the csr, fails to adequately address the housing needs of the area?s aging population. Despite a clear demographic trend toward an older population, the development does not include specific provisions for accessible, adaptable, or supported living accommodations tailored to older residents. In addition, the plan only includes a 10% allocation for affordable housing?and even this is qualified as ?where viable.? This limited provision of affordable homes, combined with the predominance of high-cost new housing, is likely to contribute to increased inequality in the community. It risks creating a social divide between long-standing residents, many of whom may be priced out of the new development, and more affluent newcomers. Without a balanced and inclusive housing strategy, the development could deepen existing disparities and fail to meet the full range of local housing needs.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Type of Housing	Mrs Beverley Anne Harrison	Response-01118	There are several house sizes (with between 2 to 5 bedrooms) proposed, which are mainly limited to more affluent, higher priced family houses. However, it?s shameful that not as much as one single storey disabled or elderly residence is proposed. Considering the UK is a country with an increased ageing population which, where possible, also actively promotes independent living for persons with manageable or limited disabilities, this is a disgrace. Though there are some older ? already occupied - single storey elderly or disabled dwellings within the existing estate, given the expected overintensifying huge population increase as a direct result of Core Strategy, it is unfair and biased against certain groups in Kirk Hallam to evade additional suitable homes for vulnerable demographics of the community ? especially considering losses over the last few years of such local specialist accommodation as the former Hillcrest Care home which was closed and refurbished into 44 flats. It?s also recently been revealed Ladywood Nursing Home may close.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Type of Housing	Rachel Brown	Response-00031	A higher percentage of housing should be affordable not executive homes we don?t need.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Type of Housing	Robert Mee	Response-01580	If this site were to be developed, I believe that a 10% allocation to affordable housing is woefully inadequate.
	South West of Kirk Hallam	Type of Housing		Response-01509	If this site were to be developed, I believe that a 10% allocation to affordable housing is woefully inadequate.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Type of Housing	Russell Bannister	Response-01360	8. Type of Housing The proposed development of 1000 homes fails to address the real housing needs of the local community, particularly in terms of affordability, accessibility, and demographic suitability. Lack of Bungalows and Accessible Housing: There is no mention of bungalows or single-storey homes, which are essential for elderly residents and people with mobility issues. Kirk Hallam has a growing ageing population who need accessible, downsized housing within their community?not more large family homes that are out of reach or unsuitable. Minimal Affordable Housing Commitment: The proposal includes a provisional target of just 10% affordable housing, and even this is subject to viability. This weak commitment means there is no guarantee that affordable homes will actually be delivered, and it risks pricing out young people, key workers, and lower-income families. Focus on High-Profit Housing Stock: The emphasis appears to be on delivering higher-cost, market-rate housing which serves the interests of developers more than the needs of the local population. This approach does little to solve the regional housing crisis or promote a socially balanced community. Missed Opportunity for Mixed Tenure: A development of this size should include a diverse mix of housing types and tenures, including rental homes, shared ownership options, accessible units, and genuinely affordable family housing. The lack of such planning raises concerns about exclusivity, isolation, and a failure to meet the needs of current and future residents. In conclusion, the proposal does not reflect the real housing priorities of Kirk Hallam and surrounding areas. Without a more inclusive and needs-based approach to housing provision, the development will fall short of serving the community it?s intended for.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Type of Housing	Simon Reeve	Response-01081	The types of housing isn't too much of a concern, that said all housing developed anywhere in the UK should be legislated to have solar, heat pump etc to ensure self sufficiency as the grid is at breaking point. As are the sewers and refuse collection services that often aren't considered. There needs to be more affordable housing £120k - £280k but not more social housing; more needs to be done for working people on lower wages as they are the group missed out when housing strategy is planned and yet they're working hard and paying taxes



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Type of Housing	Stephen Palmer	Response-00311	We don't want these house . They are only being built to make big profits for the rich . All new houses should be built to accommodate two parked motor cars.
			Steven Street	Response-01264	Need more first time buyer houses Not social housing
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Type of Housing	Tracy Lee	Response-00988	The amount of house that could be brought back into use would negate the need to build more houses and destroy the green belt. Social housing would be priority and with it bring its own problems.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Andrew Corban	Response-01496	Would destroy lots of wonderful wildlife in the area
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Cllr Simon Mabbott	Response-01480	1/. Irreversible Harm to Local Biodiversity and Natural Ecosystems The land to the south-west of Kirk Hallam is a vital part of the local ecosystem, providing essential habitat and green space that supports a wide range of wildlife. The proposed development poses a significant threat to biodiversity, disrupting the delicate ecological balance and permanently fragmenting the natural landscape. 2/. Habitat Destruction on a Large Scale The fields, hedgerows, mature trees, and open green spaces targeted for development are home to a variety of species including birds, bats, small mammals, and pollinators. These habitats would be destroyed or severely disturbed during construction, with no meaningful replacement. Once lost, these ecosystems cannot simply be re-established elsewhere. 3/. Loss of Critical Wildlife Corridors This area currently functions as a wildlife corridor, enabling animals to move safely between woodlands, fields, and hedgerows. The introduction of a housing estate and bypass would sever this natural link, creating a hard barrier that isolates animal populations and disrupts their ability to travel, feed, and breed effectively. 4/. Threat to Legally Protected Species Although a full ecological assessment has yet to be disclosed, it is highly likely that protected species?including bats, hedgehogs, badgers, and nesting birds?are present in the area. Disturbing or displacing these animals without appropriate mitigation would risk violating legal protections and could lead to long-term ecological harm. 5/. Loss of Essential Pollinator Habitats Bees, butterflies, and other pollinators rely on the wildflowers and hedgerows found throughout this green space. Their decline would not only impact local biodiversity but also disrupt the plant life and food chains they support. The wider health of the ecosystem depends on the survival of these species. 6/. Compounding Pressure on an Already Stressed Environment The surrounding area is already under strain from existing development, traffic, and recreational use. Removing even more green space and introducing additional air, noise, and light pollution will only increase the stress on remaining wildlife populations and diminish the area's natural resilience. 7/. Greenbelt Land ? More Than Just Open Space This land is designated Greenbelt for a reason. It serves not only to preserve open countryside but to support environmental health and biodiversity. Once built over, these habitats and ecological functions are gone for good?they cannot be replicated in landscaped gardens or managed green strips. 8/. A Long-Term Environmental Cost If allowed to proceed, this development would inflict lasting damage on the natural environment, reduce local biodiversity, and sever Kirk Hallam?s ecological link to the surrounding countryside. These impacts must be recognised as fundamental reasons to reject, at the very least, drastically reconsider this proposal.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Debbie Launders	Response-01293	The development is in an area of natural beauty and conservation which is under threat from many areas. We need to keep the boundaries between urban areas to allow wildlife and biodiversity to stand a chance of surviving.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Devan Meehan	Response-01406	Losing a lot green space
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Emma	Response-01265	

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	FAY SAXTON	Response-01409	With the current area of Green Belt set to be destroyed at Kirk Hallam now standing at c 50 hectares, its biodiversity will be lost. The development that replaces it appears to be mainly closely aligned homes with small gardens with little or no ability to re-establish diversity. Local people remain deeply upset at this predicted loss and share poignant video footage of it whilst it still remains Green Belt, their over 3000 objections to the development having not been listened to. I am particularly concerned about the future of Pioneer Meadows. I appreciate the Council's recognition of its Green Flag multiple prize winning LNR importance but is this purely lip service? Many developments would not even be considered for fear of disturbing such a biodiverse local asset, especially in a Green Belt setting, strikingly at its beautiful best with its 111 plant Derbyshire County Biological Register record, at this time of year. At the last Inspector's hearing, which I attended, reference to an approach to Derbyshire Wildlife Trust was made to consider sufficiency of measures to protect wildlife and biodiversity. No letter of instruction or actual report formed part of the evidence. Now, the situation has deteriorated for the worse for wildlife/biodiversity as shown in the CORE STRATEGY REVIEW AMENDMENT MAP BOOK on FIGURE 2 SOUTH WEST OF KIRK HALLAM HOUSING ALLOCATION. At present of course, the animals have the benefit of the whole of the Green Belt in which to come and go, so a proposed extension of Pioneer Meadows does not form a benefit for them in itself. To their detriment, that extension continues to lead them to a high chance of death on the Relief Road, especially with no provision stated to help them cross safely into the wider Green Belt beyond. The position now with this latest map is that Pioneer Meadows is virtually enclosed. There is nothing in the Key to the map to indicate what hatching (Strategic Green Infrastructure Corridor) infilled with Orange (Housing Allocation) actually means - does it refer, for instance, to an area where there may or may not be housing so the animals may or may not have sole access, or an area where housing has priority over the animals? Much of the unclarified hatched orange area continues to the south-east as a narrow section, which does not appear wide enough to allow often shy animals to feel safe to use it, given the Orange (Housing Allocation) is so near with its human family noise to deter them. The newly added so called "Safeguarded Land" will ultimately mean more development and yet another route out of Pioneer Meadows will be blocked to wildlife, including deer, badgers, foxes, stoats, hares, rabbits, rodents and hedgehogs etc. The position with birds, including birds of prey, owls, bats, invertebrates and insects including moths needs to be considered, including the need for special low lighting and crossings. Likewise the restriction on biodiversity via plants and fungi needs consideration. I would request the Inspector to ask for a Report/Updated Report to be obtained from the Derbyshire Wildlife Trust on the impact on wildlife/diversity of the whole of the revised proposal shown on this map, plus clarification by the Council/Developers as to what the hatching infilled with orange actually means. These steps are important because Pioneer Meadows is a valuable wildlife/biodiversity asset to both Kirk Hallam and also Derbyshire with its listing on the Derbyshire County Biological Register.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	FAY SAXTON	Response-01409	The Report may lead to important amendments to the extent of land available to animals to move safely and further provisions for their safety, and the chance of the proliferation of plant seeds within and beyond the reserve to increase biodiversity.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Fiona Turner	Response-01362	A new housing development on the edge of a nature reserve can have significant and often detrimental impacts on the reserve and its wildlife. These impacts can be both direct and indirect, short-term (during construction) and long-term (after occupation). Here's a breakdown: ? Construction Phase Impacts 1. Noise Pollution: ? Heavy machinery and construction activity generate sustained noise, which can disturb sensitive wildlife, particularly breeding birds, mammals, and amphibians. ? Some species may abandon nesting sites or relocate permanently. 2. Light Pollution: ? Bright artificial lighting at night can disrupt nocturnal species, alter insect behavior, and interfere with bird migration and bat foraging. 3. Dust and Air Pollution: ? Dust from construction can settle on vegetation, affecting plant health. ? Emissions from machinery may degrade air quality for both flora and fauna. 4. Vibration and Ground Disturbance: ? Ground vibrations from heavy equipment can impact burrowing animals and disturb the soil ecology near the boundary. ? Post-Construction/Long-Term Impacts 1. Habitat Fragmentation and Edge Effects: ? Proximity to a development changes the microclimate and ecology at the boundary, increasing exposure to wind, light, and invasive species. ? Wildlife that depends on undisturbed habitat may be forced deeper into the reserve or may not survive at all. 2. Increased Human Activity: ? Recreational pressure from new residents?dog walking, biking, off-trail hiking?can lead to soil compaction, disturbance to nesting sites, and littering. ? Unleashed pets, especially cats and dogs, can prey on birds, small mammals, and reptiles. 3. Pollution and Runoff: ? Stormwater runoff from new roads, driveways, and lawns can carry pesticides, fertilizers, and oil residues into the nature reserve, degrading water quality in streams and wetlands. ? Potential for nutrient enrichment (eutrophication), leading to algal blooms and decline of sensitive aquatic species. 4. Invasive Species Introduction: ? Landscaping with non-native plants or accidental introductions (e.g., via soil, garden waste) can lead to invasive species colonizing the reserve. ? These often outcompete native plants, altering food webs and reducing biodiversity. 5. Disturbance to Wildlife Movement and Breeding: ? Artificial barriers like roads, fences, or high-traffic paths can impede wildlife movement, affecting access to foraging or breeding sites. ? Some species may experience population decline or local extinction due to isolation. ? Cumulative and Long-Term Ecological Risks ? Loss of ecological integrity: Even if the physical footprint is outside the reserve, the ecological impacts can degrade the value of the habitat over time. ? Biodiversity loss: Especially significant in reserves set up to protect rare, threatened, or sensitive species. ? Reduced ecosystem services: E.g., pollination, water filtration, carbon sequestration?all could be compromised.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	GARY MARK WOODHOUSE	Response-01451	well what can we say apart from destroying a local nature reserve by building around it like a brick wall but even worst a housing development with a thousand houses entrapping the wildlife and oh one more thing a 24/7 40mph bypass that no amphibian or mammal can cross safely this development is a catastrophe for the local wildlife, a small wildlife corridor just aims the wildlife to the bypass to its death, roads kill lots of wildlife its a reported fact this development will not help wildlife at all it will kill more than it will ever save, disturbance from construction, dirty water run off into the local brookes streams will reduce amphibians and cut off from surrounding mates for breeding purposes wildlife will be reduced to a minimum, footfall from the new development with dogs, cycles, childrens noise and mechanical noises ie cars lorries and garden implements will drive nature away not increase its numbers a great example of amphibian destruction is the famous under road pipes for toads at Awsworth bypass, now a housing development has now wiped out the toads in that area not one survives
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Gregory Robin Watts	Response-01297	Wild life and diversity will be affected as fields are covered over with housing and roads
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	John mainstone	Response-00967	Foxes badgers hares and many species of birds all around the area near ladywood farm and the rear of wirksworth road play park and all the way to Dale Abbey. These would all be displaced if this project went ahead
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Josh August	Response-00090	Eradicating over 50 hectares of current farmland/countryside will have a huge impact on the wildlife in those areas. Building 1000 houses, all that will no doubt be fenced off - will affect 1000's of different animals. Along with that relief road, that will be the cause of a lot of animals dying. We need to look after our countryside and keep it green for the sake of the wildlife and for us as humans to enjoy.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	kimberley grabham	Response-00306	I moved to the area to be closer to green space, birds and wildlife. I have put up bird boxes, feeders and hedgehog feeding station in my garden. Building houses will upset the biodiversity of the area and restrict the habitats for so much wildlife which I love and nurture.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Lisa Attenborrow	Response-01367	We have such a broad range of wildlife in and around pioneer meadows. We have deer, fox, swans, fish, buzzards, kestrels, both types of woodpeckers, squirrels and hedgehogs which are a dying breed to name but a few and I feel their natural habitat will disappear and so too will the wildlife.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Margaret Bannister	Response-01190	4. Impact on Wildlife and Biodiversity The greenbelt area proposed for development is home to a rich variety of wildlife species, many of which rely on the area's hedgerows, meadows, and woodland edges for survival. Foxes, badgers, hedgehogs, bats, and a range of bird species are frequently observed by residents. Amphibians and invertebrates such as frogs, newts, butterflies, and dragonflies depend on the nearby watercourses and wetlands. Destroying this habitat will fragment ecosystems, reduce foraging areas, and threaten the long-term viability of local species. The loss of native flora and fauna represents not just an ecological tragedy but a disconnection from our natural heritage. This loss is contrary to local biodiversity action plans and national commitments to halt biodiversity loss. Many of the water course around the Kirk Hallam area are recognised for their ecological significance. They encompass various habitats, including standing water, lowland etc which are crucial for biodiversity ? but these ecosystems are vulnerable to pollution and habitat disruption.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Michaela Hickinbotham	Response-00229	We have up the top road natures best area for wildlife already matured already thriving yet you want to rip it out and make it a brick jungle yet are preparing to spent a lot of money converting the old golf course which if left to itself with take over and do the job for you. As children we walked over those fields n wood into Dale Abbey, we stood at the top of the hill and looked towards Ilkeston to see St Mary's church our church in Kirk Hallam and Dale Abbeys Abbey, we have done this with our children and hoped to do this with our grandchildren but that sadly we won't be able to.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Michelle Colliver	Response-01332	The proposed 1,000-house development and accompanying 40mph road in South Kirk Hallam raise serious concerns about the potential impact on local wildlife, biodiversity, and nearby protected spaces such as Pioneer Meadows Nature Reserve. This area is home to a rich mix of habitats?including grasslands, hedgerows, and wetland areas?that support a diverse range of species, including birds, bats, pollinators, and small mammals. Development on this scale would likely lead to habitat fragmentation, loss of green corridors, and increased human disturbance, all of which can significantly disrupt local ecosystems. Construction activity, increased traffic, noise pollution, and artificial lighting from new housing and the bypass road could negatively affect sensitive wildlife, particularly nocturnal species like bats and owls that rely on dark, quiet environments. Runoff from roads and housing could also impact water quality in nearby streams and wetland areas, further threatening plant and aquatic life. The presence of Pioneer Meadows, managed for conservation and biodiversity, makes this area ecologically valuable and particularly vulnerable to change.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mr J Edwards	Response-01355	I object to the loss and destruction of the wildlife habitat. These areas are precious to the community and we should do every we can to preserve these areas. Absolutely disgusting this monstrosity of a development is even being considered!
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Paul Wright	Response-01261	Further encroachment into the Green belt will have a detrimental affect on wildlife and birdlife with the destruction of habitats and the construction of roads, paving Driveways and patios. Excess water from such new surfaces will create a greater risk of pollution for the area.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Rachael Winfield	Response-01539	There's no mention of what is going to be done to counter act the effects on wildlife. This area is huge and full of animals and plants.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Robert Mee	Response-01509	See my comments on Landscape
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Roger Tranter	Response-01323	The area of the site is adjacent to a conservation area. The impact of new roads and housing will be disastrous on the wildlife - wildlife is noticeably diminishing in this area already.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Russell Bannister	Response-01360	4. Wildlife and Biodiversity The land south-west of Kirk Hallam forms part of a vital local ecosystem, supporting a range of wildlife and natural habitats. The proposed development would pose a major threat to local biodiversity, removing green space and fragmenting the ecological network that currently exists in and around the area. Destruction of Habitats: The fields, hedgerows, mature trees, and natural green spaces earmarked for development are home to a variety of species, including birds, bats, small mammals, and pollinators. These habitats would be cleared or severely disrupted during construction, with no adequate replacement. Loss of Wildlife Corridors: The area currently acts as a wildlife corridor, allowing animals to safely move between woodland, fields, and hedgerows. The bypass and housing estate would create a physical barrier across this corridor, isolating populations and making it harder for wildlife to move, feed, and breed. Impact on Protected Species: While no full ecological survey has been referenced, it is highly likely that protected species such as bats, hedgehogs, badgers, and nesting birds inhabit the area. Development could violate legal protections if these species are disturbed or displaced without mitigation. Loss of Pollinator Habitats: Bees, butterflies, and other pollinators depend on the wildflowers and hedgerows currently found in the area. Their decline has direct consequences for local plant life, food chains, and wider ecosystem health. Cumulative Effect with Existing Pressures: The surrounding landscape is already under pressure from traffic, housing, and recreational use. Removing more green space and increasing pollution (air, noise, and light) will compound stress on local wildlife. Greenbelt and Biodiversity Connection: This land is part of the Greenbelt for a reason?it not only provides space but supports environmental health. Once developed, these ecosystems cannot simply be recreated elsewhere. In summary, this development would result in long-term damage to the natural environment, reduce local biodiversity, and break the ecological link between Kirk Hallam and its countryside. It is essential that this impact be recognised as a key reason for rejecting or significantly rethinking the proposal.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Ruth Allen	Response-01258	The fields between Kirk Hallam and Dale Abbey support a large range of species, particularly plovers, hares and deer both red and fallow. The UK has an appalling record of loss of biodiversity: please don't contribute to the destruction.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Simon Frost	Response-00684	The areas earmarked for development are a strategic green area which provides numerous environments for wildlife and public amenity. The continued sprall of Ilkeston and Kirk Hallam in the area will have a negative effect on diversity and access to green space/pathways of local residents.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Simon Reeve	Response-01081	The fields between High Lane, West Hallam and Shipley/Hearon Road, Ilkeston support a diverse population of wildlife with open fields, woodlands, marsh land, lakes and streams/rivers. Removing any part of this environment for housing should be banned on this basis alone, there be no home for nature and "not cutting the grass verges" (to save money) won't make a difference.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Stephen Palmer	Response-00311	Why would a nature reserve be created for animals that have no means of roaming to open fields. This 40mph road would just be a kill zone. Disturbing the toxic soil from areas that are polluted would decimate wildlife.
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Stephen Syson	Response-00032	We already have a fragile ecosystem, that is slowly dying out because of our infringement of their homes. We need our trees, our hedgerows, our fields to keep and sustain the animals and insects who without We would not have crops
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Steven Street	Response-01264	Wild life loss of habitat for owls foxes deer newts bird population butterflies hares rabbits Taking our green belt is pure robbery and theft from the people of Kirk Hallam
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Sue Knott	Response-01268	The area around Dale Abbey is historic land. Developments and roads should not affect any green belt land. We have to protect our wildlife and biodiversity rather than systematically destroy our planet
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Sue Shaw	Response-00304	Concreting over the greenbelt will have adverse effects on wild life and nature, by the very fact of it!
1.5	South West of Kirk Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Tracy Lee	Response-00988	Wildlife would suffer with urban sprawl pushing species out of their environments and upsetting the ecological bio diversity in this area. Some species are already struggling to survive and with the addition of more street lights and traffic at night this would affect the nocturnal animals as we already suffer massive light pollution.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	William Moore	Response-01259	Detrimental to wildlife
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Aaron Locksley	Response-00711	With the proximity to the motorway, what analysis of the air quality has been done? I worry residents of the new houses could be moving into ill health. What measures will be put in place to mediate this? Could the planning permission require the houses to be fitted with a mechanical ventilation system that contains air filtration?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Adam Shooter	Response-01925	We already have the M1 and A52 on our doorstep and due to the green belt we have acceptable air quality. Removal of this and construction processes will disrupt this.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	A Harby	Response-01684	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Alex Corns	Response-01151	The harmful impact of air pollution caused by diesel exhaust fumes on our health is well known. It's responsible for causing everything from respiratory problems to dementia and even certain types of cancers. Up to 55% of roadside traffic pollution is made of non-exhaust particles, with around 20% of that pollution coming from brake dust, these particles may be just as damaging to our lungs as exhaust fumes. Composed of iron particles, brake dust is caused by friction between the iron brake rotor grinding on the brake pads when a vehicle slows down. This brake dust is then worn away and becomes airborne. And as recent research shows, brake dust triggers inflammation in the lung cells with the same severity as diesel particles. By adding brake dust particles to macrophages ? the cells responsible for clearing the lungs of invading germs, waste and debris, nearly 185% increase in the cell's inflammatory activity. Brake dust prevents the immune cells from destroying Staphylococcus aureus ? a species of bacteria responsible for pneumonia. With 180 houses being built, lets say 1.5 per house. so at least over 300 cars and all the additional deliveries, construction traffic the air quality is of course going to suffer terribly and therefore peoples health.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Alice Cooper	Response-01721	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Alice Ilett	Response-00571	The greenbelt is a well loved and respected area of Sandiacre we feel very lucky to have. Living close to the M1 this area acts as a green space and filter for the air quality and noise.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	A Malinski	Response-00620	Placing home so close to the motorway cannot be healthy! Also this band of land provides some buffer space for the existing home close by.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Amanda Leech	Response-01625	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Amy Cray	Response-01223	More cars equals yet more pollution
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Amy Skinner	Response-01447	Due to the proximity to the M1 many of the roads/streets around the green belt land already suffer with poor air quality due to the traffic pollution. The green belt and Stoney Clouds at least act as a buffer against this but by destroying the green belt, turning it into grey and building many houses there would only add to the poor air quality. The dust and dirt that would result from the works in addition to the massively increased flow of traffic would be highly detrimental to residents and visitors. Even more so for those with existing respiratory conditions. During the Covid pandemic we were encouraged to make the most of green belt areas, to improve our mental and physical health and to get fresh air, being close to nature. This land needs to be preserved for the sake of the people here now and the generations to come.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Anastasia Anthony	Response-01865	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour. More traffic = more NO2 = poor air quality, especially if we no longer have a greenbelt to mitigate this. Poor air quality contradicts Environment Act (2021) + NPPF para. 186
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Andrew Bishop	Response-01186	Any increase in traffic will affect suit quality due to HGV and car emissions in a residential area
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Andrew Davies	Response-01295	Increased traffic will affect air quality as those in employment will be travelling either towards Derby, Ilkeston, Long Eaton or Nottingham. Those going towards the latter three could well be putting more traffic & pollution as they pass Cloudside school
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Andrew Marvin	Response-00255	All the additional cars with the motorway already so close will have an impact on air quality and noise Outrageous
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Andrew Meadwell	Response-01654	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Andria Nyilasi	Response-00672	As previously stated, the sheer volume of extra vehicles would increase the air pollution tremendously and affect all local residents.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Andy Martin	Response-01761	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Angela Roberts	Response-00681	More houses means more pollution . The greenbelt area must be maintained to protect air quality in the area which already has more than its fair share of Lorries/ cars/ industry.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Annabel Marriott	Response-00760	Is this housing development practical being so close to the M1? Surely the air quality is going to be poor without these new houses/occupants adding to it?

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Anne Butler	Response-00385	The site is next to the motorway where lorries are doing the uphill run, churing out diesel fumes. Not healthy for anyone living next to it.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Anne Castledine	Response-00499	Without the green belt between Linden and the motorway, the air pollution would be much greater.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Anne Jenkins	Response-00350	Air quality will suffer due to the amount of dust and mud that will be created
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Annette Jones	Response-00961	The air quality is already getting worse in this area and the extra traffic on the motorway is only adding to the problem. We are aware that the widening of the motorway took us close to the threshold of high pollution and the addition of electric cars is not as green as we are led to believe - bigger and heavier loads on the roads not to mention tyre dust. The industrial development at Stanton also adds to this and regularly dust covers cars carried by the wind - this was also an issue when Stanton Ironworks was there and caused on-going health issues therefore green space is important to this area and should be protected.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Ann Harrison	Response-01602	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Anthony Ford	Response-01921	Increased traffic will increase the air pollution outside of my house.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Anthony Pearson	Response-01760	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Antony M Ingram	Response-01626	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	April	Response-00469	As a parent of a child with health issues, I am deeply concerned about the impact this proposed high-density development will have on local air quality. Increased traffic and construction will inevitably lead to higher levels of pollution, which can severely affect individuals with respiratory conditions and other health vulnerabilities. My son's well-being depends on clean air, and any rise in pollutants such as car exhaust and dust particles could trigger serious health complications. It is not just an environmental issue?it is a direct threat to the health and quality of life for families like mine in this community.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	A R Gregory	Response-01918	
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Arleen Corns	Response-01146	I would believe that will all the extra traffic the air quality will worsen.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Awson Wheldon	Response-01649	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Barbara Michell	Response-01787	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Barbara Warton	Response-01886	Poor. Will get worse. Glad none of my family has asthma.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Barry Partridge	Response-01778	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Ben Hollins	Response-01651	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	ben riley	Response-00607	We are near the M1, we don't want more pollution.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Ben Snowdon	Response-00428	180 additional houses will deliver 250 to 360 more cars. This will have a significant affect on air quality, compounded by the fact that green space and trees will be removed.
			Bethany Oakes	Response-00960	240 more cars is an unsustainable amount of air pollution for a small village already next to the M1.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Beverley Gardner	Response-01692	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Beverley Green	Response-01686	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Bill Hartley	Response-01696	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Bill Meadwell	Response-00864	Adding extra vehicles to the area will inevitably lead to increased emissions which will have a detrimental effect on air quality. The M1 motorway runs very close to the proposed site with 8 lanes of traffic constantly being used. It is by no means a rare event for traffic hold-ups to occur, which leads to vehicles standing still or stopping and starting, leaving behind pollution of the air. During the construction phase, there will be a number of large lorries driving very slowly along the narrow access roads which will add greatly to this pollution
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	B T Duke	Response-01900	Bad enough with the motorway.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	B T Keen	Response-01735	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	c/o The Equalised Club	Response-01603	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Callum binnall	Response-00460	All the heavy duty construction vehicles Will mess up the air quality of sandiacre
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	C A Partridge	Response-01903	Extra pollution.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Caroline Blackmore	Response-00451	Increase traffic Increase air pollution obviously
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Caroline Driver	Response-00618	Pollution is already high as we have to live so close to the M1 and A52. Volume of traffic creates many standing vehicles queuing to get on these main roads which already exacerbate the problem. Building on the ?buffer zone? that acts as lung absorbing much pollution will poison our area further with fumes.
			Caroline Roy	Response-00945	Being so close to the M1 already, we really don't need additional traffic in the area to reduce air quality
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Carol Marshall	Response-00736	Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Carolyn Hallam	Response-00489	We already have too much air pollution. We are stuck between the M1 and the A52. Our boiler is being damaged by air pollution blocking the filters. Asthma is on the rise as are other breathing problems
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Catherine Richardson	Response-00531	All this extra traffic would cause more air pollution. It's already bad enough being near the M1
			Charlotte Fry	Response-00583	Air quality is already bad enough.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Charlotte Hunter	Response-01376	This is a green belt and close proximity to a nature reserve and the building works will inevitably have a negative impact the quality of air for the surrounding people and ho live in the houses as well as the surrounding wildlife.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	C Holmes	Response-01620	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Chris Hume	Response-01373	The air quality is poor with the M1 and all the Stanton lorry traffic.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Chris Jones	Response-01718	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Chris O Connor	Response-01641	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Christian Rearson	Response-01763	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Christine Anderson	Response-00484	Air quality is already affected as it is next to the 8 lane motorway. More cars from these houses will increase this.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Christine Gough	Response-00578	The air quality is bad due to the amount of traffic now and will only get a lot worse with more houses built . There is a school and there is a shop with the only post office in Sandiacre all on Stanton Road , so the traffic is ongoing , people leaving their engines running whilst waiting for the children or dropping them off at school , all Sandiacre residents have to drive to the local shop on Stanton Road to use the Post office and also to use the cash point and banking there . So huge amount of pollution from the vehicles . This will get even worse with more houses built and all the construction vehicles adding to more pollution and poor air quality
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Christine Ridgway	Response-00465	This is worry, as I already live close to the M1 and this will create more pollution with more vehicles accessing the proposed housing development.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Claire binnall	Response-00459	This will massively reduce air quality for its already struggling residents due to Increased traffic on long Moor road and the increase of pollution from the M1
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Clare franks	Response-00498	We already live next to one of the busiest motorways with poor air quality. Adding homes will not only worsen the air quality while contractions takes place, but the homes are also being build right next to the motorway meaning the noise pollution for the houses and the extra pollution in the area will be worse.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Clare Green	Response-01751	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Cole Hawkins	Response-01714	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Colin Cox	Response-01716	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Colin Marriott	Response-00686	According to official figures Sandiacre is only just below high levels of pollution due to emissions from the motorway. In addition there is increased incidence of pollution from brake dust and tyres
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Corrina loosemore	Response-00589	At least 180 cars and more will pollute the atmosphere Trees will be remove which means carbon will not be removed naturally
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Courtney Bennett	Response-00593	There are already several large construction vehicles that pass through Sandiacre causing dust in the air and on the roads. Having the area dug up and general constructions works is going to cause further air pollution and poor quality of air for the current residents, wildlife and children.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	C Owen	Response-01917	The air quality is bad enough now with the M1 motorway which is not being monitored, so it's only going to get worse.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Craig Freeman	Response-01561	Although we have the conservation area as a cleaner space to walk and exercise our dogs, the quality will probably be decreased due to additional traffic so close, in addition to the Motorway noise and air pollution.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Craig Richards	Response-01638	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Craig Thims	Response-01765	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Cristina Jenkins	Response-01588	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	C Thompson	Response-01634	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	DAllen	Response-00525	More cars ie pollution to the environment plus upheaval and congestion whilst building
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Daniel	Response-00545	More vehicles mean more exhaust emissions, contributing to poorer air quality in a primarily residential area where children walk to school and residents engage in outdoor activities. The development's proximity to the M1 already subjects residents to elevated noise levels. Increasing local road traffic will only worsen this issue, impacting overall wellbeing. The proposed site is adjacent to a nature reserve area, as shown on the map. The increase in noise, litter, and human intrusion will have a detrimental effect on local wildlife and biodiversity.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Daniel Downes	Response-01630	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Danielle Harrison	Response-00568	No brainer. If you build on green belt the air quality will decrease. The motorway has already increased the carbon monoxide levels in my body. As a non-smoker my midwife could not believe my readings and she asked directly if I lived close to a motorway. A housing estate of this size will increase poor air quality readings.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Daniel Naylor	Response-00680	With 2300 homes approved for development in the 2022 Erewash core strategy in neighbouring kirk hallam and Stanton, and the currently developing industrial units in Stanton using Sandiacre and Stanton by dale as direct access to the m1, air pollution will already be at unnecessary high levels without adding 180 new homes in sandiacre to add to this. With the 4 lane M1 running alongside sandiacre, the air quality in this area is already in poor condition, without adding to it with 180 new homes, all with vehicles and some with more than 1 on their driveway.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Darran and Emma Rea	Response-00597	Increase of traffic pollution in the area is a concern
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	David Casey	Response-01608	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	David Cater	Response-01756	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	David Fry	Response-00596	Obviously we don't want even more pollution from more vehicles
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	David Ruddock	Response-01776	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	David Thompson	Response-01324	Detrimental to air quality

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	David Tindsley	Response-00515	I wish to object to the proposed development on the grounds of its likely negative impact on local air quality. Only a few years ago, parts of Sandiacre were identified as exceeding national air quality standards leading to a need to regularly monitor air pollution levels. It took considerable effort by both the local authority and the community to reduce harmful emissions and bring pollution levels under control. The land identified for development currently acts as a vital green buffer between the M1 motorway and existing residential properties. This open space plays an important role in absorbing pollutants and providing a physical barrier that shields homes from the worst effects of motorway emissions. The loss of this green space would remove that buffer entirely, exposing current residents to higher levels of air pollution. Whilst I understand that the council either ceased or significantly reduced monitoring of air quality in 2022 because of reduced levels at that time, since then the M1 close to Sandiacre has become a 'smart' motorway. Speed control/monitoring tends to result in more cars being slower/stationary in the area increasing air pollutants. Furthermore, HGV through the village has undoubtedly increased since then, and will increase further as the commercial property element of the re-development at Stanton expands. The proposed addition of 180 dwellings would lead to a significant increase in vehicle movements in the area both during construction and once the homes are occupied. This additional traffic, in combination with the factors previously highlighted risks tipping the local area back into non-compliance with national air quality standards, undoing years of progress. This proposal is therefore in conflict with Paragraph 186 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which states that 'Planning policies and decisions should sustain and contribute towards compliance with relevant limit values or national objectives for pollutants.' It also goes against Paragraph 183, which requires planning decisions to ensure that new development is appropriate for its location, taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health and the natural environment. Allowing development in this location risks not only increasing air pollution for future residents, who would be living right next to a major motorway, but also worsens the quality of life and health outcomes for the existing community by removing a green-belt space that currently acts as a protective buffer. For these reasons, I strongly object to the proposed development and urge the planning authority to carefully consider the long-term environmental and health impacts on the community.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	David Yeo	Response-01705	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Dean Bosworth	Response-01665	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Dean Lavelle	Response-01774	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Dean Michell	Response-01343	The extra traffic will bring extra noise and fumes to a already busy area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Debra Michell	Response-01346	To many cars use Beech Avenue to get to their homes now. More traffic more fumes. From braking,tyres and exhaust.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Debra Scully	Response-00288	Dust and particles will impact residence who currently live in a peaceful area
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Debs Washer	Response-00487	Greater pollution through increased vehicles near a beauty spot
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Denise bennett	Response-00030	We already have the highest pollution in Erewash
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Denise Creasey	Response-00786	Pollution is already high in the area due to the proximity to the A52 and M1 and the M1 junction 25. Widening of the M1 has already increased this pollution along with bringing the heavy goods vehicles closer to the housing. This proposed site currently acts to absorb much of this pollution .
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Denise Lingard	Response-01759	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Dennis Watts	Response-01726	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Derek Morton	Response-01607	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Derrick Hunt	Response-00437	When the motorway was widened to four lanes the highway's agency sent out forms for people to claim compensation in the houses that are already here How can it be right to build these new houses next to the motorway ?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Destiny Jade-Blake	Response-01636	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Diane Jones	Response-00852	Any additional traffic is detrimental to an already polluted area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Diane Mcmorrow	Response-00433	Being asthmatic I'm real concerned about the air quality/pollution living on Sycamore Crescent I struggled when the motorway was extended to 4 lanes either side we need to be aware and responsible for what we are doing especially for our young venerable children
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Diane Meadwell	Response-00807	There is proven evidence that emissions from vehicles cause health problems. This is not only from fuel, but also from tyre and brake dust which is given off by all vehicles. Many larger vehicles are not electric and are not expected to be any time soon. In the short term, the huge amount of construction traffic will result in excessive emissions of all kinds. They will need to drive slowly owing to the narrowness of the roads and the tight turns needed to approach them, thus ensuring the maximum amount of engine emissions. In the longer term, any additional traffic will obviously increase emissions. This has a negative impact not only for humans but also for the flora and fauna of the area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Diane Turner	Response-01744	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Dorothy Deeprise	Response-00817	The added traffic will make polution. Also, traffic will use the other roads nearby making them conjested
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	D Pallett	Response-01627	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	D Simpson	Response-01712	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	E Cooper	Response-01923	Ruining the air quality near nature reserve. Light pollution & noise would increase.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Elaine Pickering	Response-00811	Extra traffic fumes
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Eleanor Moseley	Response-00799	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Eleanor Newman	Response-00718	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Emily	Response-01880	With the traffic at a standstill the cars will be polluting. Plus too close to M1.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Emily Milnes	Response-00470	New houses will be along the M1 corridor, if houses are built they will have poor air quality, ignoring the increased traffic
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Emma Peterson	Response-00491	Trucks not ideal
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Emma Ryan	Response-00503	The building works will cause pollution. The 180 extra homes bringing in roughly 180-360 extra cars to the town will cause more pollution.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Emma Wall	Response-00319	More traffic, more poor air quality. Stony Flowers is a nature reserve and as such should be protected from air quality as much as it is impression of building around it. You will damage the flora, specifically the lichen that is protected by the woodland trust that Stoney clouds

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Esther Cook	Response-01861	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Ewan Snowdon	Response-00766	Further construction and traffic will negatively contribute towards lowering the air quality and as a passionate environmentalist, we have to limit what we're putting into the atmosphere and the impact on the wildlife that depends on the air quality to survive and thrive.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Fay Cresswell	Response-00701	The pollution levels in this area are high as your own records show. Adding these extra vehicles will only add more pollution and the houses will be exceptionally close to not only chemicals pollution but light pollution and noise pollution too. We are obviously further away and can hear the M1 all day and night. Our house if covered in dust much more than anywhere else I know.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Finlay Moss	Response-00588	Considering we already live next to m1 corridor (which significantly increases both noise and air pollution) this planned increase will only further decrease the already low air quality in the area
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Gail and Tony Orme	Response-00805	Since myself and my husband have moved here we have had respiratory problems coughs etc more than we have ever had . Due to heavy pollution we feel.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Gail Berry	Response-01644	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Geoff Tindsley	Response-00755	I wish to object to the proposed development on the grounds of its likely negative impact on local air quality. 1. The land identified for development currently must act as a vital green buffer between the M1 motorway and existing residential properties. This open space would play an important role in absorbing pollutants and providing a physical barrier that shields homes from the worst effects of motorway emissions. The loss of this green space would remove that buffer entirely, exposing current residents to higher levels of air pollution. 2. Speed control/monitoring on the M1 tends to result in more cars being slower/stationary in the area increasing air pollutants. There also seems to be far more HGVs going through the village. 3. The proposed addition of 180 dwellings would lead to a significant increase in vehicle movements in the area both during construction and once the homes are occupied. This additional traffic, in combination with the factors previously highlighted risks tipping the local area back into non-compliance with national air quality standards. 4. Following development in this location risks not only increasing air pollution for future residents, who would be living right next to a major motorway, but also worsens the quality of life and health outcomes for the existing community by removing a green-belt space that currently acts as a protective buffer. For these reasons, I strongly object to the proposed development and urge the planning authority to carefully consider the long-term environmental and health impacts on the community.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Georgia C	Response-01296	Next to motorway which already contributes to poor air quality in the area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Georgia Marvin	Response-00261	Construction will affect air pollution and quality. The dust, chemicals which will cover cloudside and coronation avenues will have a detrimental effect on all residents. The noise and hustle it will also bring will be outrageous and many residents will have their lives interrupted for many many years!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Gill West	Response-01725	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Glyn Holner	Response-01697	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Gordon Bruce	Response-01455	The proposed site is a green buffer zone, one of few, to protect the people of Sandiacre from the traffic on the M1. They already endure reduction in air quality and noise pollution and should not have this small green space removed as a local amenity.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Gordon Daris	Response-01639	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Greg Cox	Response-01702	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Gregg Bartrum	Response-01591	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Harriet Farnsworth	Response-01914	Yet more cars, litter etc!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Helen Gillain	Response-00964	Brake dust from cars struggling to get through narrow roads would have a severe impact on air quality and affect the health of local residents
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Helen Thompson	Response-01356	Many more lorries and vans are coming through Sandiacre from the Stanton site using Ilkeston Road/Town Street/ Derby Road to and from the M1. More housing will bring more traffic especially while it's built. Are there up to date measurements of the existing air quality for instance at the traffic lights by the canal and at the motorway junction to assess this issue?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Helen Whiteman	Response-00447	We do not need all the extra pollution of this build
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Ian	Response-00493	Increase in traffic will deplete air quality in an already bad area
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Ian Herbert	Response-00939	Sandiacre is presently plagued with fine dust from a wood recycling yard which conducts open air operations on town street. Any further residential development and traffic movements will add to the already dangerous particulate levels through brake dust and tyre particulates.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Ian Steele	Response-00780	More traffic will not improve the air quality we enjoy already in stone clouds area
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	IAN TAYLOR	Response-00972	Vehicle use will remain a mix of petrol, diesel and electric for the foreseeable future. Increased numbers of idling engines due to obstructions and queues will only exacerbate the problem.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Ian Telfer	Response-00991	On Taft Avenue we are already covered in wood dust from town street and at night seemingly everyone has wood burning stoves, and not burning clean legal wood.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Ian Ward	Response-01628	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Irina Anthony	Response-01867	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Isabelle Love	Response-00529	Again, more traffic (and there will be a lot with potentially x2 cars per household) there is obvious danger with the increase of air pollution, the area already has to deal with pollution from the M1 and removing more green sites and adding more congestion produces obvious results.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Isobel Ball	Response-01092	Undoubtedly, the machinery and digging that will be required to understand this type of planning on a green area. Will contribute heavily to air pollution, it will fill the air with dust and gases which is merely unsustainable for the type of area planned. It will drastically affect the livelihood of those already living in the area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	J. E. Lord	Response-01601	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Jack Greateorex	Response-01731	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Jacob Whitt	Response-01748	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Jacqueline Marshall	Response-01436	The increased traffic from extra Lorries if the development goes ahead will without doubt be detrimental to our health. The estimated 360 cars from the proposed development will create a decline in Air Quality for our residents.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Jade Smith	Response-01783	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Jake Simpson	Response-00667	Extra cars and housing would increase pollution and losing trees and plants would have a negative impact on air quality
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	James Meadwell	Response-01653	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	James Roberts	Response-01708	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	James Seward	Response-01683	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	James White	Response-01883	Why is the build happening next to the M1. No consideration to proposed new home owners.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Jane Dennett	Response-00965	I have Astma air quality is poor in this area. More dust and pollution from site additional traffic fumes etc
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Jane Elizabeth Tindsley	Response-00669	I wish to object to the proposed development on the grounds of its likely negative impact on local air quality. Only a few years ago, parts of Sandiacre were identified as exceeding national air quality standards leading to a need to regularly monitor air pollution levels. It took considerable effort by both the local authority and the community to reduce harmful emissions and bring pollution levels under control. The land identified for development currently acts as a vital green buffer between the M1 motorway and existing residential properties. This open space plays an important role in absorbing pollutants and providing a physical barrier that shields homes from the worst effects of motorway emissions. The loss of this green space would remove that buffer entirely, exposing current residents to higher levels of air pollution. Whilst I understand that the council either ceased or significantly reduced monitoring of air quality in 2022 because of reduced levels at that time, since then the M1 close to Sandiacre has become a 'smart' motorway. Speed control/monitoring tends to result in more cars being slower/stationery in the area increasing air pollutants. Furthermore, HGV through the village has undoubtedly increased since then, and will increase further as the commercial property element of the re-development at Stanton expands. The proposed addition of 180 dwellings would lead to a significant increase in vehicle movements in the area both during construction and once the homes are developed and occupied. This additional traffic, in combination with the factors previously highlighted risks tipping the local area back into non-compliance with national air quality standards, undoing years of progress. This proposal is therefore in conflict with Paragraph 186 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which states that 'Planning policies and decisions should sustain and contribute towards compliance with relevant limit values or national objectives for pollutants.' It also goes against Paragraph 183, which requires planning decisions to ensure that new development is appropriate for its location, taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health and the natural environment. Allowing development in this location risks not only increasing air pollution for future residents, who would be living right next to a major motorway, but also worsens the quality of life and health outcomes for the existing community by removing a green-belt space that currently acts as a protective buffer. For these reasons, I strongly object to the proposed development and urge the planning authority to carefully consider the long-term environmental and health impacts on the community.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Janet Whildes	Response-01869	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Jane Warton	Response-00662	increased pollution creating health issues and poor air quality.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Janice Taylor	Response-01743	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Janice West	Response-00989	Putting family housing so close to a busy motorway is not at all acceptable. Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Janine Holmes	Response-01595	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Jason Deepprose	Response-00818	Your plans will make the air worse. Not good for pedestrians and cyclists
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Jason Harwood	Response-01667	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Jason Webb	Response-01637	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Jayne Rowley	Response-01279	The air quality in this area is already impacted with its close proximity to the A52 and M1 especially at peak times when there is congestion on the roads. This has been further increased with the Stanton Park development and the significant rise in HGVs and traffic passing through the area. The industrial traffic travelling to the area during building works would further add to this especially in the summer months when sites are dusty. Local homes would be greatly impacted by this dust and put those local residents with respiratory conditions at an increased risk.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	J Cates	Response-01750	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Jeanette O Connor	Response-01640	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Jeffrey Whittaker	Response-00594	To close to the M1
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Jennifer Bailey	Response-01857	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Jennifer Saville	Response-00516	More traffic more pollution
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Jennifer Tindley	Response-00751	I wish to object to the proposed development on the grounds of its likely negative impact on local air quality. 1. The land identified for development currently must act as a vital green buffer between the M1 motorway and existing residential properties. This open space would play an important role in absorbing pollutants and providing a physical barrier that shields homes from the worst effects of motorway emissions. The loss of this green space would remove that buffer entirely, exposing current residents to higher levels of air pollution. 2. Speed control/monitoring on the M1 tends to result in more cars being slower/stationary in the area increasing air pollutants. There also seems to be far more HGVs going through the village. 3. The proposed addition of 180 dwellings would lead to a significant increase in vehicle movements in the area both during construction and once the homes are occupied. This additional traffic, in combination with the factors previously highlighted risks tipping the local area back into non-compliance with national air quality standards. 4. Following development in this location risks not only increasing air pollution for future residents, who would be living right next to a major motorway, but also worsens the quality of life and health outcomes for the existing community by removing a green-belt space that currently acts as a protective buffer. For these reasons, I strongly object to the proposed development and urge the planning authority to carefully consider the long-term environmental and health impacts on the community.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Jenny Stephens	Response-01723	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Joanna hardy	Response-01304	Sandiacre already has to deal with pollution from the M1. More traffic will create more pollution and the construction of so many homes will create dust and further reduce air quality. The greenbelt land is currently acting as a buffer, with the trees acting as a barrier to some of the M1 pollution. Removing this area for houses or any buildings would remove this buffer.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Joanne Guyatt	Response-01784	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Joanne Johnson	Response-00765	Air pollution facts and figures up to 43,000 premature deaths? a year are linked with air pollution in the UK 1,460 schools in neighbourhoods across England are located in areas where nitrogen dioxide or PM2.5 levels, or both, are double the World Health Organisation guidelines. Air pollution affects people of all ages? but children are particularly vulnerable? to dirty air as their lungs are still developing and they breathe faster and are often close to the ground near vehicle exhausts. Health effects can include growing up with reduced lung capacity. From Friends of the Earth Erewash - This in the Maple Ave area Annual concentration Health limit NO2 12.1 µg/m3 10 µg/m3 These are already above the governments recommended limits. PM2.5 8.1 µg/m3 5 µg/m3 Households without a car/van 13% - this will increase with more housing £20 billion how much air pollution costs? the UK economy every year The air quality is not the best around this area as it is flanked by the M1, Derby Road and the A52 close by. Children and the elderly will suffer the most if they live in the proposed new housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Joanne Lambert	Response-00494	Extra vehicles once the houses are built are going to impact on the air quality in the area, the building work itself will also have an impact. Sandiacre already has a high level of pollution due to being close to the m1. Further pollution could see a decline in health outcomes for residents.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Jodie Owen	Response-01688	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Jodie Shrive	Response-00601	More vehicles means more unnecessary emissions and noise. This will not only harm the environment but will also deteriorate the quality of life for current longstanding residents, particularly those of us living near the development access points.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Joe Sells	Response-01924	Building so close to the motorway raises serious concerns about air pollution, exposing residents, especially children & the elderly to harmful emissions & health risks.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Jo Gerhardt	Response-01286	Sandiacre is already an area of poor quality. Apparently the powers that be have stopped monitoring the levels. The M1 is close by plus all the HGV's, vans etc making pollution levels higher than other parts of the country. Constructing an additional 180 houses next to the M1 would increase pollution levels due to dust from construction and exhaust fumes from the additional 200 plus cars, into an already polluted area. I reluctantly open my front windows due to pollution. I get a layer of black dust on a regular basis on my window sills probably due to the many HGV's etc brake dust.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	John Gardner	Response-01694	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	John G Brown	Response-01752	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	John Hibbitt	Response-01855	One of the worst now. Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	John Ledger	Response-01605	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	John Payne	Response-01785	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	John whiteman	Response-00450	We have enough pollution as it is with all the extra hg v vehicles from the Stanton site without the traffic this will make
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Jon Burn	Response-01722	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Josh Williams	Response-01632	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	J Pearson	Response-01772	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	J Telfer	Response-01876	My window ledges have dust on every day.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Judith A Putfer	Response-01863	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Judith Blackburn	Response-01928	What is going to happen when the air becomes more polluted with dust and noise? I know we are already affected by pollution because my homes is already covered in dust from the motorway.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Julie Hill	Response-01643	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	J West	Response-01874	To put houses so close to a major motorway surely cannot be a healthy option for family homes.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Karen Alldread	Response-01868	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Karen Blain	Response-01732	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Karen Evans	Response-00523	Any removal of trees etc will impact air quality.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Karen Harwood	Response-01668	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Karen Pitts	Response-00643	Brake pads and tyres contribute significantly to non-exhaust emissions, a major source of air and water pollution, according to a study by the University of Southampton [1, 2, 18, 22]. These particles are released as the vehicle wears down, and while some are toxic, they also contribute to the formation of microplastics, which can be harmful to the environment and potentially human health. Respiratory health issues plus potential cancer and Alzhiemers developing The government?s Air Quality Expert Group said particles from brake wear, tyre wear and road surface wear directly contribute to well over half of particle pollution from road transport. 180 houses equals approx. 250 cars (O.N.S 1.29 per household) plus associated visitors etc going both ways up narrow steep existing roads gives conservative 19,000 vehicles per year. This coupled with the already high vehicle pollution from the M1 will give rise to serious health implications for the existing residents and foot traffic especially children on their way to school. Acceleration to get up the hill will emit high exhaust emissions and braking to avoid other vehicles. Braking to go down such steep streets necessitates using your brakes constantly especially at the blind corners and t junction this at Cloudside Rd. Vehicles will give off constant pollutants and micro plastics on both inward and outward journeys. Far in excess of acceptable levels.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Kathryn Lovatt	Response-00497	The proposed building of 180 homes is of great concern to my family and I due to the increased pollution levels (adversing affecting air quality/noise levels) during the construction of the homes and following the development's completion. Conservative estimate: 700+ additional daily car/vehicle journey's driving past current homes. This is in addition to the pollution residents (air and noise) already experience due to living in close proximity to the M1 motorway. Furthermore, building new homes incredibly close to the M1 motorway is obviously detrimental to the health and well being of families/children living in those homes.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Kathryn Martin	Response-00527	It is the last green buffer between the m1 and sandiacre. Air quality already poor.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Katie Morrice	Response-00664	The increase in traffic from residents and construction activity will introduce more exhaust emissions and pollutions into the air which is extremely concerning considering how close the area is to a local nature reserve. These changes will significantly degrade the air quality around the area. The noise pollution will considerably affect the surrounding area already being close to the busy M1 there can be loud periods during peak times. Having an increase on this will really affect the residents surrounding it. Pollution is already high in the area due to the proximity to the A52 and M1 and the M1 junction 25. Widening of the M1 has already increased this pollution along with bringing the heavy goods vehicles closer to the housing. This proposed site currently acts to absorb much of this pollution .
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Katie Robinson	Response-00943	I only moved to this area a year ago so I received the environmental reports that showed polluted areas and air quality - which was very important to me due to health concerns. The land you want to build on is right next to the motorway and was shown as having poor air quality but also showed that it was a buffer between the motorway and the estate to essentially negate the negative impact of the motorway and pollution it causes. If you build on that site you are taking away that buffer and will cause further poor air quality that will effect the current residents which will cause poor health especially for people like myself that suffer from breathing conditions like asthma.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Kelly Randall	Response-00591	The existing green belt provides essential protection against motorway pollution. Removing this buffer will deteriorate air quality and expose new homes to noise and emissions from the M1, contravening basic public health standards.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Kelsey Green	Response-01666	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Kenneth Cooper	Response-01720	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Kern-Paul Lewis	Response-01715	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Kerry Meadwell	Response-01655	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Kerry Smith	Response-01271	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Kerry stokes	Response-00769	As an asthma sufferer the increase in traffic pollution caused by the increase in cars for new residents & construction traffic will have impact on my quality of life. I'm really concerned about the negative impacts the build will have on our air quality. The air quality is already poor with the increase in Lorrie's we're experiencing in Sandiacre, coming from the M1 to Stanton. So adding another 500 plus transport journeys a day will only exasperate this. Not only will it come from exhaust fumes but also the micro plastics created from car brakes & tyres. We live at the bottom of Stanton road (hill) & know that brakes are used nearly all the way down, adding another few hundred lots of this (from more cars the build brings) will only make this so much worse. I am an asthma sufferer so I know how much my lungs suffer from air pollution & know how the new build will negatively affect my health.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	KH Taylor	Response-01663	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Kim Helm	Response-00632	The air quality will be worse, as a person suffering with Asthma I prefer not to add to the pollution even more Not great for a house estate to be next to the motorway
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Kirk Moss	Response-00439	The site is adjacent to the M1, an area known for high levels of nitrogen oxides (NOx) and other pollutants. Currently, the open fields help disperse toxic gases. Development would trap these pollutants, exposing residents to dangerously poor air quality. Prolonged exposure to NOx is linked to respiratory diseases, cardiovascular issues, and premature deaths.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Kirsty Handa	Response-00445	The existing residents air quality is going to severely reduced and have a huge negative impact. The dust and debris that will come from the construction is going to be in people's gardens and homes affecting people's health. Air quality will also have an effect on any proposed development with the M1 being so close. This could have huge long term effects on any residents and this is not sustainable and there is also nothing can be done to reduce this. This will negatively impact both existing and proposed residents
			K Reynolds	Response-01916	There is already too much pollution. We need to cut down, not create more.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Kristie Rugers	Response-01864	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Kyle Jones	Response-01764	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	L A Keen	Response-01659	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Laura Hallam	Response-01711	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Laura Thompson	Response-00702	The building of the home alone will affect air quality. The losses of green spaces and loss of trees/vegetation will impact on air quality. We would lose a green space where people go for exercise and relaxation.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Laurence Luck	Response-01727	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Lauren Freeman	Response-01562	More vehicles, more pollution around our homes. Not only vehicle pollution but the dust which will be stirred up by creating these homes. This will aggravate health conditions and possibly cause long term damage to residents.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Lauren Rose	Response-01446	Air quality in the area is historically poor and increased traffic from vehicles to the proposed development will reduce this quality further. The heavy goods vehicles needed to create the development will also reduce the air quality further.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Leah morral	Response-00712	Most houses now have at least 2 cars, so that's a potential 360 extra cars polluting the air in our area and beautiful surroundings

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Lee Wilcock	Response-01670	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Lesley Bruce	Response-01397	This area of Sandiacre already endures the pollution from both the increasingly busy M1 and A52. The proposed area for 180 extra homes plus their vehicles would not only increase that pollution, but remove the important green belt which separates homes from the detrimental effect of that M1 traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Lesley Carter	Response-00536	We have pollution from the adjacent motorway, A52 and the increasing number of lorries that are now based in the growing number of new units in Stanton that thunder through the village to access the main routes. Adding 180 houses and associated vehicles etc will add to poor air quality, noise pollution and congestion.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Lesley Morral	Response-01920	Sandiacre has only just managed to reduce to acceptable levels which this proposal will increase again.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Lia Thims	Response-01766	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	lilly stokes	Response-00767	i go on multiple walks as walking helps with my mental health and i walk to school everyday, with the amount of pollution increasing this will damage my lungs and the idea of this puts me off walking making my mental health much worse. On top of this my mum struggles with asthma and with the pollution in the air this will cause her asthma to get a lot worse seeing my mother struggle like this makes me incredibly upset and anxious.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Linda Castledine-Davies	Response-00850	Historically the area of Sandiacre has had extremely high levels of pollution because of its proximity to the constantly busy A52 and M1 junction 25. Higher than the rest of England at times. Some improvement may have been made with cleaner fuel and more environmentally cleaner cars but the recent widening of the M1 into 4 lanes has moved the bulk of vehicles and heavy duty vehicles much closer to the residents in this area. Although traffic may move at a more steady speed during the day it is still very congested at peak times of commuting and school runs. Every day sees a long line of traffic spewing out their pollutants as they try to access at junction 25. The residents of Poplar Ave, Linden Grove, Sycamore Crescent, Chestnut Grove, Cloudside Road and Larch Drive are particularly affected by the M1 and also spent 2 years of constant congestion during the widening process with all lines stationary belching out their fuels. It is extremely noticeable on health when the wind is in a northerly direction. The green belt land acts as an effective buffer and barrier to some of these pollutants. Not only will this proposal remove this buffer an additional 180 high density houses will add to it considerably with an average of 6 tonnes of CO2 alone being emitted by each house. a study by the Office for National Statistics found that households contribute 26% of UK emissions, with travel accounting for a significant portion. The total lack of existing amenities or facilities and none being proposed means all requirements will need to be sourced outside of the site. The terrain is steep not suited to walking and cycling but many, the public bus can only access so far up the hill in good weather so majority will use their vehicles. With just one access point, by completion, that will equate to and extra 700 plus vehicles a day spewing out their pollution onto the nearby residents. Childrens health will be greatly affected as they walk to school. Pollution is contaminates everyone and the environment it impacts the air, water, and land, and can harm humans and animals. Not only will this impact residents it will have a detrimental effect on the flora and fauna on Stoney Cloud Nature Reserve. Pollution the average UK household emits about 6 tonnes of CO2 annually that would equate to and extra 1080 tonnes a year on households and wildlife. Constructing a new house likely emits on the order of 15 to 100 tons of CO2. In 2023, cars accounted for 52% of all domestic vehicle emissions. The UK's average petrol car produces 164 grams of CO2 per kilometre, equivalent (g CO2e), while a diesel car produces 170 grams of CO2/km New developments can negatively impact wildlife through pollution from various sources, including construction dust, runoff containing chemicals and nutrients, and noise pollution. These pollutants can harm wildlife directly or indirectly by affecting habitats and the food chain. Furthermore, development can fragment habitats, reducing connectivity and impacting species' ability to find food, breed, and adapt to climate change. The proposal for 180 houses to be built on this site will impact on the health of existing residents and foot traffic in this area in so many ways. Air pollution from brake discs and tyres is well known and this proposal which could increase traffic by up to 20,000 vehicles a year, possibly more, plus heavy construction vehicles will raise the pollution that is already high to dangerous levels. Many studies hav

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Linda Castledine-Davies	Response-00850	e shown the impact on respiratory and neurological conditions from the toxic materials and micro plastics which may also contribute to cancers and Alzheimers. This will be exacerbated by the narrow twisting roads with no where to dissipate these toxic elements. Children in particular and foot traffic will be particularly affected and childhood asthma and breathing problems are already a problem in this area. Please take all of this into consideration and a full disclosed analysis of this needs to be done. Brake pads and tyres contribute significantly to non-exhaust emissions, a major source of air and water pollution, according to a study by the University of Southampton [1, 2, 18, 22]. These particles are released as the vehicle wears down, and while some are toxic, they also contribute to the formation of microplastics, which can be harmful to the environment and potentially human health. Respiratory health issues plus potential cancer and Alzhiemers developing The government?s Air Quality Expert Group said particles from brake wear, tyre wear and road surface wear directly contribute to well over half of particle pollution from road transport. 180 houses equals approx. 250 cars (0.N.S 1.29 per household) plus associated visitors etc going both ways up narrow steep existing roads gives conservative 19,000 vehicles per year. This coupled with the already high vehicle pollution from the M1 will give rise to serious health implications for the existing residents and foot traffic especially children on their way to school. Acceleration to get up the hill will emit high exhaust emissions and braking to avoid other vehicles. Braking to go down such steep streets necessitates using your brakes constantly especially at the blind corners and t junction this at Cloudside Rd. Vehicles will give off constant pollutants and micro plastics on both inward and outward journeys. Far in excess of acceptable levels. Tyre pollution. A car's four tyres collectively emit 1 trillion ultrafine particles ? of less than 100 nanometers ? per kilometer driven. They are small enough to reach into the deep lung. These particles may contain a range of toxic chemicals including polyaromatic hydrocarbons, benzothiazoles, isoprene, and heavy metals like zinc and lead Tyre particles emitted during use are a major component of microplastics in urban runoff and a source of unique and highly potent toxic substances. Thus, tyres represent a ubiquitous and complex pollutant that requires a comprehensive examination to develop effective management and remediation Brake pad dust can be more toxic than exhaust emissions. Microscopic particles emitted from brake pads can be more toxic than those emitted in diesel vehicle exhaust, a study has found. This research shows that even with a move to electric vehicles, pollution from cars may not be able to be eradicated. While newer pads are made without asbestos, they contain high levels of copper, which can aggravate asthma when inhaled. Older cars may have brake pads that contain asbestos. Environment Minister Thérèse Coffey said : ?The documents published today make clear that it is not just fumes from car exhaust pipes that have a detrimental impact on human health but also the tiny particles that are released from their brakes and tyres. Prof Anna Hansell, Professor of Environmental Epidemiology, University of Leicester, said: It shows that particulates from brake and tyre wear from both combustion-engine and electric vehicles h
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Linda Castledine-Davies	Response-00850	ave toxic impacts on human cells. And risks to human health and ecological systems. Dr Antonis Myridakis, Lecturer in Environmental Sciences, from Brunel University of London, ?that copper-enriched brake-wear PM induces significant oxidative stress, inflammation, and metabolic reprogramming in lung cells, surpassing even the effects of diesel exhaust PM. This aligns with established evidence regarding the role of transition metals in PM toxicity, but also introduces new insights into the pseudohypoxic activation of hypoxia-inducible factor (HIF) signalling, which has been implicated in chronic lung diseases and cancer.? Scientists are ?increasingly concerned? by the health impact of air pollution produced by the wear of vehicle tyres. The particles are especially damaging due to the toxic chemicals they are made from, say the scientists from Imperial College London. Small particles separate from tyres as cars travel, become airborne and can be inhaled deep into the lungs. Air pollution causes 26,000 to 38,000 early deaths a year in England Harmful particle matter from tyres ? and also brakes ? is a very serious and growing environmental problem, one that is being exacerbated by the increasing popularity of large, heavy vehicles such as SUVs, and growing demand for electric vehicles, which are heavier than standard cars because of their batteries. Construction vehicles contribute to air pollution through brake and tire wear, releasing particulate matter (PM) into the atmosphere, including both fine and coarse particles. These particles can contain toxic chemicals like polyaromatic hydrocarbons, benzothiazoles, and heavy metals. Additionally, construction sites can contribute to resuspension of road dust, further impacting air quality. It is estimated a site of this size will take approx 5 years to complete and that is IF a further phase is not introduced once this green belt is breached.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Linda Oscroft	Response-01927	This land sits directly alongside the M1 motorway and with the infrastructure required increases on top of the motorway pollution to the whole area in general.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Lindsey Rawlinson	Response-01624	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	LISA ANNE GILLIGAN-LEE	Response-00710	Increase in emissions of nitrogen dioxide and other particulate matter. More cars on the road will worsen air quality?something that is directly linked to asthma, respiratory issues, and heart disease. The loss of green space means we lose a vital natural filter for air pollutants. At a time when climate change and public health are top priorities, approving this development would run counter to both local and national environmental goals. Children, elderly and others with health issues are at risk from poor air quality which can be made worse by traffic.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Lisa J Pearson	Response-01762	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Liz Woodhouse	Response-01584	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	L Mee	Response-01777	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Logan Fox	Response-00746	Living near the M1 does result in extra air quality issues, but we are fortunate to have the open space and forest near us that helps this a lot. Removing this will see us lose these benefits and the additional houses, cars and people will result in a far less 'clean' area. Not fair on those living in a quiet and healthy space.
			Lorraine Daly	Response-00495	Air quality is already poor due to heavy traffic and proximity to A52 and M1
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Lorraine Hands	Response-00534	The whole area is close enough to the motorway , excessive traffic goes through Sandiacre to get to the motorway (large Lorrie?s) which roads in the area were never designed to take! It is increasingly becoming a dirty place from dust the traffic causes! I live on Moores Avenue which is off Starch Lane, Starch Lane is the cut through for many people who live this end of Sandiacre! We just do not need more traffic ???..
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Louise dix	Response-00975	The pollution from all the extra cars on roads with most household having 2 cars and how that will effect the local school air quality at breaks when they already have the motorway so close
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Louise Felfoldt	Response-01733	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Louise Harper	Response-01571	With more houses there will be more air pollution, at the moment only horses have been there for many years, building houses will create lots of dust and increased noise , at the moment it is very quiet
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Louise Harrison	Response-01719	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Louise Jacks	Response-01767	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Louise Libberton	Response-01693	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Louise Robinson	Response-00647	Queuing traffic is already a big concern down Rushy lane and Town street. Increasing houses, will increase cars and result in further congestion which will increase pollution further. This is especially undesirable outside schools (such as Friesland and cloudside). Road infrastructure needs improvement first, especially access to the M1.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Lucy johnson	Response-01369	With the M1 and A52 being as close to Sandiacre as they are (you know it can?t be helped) the air quality in Sandiacre isn?t great! It needs to get better for the community! We don?t need any more air pollution in our town! Let?s be a town that doesn?t follow the norm of new housing and developments! We need to get away from that and have green spaces to soak up the pollution!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	lucy victoria garner	Response-00949	lots of research around health impact of increased pollution and living next to roads. risk of respiratory disease living close to motorway with increased particles. risk of child health impact growing up above motorway <a href="https://www.bmj.com/content/367/bmj.l6677#%3A:text=Living%20near%20a%20busy%20road%20can%20stunt%20lung,tougher%20air%20pollution%20laws%20in%20the%20UK.%201">https://www.bmj.com/content/367/bmj.l6677#%3A:text=Living%20near%20a%20busy%20road%20can%20stunt%20lung,tougher%20air%20pollution%20laws%20in%20the%20UK.%201</a> Significant studies available regarding the health concerns around air quality, social overcrowding and the need for green spaces.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Luke Chein	Response-01779	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Lynda Morton	Response-01606	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Macie Brothwell	Response-01633	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Malcolm Dillon	Response-00722	Air quality will inevitably be reduced for the people on the access route. A possible 360+ vehicle miles per day just to service this site will have pollution levels that will be concentrated in a residential area. The proposed housing will be very close to the M1, four lane motorway. This section of motorway regularly experiences standing traffic stretching all the way back to junction 25. This standing traffic will inevitably produce additional pollution from the "normal" pollution generated by vehicles on a very busy motorway. The loss of trees due to the loss of greenbelt will also have a detrimental effect on all of the Sandiacre citizens, not simply the additional density of population.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Malcolm Fox	Response-00215	People move and live into an area like this for the peace and quiet and Air Quality is a life essential these days. Firstly, the building impact alone will negatively effect all current residents with dust and debris the norm for months on end. Removing the green belt reduces the overall space which will simply negatively impact air quality on the whole. Again, why remove a green site when there are plenty of other areas that could be considered which would not impact air quality with the removal of green space?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Malcolm Riggs	Response-01680	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Malc Orbiston	Response-01673	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Mandy Rait	Response-01587	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour. There is already a constant barrage of heavy HGVs through our village producing excessive noise and pollution.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Marcel Janovsky	Response-00481	Air quality very bad
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Mark Gough	Response-00888	Pollution is horrendous coming from cars and lorries in Beech Avenue, Stanton Road , Spencer Ave and of course the M1 is near , the amount of poor air quality affects the people living here. Air pollution is medically linked to brain and breast cancers , dementia, reduced ability to learn , asthma, bipolar disorders, lung cancers , heart disease , strokes (survey done from Mums for Lungs on air quality) and you're thinking that 180 more houses right near the M1 isn't going to make a difference !!! Think of the people going to live there ! The air quality is going to affect everyone around here even more .
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Mark Leek	Response-01740	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	mark skelton	Response-01341	Absolutely something that we are concerned about. More heavy diesel delivery Lorries and cars passing by our home.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Mark Warton	Response-00693	Even more pollution and health issues
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Marta McManus	Response-00646	This development means having less of a barrier between M1 and nature reserve and also sandiacre
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Martin Driver	Response-01387	Air quality is poor around the area. Monitoring has tapered off this last few years. I read that it's not required as it went down. I'd say this was due to Covid and less traffic on the road. Needs to be regularly monitored again. Has serious health implications
			Martin Ford	Response-01908	More vehicles.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Martin Hardy	Response-01413	If the proposed construction is permitted the air quality in the area will drop. We already have air and noise pollution from the M1 and increasing traffic and building works will cause more. The traffic would cause issues with dust, fumes from large vehicles and dust from break pads. Also having such a large construction site would cause large amounts of dust to be produced which would fall over the surrounding area. Causing breathing problems, dirty cars and make drying washing outside impossible. The noise from the construction site over several years would also negatively impact the local area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Martyn Locker	Response-00903	As mentioned above, 200+ more cars idling and queuing to get in and out of the estate using the single access road is undoubtedly going to have a negative impact on air quality.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Matt Hallam	Response-00476	Having another lane added onto the m1 has made it louder for the people on cloudside and chestnut, imagine 200+ cars on this new area. Going from listening to the horses running up and down to chavy boy racer cars polluting the air and sound
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Matthew Buckland	Response-00615	Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to M1, which runs alongside the majority of the current field. In particular congestion at peak times accessing junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to the proposed area. A number of trees on the site would need to be cut down which would further reduce the air quality as they naturally absorb pollutants.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Maurice Mason	Response-01617	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Maxine Sutton	Response-00471	The extra cars will not only congest the local area they will contribute to air pollution. The Council has a duty of care to ensure the health of residents, especially young children, is not affected.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	M Dougle	Response-01749	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	M Eastwood	Response-01757	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Melanie	Response-00586	The existing Green Belt provides a vital buffer between residential areas and the M1 motorway, helping to mitigate air and noise pollution. Removing this buffer would directly expose future and existing residents to higher levels of harmful pollutants and noise, with potentially serious health implications. There is evidence of air pollution online, so is public knowledge.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Melanie Caumont	Response-01272	Increased vehicle emissions from hundreds of new residents will contribute to a decline in local air quality. Given the site's proximity to the M1 motorway, the area already experiences heightened pollution levels. Adding more traffic and construction activity will negatively impact air quality and public health, particularly for children and the elderly.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Melanie Howarth	Response-01621	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Michael Anderson	Response-00461	This site runs adjacent to an eight lane motorway. With the extra residents vehicles for this site it must have an impact to air quality.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Michael Darnell	Response-00648	The development would too close to the M1 and air quality for potential residents would be very poor. The current green space provides a buffer.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Michael Ocroft	Response-01926	This land sits directly alongside the M1 motorway and with the infrastructure required increases on top of the motorway pollution to the whole area in general.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Michell Birkin	Response-01657	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Michelle Alsop	Response-01645	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Michelle Cox	Response-01724	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Michelle Ledger	Response-00815	Air Quality ? Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 & M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of this pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Michelle Wenham	Response-01650	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Mick Hughes	Response-01701	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Mike Darnell	Response-00698	The incline up the steep hills and bends make tyre and brake usage so great and all this affects air quality not counting exhaust fumes
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Miss Garratt	Response-00905	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Miss R Cordon	Response-01648	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Misty McGrath	Response-01556	We should not be building houses so close to the M1. The air quality is already poor, and reducing the green space and expanding the residential areas are going to contribute to making that worse.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Mollie Snow	Response-01729	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Molly Newbold	Response-00486	Of course it will be affected, you could add 360 new cars to our streets if each household averages 2 cars per house
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Mr. Mark Lovatt	Response-00956	I am concerned about a decline in air quality which would be caused by the added pollution from hundreds of extra vehicles driving by daily. The air quality is already compromised by living near the motorway and the nearby busy roads. During years of housing construction, the roads accessing the proposed site would be inundated with huge vehicles emitting fumes - thus adversely affecting the air we breathe. The dust caused by the building of the proposed housing estate, would equally add to air pollution and massively affect the quality of life of local residents.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Mr & Mrs Turton	Response-01660	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Mr and Mrs R Skelton	Response-01274	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Mr and Mrs Wright	Response-01275	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Mr Colin Key	Response-01841	Substantial increase in Pollution (of all kinds) in an already higher than average area will affect the health of existing and future residents and have a detrimental effect on their wellbeing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Mr David Ainsworth	Response-00621	The volume of houses will have a direct increase in carbon monoxide. I have asthma and am concerned that the volume of traffic will directly affect my respiratory health.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Mr K Gubb	Response-01838	Substantial increase in Pollution (of all kinds) in an already higher than average area will affect the health of existing and future residents and have a detrimental effect on their wellbeing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Mr K Turton	Response-01706	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Mr Luke	Response-01703	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Mr P J Tanner	Response-01728	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Mr R M Draper	Response-01856	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Mr R Widdowson	Response-01734	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Mr S. Haywood	Response-01585	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Mrs Christina Pope	Response-00732	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Mrs Donna C. Ball	Response-01594	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Mrs Froggatt	Response-00449	Too much heavy traffic causing air pollution
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Mrs Griffin	Response-01698	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Mrs J. Cooper	Response-01596	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Mrs Jennifer Fry	Response-00581	More traffic will increase air pollution
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Mrs Joanne Thompson	Response-01690	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Mrs J Reeder	Response-01909	This will deteriorate with all traffic with fumes & noise.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Mrs Lee Farabella	Response-01899	More emissions cause air pollution.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Mrs Linda Cox	Response-01753	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Mrs Luke	Response-01704	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Mrs M. Rose	Response-01583	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Mrs Marie Draper	Response-01755	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour. I suffer with C.O.P.D - more cars and lorries in the area will not help my health.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Mrs M Burke	Response-01887	More emissions will cause much more air pollution.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Mrs N Taylor	Response-01896	Vehicle emissions will cause much more air pollution.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Mrs Rachel Coats	Response-01623	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Mrs R Cordon	Response-01647	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Mrs Rigby	Response-00641	pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 & M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to the nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of this pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by noise, Air and light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Mrs Shani Wainwright	Response-00754	Pollution is already historically high in this area due to its proximity to the A52 & M1. A massive increase in vehicles means even more emissions and road noise. This is not only harmful to the environment and wildlife but also in particular to the current residents, as it will deteriorate their quality of life greatly and have lasting negative health and wellbeing implications. The M1 road widening has already brought heavy goods vehicles closer to nearby houses, increasing pollution levels. Plus increased traffic through Sandiacre due to the New Stanton Park development, bringing increased cars and many heavy goods vehicles through Sandiacre...again increasing traffic congestion and negative impacting air quality.....and on top of this you now propose to add a further 700 vehicles to the area due to the new development.....further impacting all of these issues. At peak times Sandiacre will become a car park of danger and pollution, with traffic queuing through Sandiacre to get to use junc 25 of the M1.....which is already a problem anyway!!!!

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Mrs Sheila Hickingbotham	Response-01338	The proposal to build these houses so close to the M1 motorway can only result in a further deterioration of air quality for the residents. This area of green belt land serves as a 'buffer' between the motorway and existing houses and contributes to the improvement of air quality by reducing pollution from vehicle use.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Mrs Shirley Victoria Riggs	Response-01685	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Mrs Susan Bantle	Response-01612	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Mrs Turton	Response-01707	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Mrs Whittaker	Response-00595	The additional houses will add to the poor air quality already in the area due the traffic on the motorway.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Nasim Rashid	Response-01103	Increase in cars is bound to have a detrimental effect on air quality
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Natalie Bentley	Response-01646	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Neil Biddulph	Response-01891	
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Nicole Cooper	Response-01597	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Nikki Vincent	Response-00688	The additional air pollution from the increased traffic in our local area will have health implications for all! The level of air pollution in our area is already of concern to me, particularly the effects this has on my children's future health.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Normn McCrea	Response-01754	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Oliver Marriott	Response-00679	Air Quality Pollution / Air quality - My husband suffers with asthma, we have a very strong concern over the air quality and the pollution caused by the extra traffic and larger vehicles, what measures will you take in order to prevent this?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Olivia Allen	Response-00520	Air quality will be a lot worse with more cars. We need to try and keep the green areas not turn it into grey areas
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Paige Walker	Response-01669	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Pam shepherd	Response-00453	With the motorway running on this route this area helps to reduce the damage to the air quality taking this land away and building on it is going to to reduce the air quality even more it's total impractical
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Pat Hardy	Response-01739	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Patricia Ancliff	Response-00948	The air quality on B5010 is already poor. Adding more vehicles can only worsen this
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Paula Darnell	Response-00665	The heavy electric cars the tyre wear the constant exceleration stopping and starting. The pollution will be immense. Then of course the fumes.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Paula Luck	Response-01710	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Paula Sims	Response-01687	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Paul Randall	Response-00131	This green belt offers a buffer zone between the existing residents and the M1 corridor. This buffer will disappear increasing the potential for poor air quality and increased noise in Sandiacre. Also, building new homes next to the motorway is not a great idea?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Paul Vleeton	Response-01770	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	paul wheeldon	Response-00582	Increased traffic fumes from extra traffic coupled with that coming from what is now an 8 lane M-way will be detrimental to health
			Paul Wilkes	Response-00599	We are not happy as the developers adding a bigger carbon footprint to the area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Peter Anthony	Response-01866	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Peter brown	Response-00671	We get lots of thick black dust inside our home already due to traffic pollution and it will get worse
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Peter Nicholls	Response-01622	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Pete West	Response-01700	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Phil Creasey	Response-01342	The increase in traffic from residents and construction activity will introduce more exhaust emissions and pollutions into the air which is extremely concerning considering how close the area is to a local nature reserve. These changes will significantly degrade the air quality around the area. Pollution is already high in the area due to the proximity to the A52 and M1 and the M1 junction 25. Widening of the M1 has already increased this pollution along with bringing the heavy goods vehicles closer to the housing. This proposed site currently acts to absorb much of this pollution .
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Philip Reed	Response-01449	I object to the proposed development of 180 houses on greenbelt land due to the significant deterioration in local air quality it would cause. Increased traffic and loss of natural vegetation will raise pollution levels, endangering public health and damaging biodiversity in an area meant to be protected for environmental preservation.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	P Sandes	Response-01682	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Rachel Crossley	Response-01661	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Rachel Skelton	Response-01241	Extra traffic in the area will worsen air pollution

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	R Barratt	Response-01664	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Rcahel Sharp	Response-00652	The air quality in the centre of Sandiacre is particularly bad due to the volume of traffic and type of traffic (HGV). Waiting to cross the roads there is bad. Family members used to live on Town Street and the grime from the air was evident on the inside surfaces and outside of the windows. We also have the M1 close by which must also affect the air quality and the development will be right next to this. Green spaces are vital to counteract this.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Rebecca Longmuir	Response-00253	You wish to add more traffic in a small tightly packed area. This is an obvious problem. More traffic and cars! More pollution. Less air quality for the locals and the children who live here
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Rhiannon Lowater	Response-01592	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	R Hibbitt	Response-01862	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Richard Broughton	Response-01352	It goes with saying that 180 house with like vehicles Woodburning stoves and the like can only be detrimental
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Richard Chambers	Response-00745	The air quality in Sandiacre is already poor due to the M1 - this will only make it worse
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Richard Deeprise	Response-00816	This development will reduce the air quality in the area due to more buildings and Vehicles
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Richard Haines	Response-01674	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Richard Jenkins	Response-00264	I also have respiratory issues and a regular prescription for nasal spray. It is only recently (November 2024) that I was able to stop using an inhaler to alleviate symptoms. The proposed development is likely to add some 20,000 vehicle movements per annum (using Government statistics) in the immediate vicinity ? ALL of these additional vehicles will be obliged to use Stanton Road (less than 200 metres from my house), and most will no doubt use Maple Avenue (less than 60 metres from my house). The additional microparticle pollution from rubber tyre degradation, brake dust and exhaust fumes are guaranteed to impact on our health. Bad enough at the best of times but made far worse when we can't even get to see a doctor!! The average UK household emits about 6 tonnes of CO2 annually. Thus, this development would equate to and extra 1,080 tonnes a year on households and wildlife. Constructing a new house likely emits on the order of 15 to 100 tons of CO2, thus some 2,700 ? 18,000 tons of CO2 would be created by this development.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Richard Marriott	Response-00675	Air Quality Pollution / Air quality - My husband suffers with asthma, we have a very strong concern over the air quality and the pollution caused by the extra traffic and larger vehicles, what measures will you take in order to prevent this?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Richard Naylor	Response-00066	The air quality will be affected during the years of building and the additional traffic of, say, 360 additional vehicles, 2 per house.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Richard Shrimpton	Response-01301	Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 & M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of this pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Rob Lowe	Response-01768	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Roger Farnsworth	Response-01910	Yet more cars, litter etc!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Rosemarie Gough	Response-00997	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Roy Drew	Response-01614	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Ruby Sharp	Response-00886	180 houses equals approx. 250 cars (O.N.S 1.29 per household) plus associated visitors etc going both ways up narrow steep existing roads gives conservative 19,000 vehicles per year. This coupled with the already high vehicle pollution from the M1 will give rise to serious health implications for the existing residents and foot traffic especially children on their way to school. Acceleration to get up the hill will emit high exhaust emissions and braking to avoid other vehicles. Braking to go down such steep streets necessitates using your brakes constantly especially at the blind corners and t junction this at Cloudside Rd. Vehicles will give off constant pollutants and micro plastics on both inward and outward journeys. Far in excess of acceptable levels.
			Ryan Selby	Response-00479	Air pollution with the added vehicles and the time it takes to build these houses and the machinery, air quality would be effected.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	S. Brailsford	Response-00598	Additional traffic from the lorries in building phase especially when stopped with the engine running for other road users to pass on already narrow streets will have a massive impact on air quality Additional cars from 180 extra houses will add to the traffic build up in the area causing excessive air pollution In summer you can already taste the difference in the air at peak times
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	S. Jones	Response-01615	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Sally Davies	Response-01294	Air quality is bound to be poor due to the higher levels of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Samantha Anne Whitney	Response-00757	The extra 360 cars, and emissions from housing and extra people are going to decrease the air quality. The air quality is already very close to the acceptable levels so with the extra development the air quality will be very poor. The development is next to the M1 motorway and I'm sure it wouldn't be pleasant for the homes to be so close to all those fumes either.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Samantha Whildes	Response-01270	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Sam Buckland	Response-00600	Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to M1, which runs alongside the majority of the current field. In particular congestion at peak times accessing junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to the proposed area. A number of trees on the site would need to be cut down which would further reduce the air quality as they naturally absorb pollutants.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Sam Fleck	Response-00821	I wish to object to the proposed development on the grounds of its likely negative impact on local air quality. Only a few years ago, parts of Sandiacre were identified as exceeding national air quality standards. It took considerable effort by both the local authority and the community to reduce harmful emissions and bring pollution levels under control. Monitoring and mitigation measures were introduced, and progress has been hard won. The land identified for development currently acts as a vital green buffer between the M1 motorway and existing residential properties. This open space plays an important role in absorbing pollutants and providing a physical barrier that shields homes from the worst effects of motorway emissions. The loss of this green space would remove that buffer entirely, exposing current residents to higher levels of air pollution. Furthermore, the proposed addition of 180 dwellings would lead to a significant increase in vehicle movements in the area both during construction and once the homes are occupied. This increased traffic, in combination with exposure to existing pollution from the M1, risks tipping the local area back into non-compliance with national air quality standards, undoing years of progress. This proposal is therefore in conflict with Paragraph 186 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which states that 'Planning policies and decisions should sustain and contribute towards compliance with relevant limit values or national objectives for pollutants.' It also goes against Paragraph 183, which requires planning decisions to ensure that new development is appropriate for its location, taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health and the natural environment. Allowing development in this location risks not only increasing air pollution for future residents, who would be living right next to a major motorway, but also worsens the quality of life and health outcomes for the existing community by removing a green space that currently acts as a protective buffer. For these reasons, I strongly object to the proposed development and urge the planning authority to carefully consider the long-term environmental and health impacts on the community.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Sam Greatorex	Response-01695	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Sandra Cooke	Response-01613	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Sarah Favell	Response-00038	This is of a bit concern due to the amount of HGVs going through the village and very near the M1
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Sarah Harrison	Response-01658	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	S Bryne	Response-01677	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Sebastian Roberts	Response-01675	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Shanead Ligton	Response-01689	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Shannon moss	Response-00454	The proposed development site is located on the edge of the M1, an area known for high levels of nitrogen oxides (NOx) and other harmful pollutants. Currently, the open fields serve as a natural disperser of these toxic gases. However, introducing a residential development will trap these pollutants, exposing future residents to dangerously poor air quality. The World Health Organisation (WHO) has linked prolonged exposure to NOx with respiratory diseases, cardiovascular issues, and premature deaths. Approving this development would be an irresponsible act of environmental and public health negligence
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Shannon Robinson	Response-01635	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	sharon thornhill	Response-00448	my comment on traffic covers this section adequately and during construction which i would presume will take a few years there will be a lot of pollution and dust etc
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Sharon weston	Response-00440	Air quality is appalling in Sandiacre,I live on chestnut grove,n I've never known a house so dusty,n got worse when an extra lane was added on m1 n yes I do clean my house
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Shaun Green	Response-01773	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Sheila	Response-00587	The existing Green Belt provides a vital buffer between residential areas and the M1 motorway, helping to mitigate air and noise pollution. Removing this buffer would directly expose future and existing residents to higher levels of harmful pollutants and noise, with potentially serious health implications. This is already public knowledge as you can check the current state of the Air quality in Sandiacre online.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Sheila Payne	Response-01782	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Sian Knox	Response-01679	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	S Leek	Response-01737	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Sonya Birkin	Response-01656	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Sophie	Response-00472	We already have struggles in the area with the local motorways polluting the area
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Sophie Bennett	Response-01631	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Sophie Farnsworth	Response-01913	Yet more cars, litter etc!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Stephen Barlow	Response-01808	I have recently moved to Sandiacre from Hallam Fields, Ilkeston to move away from the noise and pollution of Wards Recycling. We chose our property as it is a lovely area with good local amenities and walks with no noise or pollution which we previously experienced.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Stephen Davies	Response-00214	Currently the fields behind Larch Drive provide a break to M1. Development would worsen this. The area has only recently been agreed as having acceptable air quality and the proposed development is likely to reduce air quality bearing in mind additional vehicle movements. The reduction in green space will also exasperate the impact of the M1. Note also the impact of tyre dust from the ever increasing use of electric vehicles
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Stephen Sacker	Response-01598	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Steve Bilbie	Response-00285	Air quality is going to be at a high risk for the people in this area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Steve Whittaker	Response-01781	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Stuart Pensom	Response-00049	Air quality is getting bad. I have noticed this as being an asthma sufferer
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Sue Harrison	Response-01629	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Susan Heinke	Response-00468	This will considerably add to global warming and climate disruption. When are we going to learn and say enough is enough
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Susanne Beaven	Response-01618	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Tamara Partridge	Response-01780	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Tarnya Hinman	Response-01786	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Thomas Ilett	Response-01088	Research and studies have demonstrated living near a major road can have significant detrimental health consequences, including Alzheimer?s, Parkinson?s, multiple sclerosis and mental disorders ( <a href="https://ehjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12940-020-0565-4">https://ehjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12940-020-0565-4</a> and <a href="https://www.kcl.ac.uk/news/study-supports-link-between-traffic-related-air-pollution-and-mental-disorders">https://www.kcl.ac.uk/news/study-supports-link-between-traffic-related-air-pollution-and-mental-disorders</a> ). As the proposed housing allocation is within close proximity to the M1 motorway, these studies and research highlight housing allocation for this Green Belt as inappropriate. Aside from the aforementioned points, representing how the proposed housing allocation would negatively impact the current Sandiacre community, should the housing allocation go ahead; new residents would be blighted by the previous points and be subjected to increased negative health risks.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Tim Derbyshire	Response-01681	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Tim Gough	Response-00996	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Toby Moran	Response-01769	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Tom Ball	Response-01672	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Tony Weston	Response-00990	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Tracey Howe	Response-01860	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Tracey Hughes	Response-01699	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Tracy Jones	Response-00436	It is poor enough with the Lorrie?s running up and down derby road
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Tracy Kerry-Cliff	Response-00801	The levels of pollution, in this area will thus be increased incrementally - and it will be unacceptable. Health issues need to be considered, of the residents that already live in this busy community, and also, the mental health issues of all these people who currently use this open land to relax, and calm themselves, walking their children and animals and breathing in the fresh air.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Trevor Rowston	Response-01678	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Tricia Herbert	Response-00944	there are already problems with the huge number of lorries in this area since the opening of the Stanton Lorry Park alongside the unmonitored dust coming from Maple Tree Wood Yard...

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Try church	Response-00033	Constant heavy plant machinery will cause a massive reduction in air quality, dust disturbance and breathing issues. Many of the residents on larch drive are elderly and it will cause a drastic impact on health and anxiety
			Tyler Hobbs	Response-00879	Pollution due to additional cars that will frequent the local area will be bad for our children, wildlife and environment.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Vanessa Asbach	Response-00700	More houses mean more people, more people mean more cars. The emission is going to go up in the area and affect everyone around the area
			Verity Lamb	Response-01298	Again, you can't just keep increasing traffic in a finite area and not have pollution increase
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Vickie Wright	Response-01552	More vehicles means more emissions and noise. This not only harms the environment but also deteriorates the quality of life for current residents and wildlife.
			Vicky	Response-00485	Why destroy more green belt when there are houses empty!! We already have the local hotels filled with immigrants where does it end
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Victoria Abraham	Response-01652	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Victoria Galpin-shrimpton	Response-01009	Air Quality ? Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 & M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of this pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Victoria Greatorex	Response-01730	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Victoria Marriott	Response-00674	Pollution / Air quality - My husband suffers with asthma, we have a very strong concern over the air quality and the pollution caused by the extra traffic and larger vehicles, what measures will you take in order to prevent this?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Vivien Davis	Response-01582	Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. Pollution is historically high in this area because of the proximity to A52 and M1. In particular congestion at peak times accessing Junction 25 still takes place. Widening has brought the heavy goods vehicles even closer to nearby houses. This site acts as a lung absorbing much of pollution. Animals and wildlife will be greatly affected by Noise, Air and Light pollution affecting their natural behaviour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Wayne Major	Response-00408	I wish to object to the proposed development on the grounds of its likely negative impact on local air quality. Only a few years ago, parts of Sandiacre were identified as exceeding national air quality standards. It took considerable effort by both the local authority and the community to reduce harmful emissions and bring pollution levels under control. Monitoring and mitigation measures were introduced, and progress has been hard won. The land identified for development currently acts as a vital green buffer between the M1 motorway and existing residential properties. This open space plays an important role in absorbing pollutants and providing a physical barrier that shields homes from the worst effects of motorway emissions. The loss of this green space would remove that buffer entirely, exposing current residents to higher levels of air pollution. Furthermore, the proposed addition of 180 dwellings would lead to a significant increase in vehicle movements in the area both during construction and once the homes are occupied. This increased traffic, in combination with exposure to existing pollution from the M1, risks tipping the local area back into non-compliance with national air quality standards, undoing years of progress. This proposal is therefore in conflict with Paragraph 186 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which states that "Planning policies and decisions should sustain and contribute towards compliance with relevant limit values or national objectives for pollutants." It also goes against Paragraph 183, which requires planning decisions to ensure that new development is appropriate for its location, taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health and the natural environment. Allowing development in this location risks not only increasing air pollution for future residents, who would be living right next to a major motorway, but also worsens the quality of life and health outcomes for the existing community by removing a green space that currently acts as a protective buffer. For these reasons, I strongly object to the proposed development and urge the planning authority to carefully consider the long-term environmental and health impacts on the community.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	William Marriott	Response-00676	Air Quality Pollution / Air quality - My husband suffers with asthma, we have a very strong concern over the air quality and the pollution caused by the extra traffic and larger vehicles, what measures will you take in order to prevent this?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Air Quality	Zoe Hughes	Response-01919	The area is already polluted by the M1 & A52 adding such a densely populated housing estate will cause further issues.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Aaron Locksley	Response-00711	The bus service itself will struggle with the traffic, especially when heavy goods vehicles and the buses cross paths. Apart from that does the bus service around peak usage have the capacity to cater for 180 new homes?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	A Harby	Response-01684	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Alex Corns	Response-01151	With potentially 180 houses being built, will the local bus service be required to put extra services on ? This again will add to compromised safety/traffic congestion as they already struggle to navigate around the streets of Sandiacre.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Alice Cooper	Response-01721	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Alice Ilett	Response-00571	The bus service generally around Sandiacre is great. However around this area of Sandiacre due to the bad traffic already can take a while. The parking and traffic in general- especially around school hours is dangerous and the bus can't always get through.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Amanda Leech	Response-01625	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Amy Cray	Response-01223	There?s no bus?.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Amy Skinner	Response-01447	The bus services that operate in and around Sandiacre estates already struggle at times to navigate through narrow roads which have cars parked either side. This makes the running of the service difficult and in fact it simply doesn't serve some streets after 7pm due to the lack of road access. I firmly believe that the works and the huge increase in traffic will make this service nigh on impossible to operate as frequently as it does, which would thus negatively impact the many many people who are dependent upon it. If the bus was no longer able to serve the estates at all due to the increased congestion many people would struggle as it is a long walk into Sandiacre town, one which for the elderly and those with reduced mobility would be unable to undertake.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Anastasia Anthony	Response-01865	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Andrew Bishop	Response-01186	The current service already has difficulty navigating the volume of free flowing and parked traffic therefore any increase will add more burden.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Andrew Davies	Response-01295	It will require an increase in the frequency of 14b for those travelling toward Ilkeston so that have an alternative public transport service offered. Also to access public transport toward Derby would require walk through to Derby Rd
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Andrew Marvin	Response-00255	Many elderly people rely on this bus service which is already a challenging route for the buses based on the local parking and traffic It?s going to be very dangerous!!!!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Andrew Meadwell	Response-01654	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Andria Nyilasi	Response-00672	The local bus service would be put under tremendous strain by the sheer volume of extra passengers. It would not be able to reach the new estate due to the narrow roads and lack of turning points.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Andy Martin	Response-01761	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Anne Butler	Response-00385	Bus services to it will be non existent as the buses will not be able to negotiate the surrounding streets.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Anne Castledine	Response-00499	Buses have problems getting around because of parking, the roads are those of a village; extra traffic from the proposed house builds will cause mayhem.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Anne Jenkins	Response-00350	There would be no opportunity to extend the bus route and extra traffic would make it difficult for buses to cope
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Annette Jones	Response-00961	The bus service already struggles with access at times. In winter this is made even worse because of the steepness and tight manoeuvres that have to be contemplated. The snow and ice is very hazardous and doesn't melt as quick at the top so some people are house bound during this period.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Ann Harrison	Response-01602	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Anthony Pearson	Response-01760	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Antony M Ingram	Response-01626	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	A R Gregory	Response-01918	
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Awson Wheldon	Response-01649	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Barbara and John Morrell	Response-00509	I am greatly concerned about the impact extra traffic will have on the bus route which at the moment runs very near to this proposed development and down Beech Avenue. The area will quite simply not cope with more vehicles.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Barbara Michell	Response-01787	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Barbara Warton	Response-01886	Can't facilitate any more.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Barry Partridge	Response-01778	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Ben Hollins	Response-01651	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Ben Snowdon	Response-00428	The busses get stuck at my house on Stanton Road with the current traffic levels. Increased traffic will make the bus route even more congested. I have photographic evidence
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Beverley Gardner	Response-01692	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Beverley Green	Response-01686	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Bill Hartley	Response-01696	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Bill Meadwell	Response-00864	There is a limited service from Sandiacre estates. The Nottingham Trent Barton 14 service only runs until 7pm and after that time you have to walk from Stanton Road. Many people, especially the elderly and disabled, would find that an impossible walk as it is uphill all the way. There is a bus to Ilkeston, but this only goes along Stanton Road. It is inevitable that people will use cars and taxis, especially for medical appointments.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	B T Duke	Response-01900	No Bus.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	B T Keen	Response-01735	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	c/o The Equalised Club	Response-01603	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Callum binnall	Response-00460	The bus is already struggling, you wouldn't be able to add any bus stops as the bus wouldn't get up near the new builds
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	C A Partridge	Response-01903	Buses would not be able to extend route 4. They are already looking at shortening the route because of parked cars.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Caroline Driver	Response-00618	There is a bus service but there shouldn't be as the roads are too narrow. The bus is regularly stuck on Beech Avenue, honking their horn and the driver knocking on doors, often very angrily. When I'm driving on my own street, it is necessary to mount the curb in order for the bus and a car to pass at the same time. This is a danger to all especially pedestrians.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Carol Marshall	Response-00736	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Catherine Richardson	Response-00531	The bus service already struggles with access and frequently gets held up on Beech Avenue
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Charlotte Fry	Response-00583	We already have plenty of buses coming up and down the roads. We don't need anymore
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Charlotte Hunter	Response-01376	There is a major bus route which falls at the bottom of the road, this is going to cause mayhem as the roads are very narrow. Being prone to accidents happening.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	C Holmes	Response-01620	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Chris Hume	Response-01373	I use the buses to Nottingham, there are often issues for the drivers with parked cars and vans for the busses to pass. Honestly I don't know how the drives put up with this as it's dangerous now, this development would make it worse
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Chris Jones	Response-01718	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Chris O Connor	Response-01641	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Christian Rearson	Response-01763	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Christine Anderson	Response-00484	Extra traffic will impinge on our already stretched local bus service. Buses are required, especially for the elderly, to reach the Drs, Chemist, Shops etc. Buses are unable to get through the estate and more cars on our small roads will make it quite impossible and feel that the Bus companies will have to change their routes !

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Christine Gough	Response-00578	One bus service runs up and down Beech Avenue and Coronation rd, and Stanton Road . This is a necessity for people who need to get to work., shopping and for the elderly that rely on this . Not many people I have seen use the bus from this end at work peak times but of course the bus would pick up through Sandiacre . It is needed . The only complaint I have is that the buses struggle to get down Beech Avenue most of the time , due to the cars being parked in this road . And it's a complete nightmare school times with even more cars parked outside the school on Stanton Road, and cars parked to use the shop with the only post office in Sandiacre at the shop . The shop and school are on the same side . Elm Ave gets cars parked all along there too so difficult for them pulling out when a bus is trying to turn into Spencer Ave .
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Christine Ridgway	Response-00465	I rely on using the buses to get about and they are very limited, so this issue would be made worse with new housing developments.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Claire binnall	Response-00459	Useless services always late
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Clare Green	Response-01751	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Cole Hawkins	Response-01714	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Colin Cox	Response-01716	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Colin Marriott	Response-00686	The i 4 bus service in this area is a godsend especially for elderly people. If this development was to go ahead and with increased traffic movement, congestion on Stanton Road . Could this mean a cancellation of the bus which would lead to some people being unable to get to shops, the Post Office or face a 15 to 20 minute walk to another bus stop.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Courtney Bennett	Response-00593	The bus services in the area is already inconsistent. This will cause more people to use cars and motorbikes increasing the road congestion even more, polluting the air even more, increasing the risk of antisocial behaviour towards pedestrians and transport services when there aren't enough services to provide for the residents as is.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Craig Freeman	Response-01561	Buses can only loop around Coronation Avenue and Maple Drive. These buses often have to use the pavements to navigate around the narrow turns. This will require many people having to walk down from the new estate to a very limited number of ref bus stops, potentially requiring more frequent buses along congested and narrow roads.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Craig Richards	Response-01638	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Craig Thims	Response-01765	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Cristina Jenkins	Response-01588	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	C Thompson	Response-01634	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Daniel	Response-00545	The local council in my opinion runs a good public transport system however adding. Adding 180 new households will put pressure on this and lead to a inferior service. Without significant investment in bus infrastructure, the majority of new residents will rely on private vehicles, which will worsen congestion and pollution.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Daniel Downes	Response-01630	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Danielle Harrison	Response-00568	The bus route through the estate already struggles to navigate the roads, this will be increased with a further highly populated estate is built with poor access routes to it.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Darran and Emma Rea	Response-00597	The bus service is a concern, it is going to isolate and cut off a lot of elderly and disabled people who do not have access to cars if the bus that currently services this area has to cease because of the increase in traffic and parked cars
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	David Casey	Response-01608	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	David Cater	Response-01756	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	David Ruddock	Response-01776	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	David Tindsley	Response-00515	I wish to raise an objection to the proposed development on the grounds of poor accessibility and inadequate public transport provision. There is already existing evidence that buses regularly struggle to navigate the narrow residential roads leading to the proposed site. In some cases, buses have become stuck due to parked cars and tight corners. Given the constraints, I am uncertain how a large service bus would be able to safely access the proposed site entrance, especially when accounting for construction traffic and future vehicle use. If a bus is unable to enter the site itself, residents particularly those who are older or have limited mobility would be expected to walk back uphill from the existing bus stop on Cloudside Road/Maple Avenue to return home. This presents a serious accessibility concern, as the existing roads include a significant gradient, which would make walking difficult or even unmanageable for many, especially in poor weather. This directly conflicts with Paragraph 112 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which requires that developments give priority to pedestrian and cycle movements and promote access to high-quality public transport. It also contradicts Paragraph 130, which emphasises that developments should be inclusive and accessible, ensuring that they meet the needs of people with disabilities and reduced mobility. If the development cannot provide a site layout that enables safe and practical access for buses, it will result in a scheme that is not only poorly connected but excludes a significant portion of the population from being able to live there comfortably. For these reasons, I object to the current proposal and urge the planning authority to ensure that any approved development provides proper, accessible public transport links that serve all residents.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	David Yeo	Response-01705	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Dawn Glennis Smith	Response-00510	Bus services are already impacted by parked vehicles, narrow roads, etc. An already difficult route would prove impossible if extended.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Dean Bosworth	Response-01665	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Dean Lavelle	Response-01774	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Debra Michell	Response-01346	We need this bus service for everyone. I do believe you should double yellow lines on the corners of Beech Avenue so the bus can get round more easily.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Debra Scully	Response-00288	Insufficient bus services in the area and none adjacent to the site means more cars in the road
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Denise Creasey	Response-00786	As the current bus service is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue due to the steepness and parked cars it would not be possible to provide a bus service for a residents on an even higher site.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Denise Lingard	Response-01759	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Dennis Watts	Response-01726	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Derek Morton	Response-01607	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Derrick Hunt	Response-00437	There is only one bus route one way up Stanton road up coronation ave down beech AVE up Stanton road and put through travers road. If it can get round due to parked cars delivery drivers and courier vans blocking the roads
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Destiny Jade-Blake	Response-01636	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Diane Jones	Response-00852	Sandiacre has no Chemist, Bank or Post Office and one Doctor's surgery. This means that people have to travel into Stapleford or Long Eaton to access these services. The village cannot sustain increases in population in our local schools etc.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Diane Mcmorrow	Response-00433	There is a bus service it sometimes struggles to pass with park cars I can't imagine what the extra volume of traffic would do to the bus service our roads are not built to cope with this.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Diane Meadwell	Response-00807	There is a limited bus service in this area. The residents of the proposed development will not be close to any of these services and will no doubt drive to their destinations. The walk from the area to the nearest bus stop is quite substantial, with the return trip being uphill. This excludes those people who are unable to carry out this walk, and could thus create isolation
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Diane Turner	Response-01744	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	D Pallett	Response-01627	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	D Simpson	Response-01712	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Eleanor Moseley	Response-00799	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Eleanor Newman	Response-00718	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Elisha Gunn	Response-00585	Due to the increased number of cars already parking on the roads causing minor obstructions to bus services and difficulty navigating from the Bluebell end of Sandiacre right up to beech avenue and round by adding more houses which will increase the number of cars will make this extremely important bus service nearly impossible to continue
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Emma Ryan	Response-00503	Perhaps it will get a few more people using the bus service. But that is probably the only positive I can see in any of this. But I doubt that many as the bus service isn't that reliable at the best of times.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Emma Wall	Response-00319	Coronation Avenue is already difficult for buses to get through the increase of buses. I've no doubt we need to go up through cloud side in order to get to this new development and therefore the infrastructure will not cope with it.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Esther Cook	Response-01861	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Fay Cresswell	Response-00701	Currently we have the I4 and 14 bus service this side of Sandiacre with only the I4 coming anywhere near to the new development. The nearest bus stop will be where Coronation/Mapleand Cloudside meets. This runs from 5:30 until 7pm then nothing until following day with no service up here Sunday. During the rest of the time buses run on Stanton Road a good 20 minutes away from the new development for the able bodied. The I4 runs to Nottingham and the 14 Ilkeston.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Gail Berry	Response-01644	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Geoff Tindley	Response-00755	1. Whilst I do not have any experience of using the bus service in the area, I can well understand the problems that the buses have in negotiating the local roads. I know that both my parents have had situations where the bus driver has been unable to get through a gap because of parked cars, and has had to stop and knock on doors to ask people to move their vehicles. I wish to raise an objection to the proposed development on the grounds of poor accessibility and inadequate public transport provision. 2. There is no way that a bus could access the development land. Access from the development site would be difficult for less mobile residents, or parents with pushchairs, and I believe this would discourage the use of public transport, and thereby encourage increased car usage, which is not ecologically friendly. For these reasons, I object to the current proposal and urge the planning authority to ensure that any approved development provides proper, accessible public transport links that serve all residents.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Georgia C	Response-01296	Limited bus services in place as is.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Georgia Marvin	Response-00261	The I4 is the only bus route which many residents rely on. Many elderly residents rely on this service to carry out their retirement. The bus service struggles to get through as it is with the congestion of vehicles and parked cars. How are the services going to cope with over 200 more residents to take ? The buses will always be reaching full capacity !
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Gill West	Response-01725	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Glyn Holner	Response-01697	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Gordon Bruce	Response-01455	The busses on Coronation AVE and Stanton Road are frequently held up by the many cars which struggle to park to access Cloudside, the swimming clubs at the pool and the Costcuttr shop. 180 extra houses will only make bus access more difficult.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Gordon Daris	Response-01639	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Greg Cox	Response-01702	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Gregg Bartrum	Response-01591	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Helen	Response-00883	The I4 bus already has issues getting around the route up Stanton Road and onto the estate. Many times vehicles have to back up to allow the bus to pass due to parking and accessibility. The roads aren't wide enough for vehicles to pass as it is. With increased traffic this will cause major congestion and road rage incidents!



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Helen Gillain	Response-00964	One one day alone I witnessed 2 busses struggling to get through Coronation Avenue ... I am told by an i4 Trent Barton Driver that this service is regularly cancelled due to inaccessability issues
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Helen Richardson	Response-00432	There are no significant bus services that service the proposed area apart from the R4 which has a limited time table.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Helen Thompson	Response-01356	I think this will exacerbate the problems of bus access through this area due to increased traffic and parking. Has the bus company been consulted with especially about existing problems?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Helen whiteman	Response-00447	How are you going to get buses up there. No thought whatsoever given as usual from an uncaring council
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Ian herbert	Response-00939	The i4 bus service does go near to the proposed site but residents will find that after 6pm it becomes a cinderella service with frequent cancellations and only once an hour after 8pm.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	IAN TAYLOR	Response-00972	There is currently only one bus route in this area (i4) which is already liable to regular disruption due to congestion on Stanton Road and other roads. Buses regularly cannot turn onto Spencer Avenue, causing delays and impacting pedestrian safety.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Ian Ward	Response-01628	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Irina Anthony	Response-01867	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Isabelle Love	Response-00529	One bus that passes through the area to commute to Nottingham (not Derby), and struggles to do so, this will only encourage the use of cars. i4 is a poor service at the best of times.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Isobel Ball	Response-01092	Our bus services are already strained. With some not showing up and most overcrowded. It is almost impossible to get where you need to be without leaving at least 2x earlier than is required. This is already a difficulty many of us face living in this area. So building houses to live hundreds more will absolutely escalate this issue. Furthermore, buses may have to become more frequent to accommodate to the additional passengers. Which will make the difficulty of getting around those tight corners and streets more frequent, thus, making congestion far far worse.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	J. E. Lord	Response-01601	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Jack Greatorex	Response-01731	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Jacob Whitt	Response-01748	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Jacqueline Marshall	Response-01436	If you have checked how difficult it is for buses to navigate the route that they take at present you would fully understand that extra buses can not be accommodated and would not be able to access the proposed development without great disruption to residents.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Jade Smith	Response-01783	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	James Meadwell	Response-01653	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	James Roberts	Response-01708	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	James Seward	Response-01683	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Jane Elizabeth Tindsley	Response-00669	I wish to raise an objection to the proposed development on the grounds of poor accessibility and inadequate public transport provision. There is already existing evidence that buses regularly struggle to navigate the narrow residential roads leading to the proposed site. I have personally used the 14 bus service both to Nottingham and returning to Sandiacre (Larch Drive). On several occasions the bus driver has had to stop the bus, get off, and physically knock on the doors both on Beech Avenue and Coronation Road to ascertain who the car(s) belonged to and to request them to move their car(s) to allow the bus to continue its journey. Given the constraints, I am uncertain how a large service bus would be able to safely access the proposed site entrance, especially when accounting for construction traffic and future vehicle use. If a bus is unable to enter the site itself, residents particularly those who are older or have limited mobility would be expected to walk back uphill from the existing bus stop on Cloudside Road/Maple Avenue to return home. This presents a serious accessibility concern, as the existing roads include a significant gradient, which would make walking difficult or even unmanageable for many, especially in poor weather. This directly conflicts with Paragraph 112 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which requires that developments give priority to pedestrian and cycle movements and promote access to high-quality public transport. It also contradicts Paragraph 130, which emphasises that developments should be inclusive and accessible, ensuring that they meet the needs of people with disabilities and reduced mobility. If the development cannot provide a site layout that enables safe and practical access for buses, it will result in a scheme that is not only poorly connected but excludes a significant portion of the population from being able to live there comfortably. For these reasons, I object to the current proposal and urge the planning authority to ensure that any approved development provides proper, accessible public transport links that serve all residents.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Janet Edwards	Response-01906	Services are already overstretched & the proposed building would put even more pressure on them.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Janet Whildes	Response-01869	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Janice Taylor	Response-01743	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Janice West	Response-00989	Buses are so precious to all residents of Sandiacre and on the Coronation Estate essential. The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Janine Holmes	Response-01595	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Jason Deepprose	Response-00818	Make more free bus services. If public transport was free or cost less people would stop using cars
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Jason Harwood	Response-01667	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Jason Webb	Response-01637	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Jayne Rowley	Response-01279	Due to the narrowness of some of the roads in this area and also the parked cars the bus often struggles to follow its route as it is unable to pass through the parked cars on and oncoming traffic. The increase in traffic and also industrial traffic would potentially make the service unreliable for its users.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	J Cates	Response-01750	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Jeanette O Connor	Response-01640	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Jennifer Bailey	Response-01857	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Jennifer Saville	Response-00516	already commented on, problems with 14 accessing bus route around narrow streets

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Jennifer Tindsley	Response-00751	1. Whilst I do not have any experience of using the bus service in the area, I can well understand the problems that the buses have in negotiating the local roads. I know that both my parents have had situations where the bus driver has been unable to get through a gap because of parked cars, and has had to stop and knock on doors to ask people to move their vehicles. I wish to raise an objection to the proposed development on the grounds of poor accessibility and inadequate public transport provision. 2. There is no way that a bus could access the development land. Access from the development site would be difficult for less mobile residents, or parents with pushchairs, and I believe this would discourage the use of public transport, and thereby encourage increased car usage, which is not ecologically friendly. For these reasons, I object to the current proposal and urge the planning authority to ensure that any approved development provides proper, accessible public transport links that serve all residents.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Jenny Stephens	Response-01723	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Joanna hardy	Response-01304	The current bus services struggle to get along some of the narrow roads in sandiacre and increased traffic from the proposed site would increase this issue.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Joanne Guyatt	Response-01784	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Joanne Johnson	Response-00765	Our bus service is adequate, we don't need anything changing in this area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Jodie Owen	Response-01688	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Jodie Shrive	Response-00601	The public transport around this area of Sandiacre is already very limited, adding another 180 homes with at least 2 people per household puts increased & un-needed pressure on a public transport system that is already on it's knees. Therefore you will be encouraging people to use their cars, referring back to the other issue of congestion. Has this been thought through at all?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Jo Gerhardt	Response-01286	There would be no access to bus stops unless you walked down a steep hill. Could be difficult in icy bad weather.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	John Gardner	Response-01694	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	John G Brown	Response-01752	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	John Hibbitt	Response-01855	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	John Ledger	Response-01605	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	John Payne	Response-01785	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	John whiteman	Response-00450	No buses will be able to get near to the proposed site
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Jon Burn	Response-01722	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Josh Williams	Response-01632	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	J Pearson	Response-01772	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Judith A Pulfer	Response-01863	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Judith Blackburn	Response-01928	Delays in bus journeys.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Julie Hill	Response-01643	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Karen Alldread	Response-01868	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Karen Blain	Response-01732	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Karen Harwood	Response-01668	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Karen Pitts	Response-00643	I refer to the increase in traffic congestion. If you take the time to speak to bus drivers on the route, I think they would all agree that it is already intolerable, causing delays and frustration to all concerned.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Kathryn Lovatt	Response-00497	Regular users of the Trent Barton i4 bus service including many elderly people, could be adversely affected by the increase in vehicles on Coronation Avenue/Beech Avenue (due to the proposed housing development). The i4 bus currently has difficulties negotiating the number of vehicles (including parked vehicles) on Beech Avenue and frequently gets completely stuck and has to wait for cars to move. I have personally been a bus passenger when this has happened. This congestion would be made worse by increased number of vehicles on Stanton Road, Beech Avenue and Coronation Avenue. My fear is that Trent Barton could stop this bus service altogether as it impacts on their drivers and timetabling. The removal of this bus service would prevent non drivers (including elderly and disabled) accessing shops, doctors surgeries etc. and would mean some people losing their independence thus having a detrimental impact on their lives.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Kathryn Martin	Response-00527	Surrounding roads are tight and congested, buses often get stuck.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Katie Morrice	Response-00664	There is a regular bus route through station Road, coronation avenue, maple avenue and Beech avenue. This route already has to avoid a lot of the on street parking around the area, having an increased traffic flow will cause a lot of congestion turning onto streets like cloudside Road where a bus stop is right at the bottom of it. As the current bus service is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue due to the steepness and parked cars it would not be possible to provide a bus service for a residents on an even higher site.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Katie Robinson	Response-00943	The bus that services the top of the estate is already under pressure - during the winter it can not services the area where the proposed plan is due to ICE or snow or extreme weather. In addition to this in sometimes has to miss this side of the estate out due to the traffic on the roads and parked cars. I have experience myself many times the road has been blocked as the bus can not proceed on his route due to park cars and at worse double parked cars - the roads are small as it is so when the cars are double parked it makes it very difficult for the bus to proceed. We have to wait for the driver to knock on doors asking people to move their cars and at best they do and if they don't I have seen the bus reverse and exit and not complete the route he is meant to go on. Add extra traffic and park cars and this is only going to get worse. Some people relay on that service -people like myself that have mobility problems so not having this service or having it effected will cause major problems. Also if the bus route is constantly effected could Trent Barton pull the service from this area? Currently it's manageable with problems but this build could very easily push it pass the point of manageable.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Katrina	Response-00628	I've already seen the i4 bus driver have to leave the vehicle to knock on peoples doors to get them to move their cars as he was unable to fit through, this will get even worse with more cars on the road.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Kelly Randall	Response-00591	Current bus services are limited, with the R4 route only serving Nottingham and often disrupted during winter. Other public transport links are not within easy walking distance, reducing the site's accessibility.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Kelsey Green	Response-01666	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Kenneth Cooper	Response-01720	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Kern-Paul Lewis	Response-01715	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Kerry Meadwell	Response-01655	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Kerry Smith	Response-01271	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Kerry stokes	Response-00769	Buses often have trouble trying to get round the streets in this area due to the volume of parked cars. We've had experience of big Lorries getting stuck down Stanton road when they meet public buses coming in the opposite direction, this results in them mounting the kerb which is really dangerous for me & my children walking on the pavements. We already have congestion with various businesses around us which bring in bigger vehicles, the construction of the new houses will bring even more & block up the roads. We had one incident where a bus & lorry met on Stanton road & couldn't get past one another so the bus had to mount the pavement & manoeuvre several times before they could move any where.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	KH Taylor	Response-01663	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Kim Helm	Response-00632	An extra bus service or more frequent buses will be needed putting more vehicles on the road
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Kirk Moss	Response-00439	The existing bus route that serves Sandiacre already struggles to navigate the narrow streets near the proposed site. If public buses struggle with access, larger construction and delivery vehicles will find it nearly impossible.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Kirsty	Response-00970	Roads are too tight for buses
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Kirsty Handa	Response-00445	There is a 1 bus that services this area. The proposed development could negatively impact this service as it already struggles to drive through the estate with parked cars, adding more vehicles will hinder this
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Kirsty Meredith	Response-01462	The bus already struggles to get round Coronation avenue, we do not want to lose this service due to access issues becoming worse.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Kristie Rugers	Response-01864	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Kyle Jones	Response-01764	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	L A Keen	Response-01659	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Laura Hallam	Response-01711	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Laurence Luck	Response-01727	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Lauren Freeman	Response-01562	I have witnessed the 14 bus struggle to pass the corner of town street onto Stanton Road and also the corner onto Spencer avenue countless times because of parked cars and traffic. As well as the great difficulty it has actually passing from one end of Stanton Road to the other during school start and end. This would become a greater problem with more traffic and construction vehicles. If Trent Barton then decide that Stanton Road/coronation avenue/beech avenue are impassable and change the route this could have a major impact on residents.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Lauren Rose	Response-01446	Bus services have already been cut to the proposed development area and so the area is already poorly serviced. In the winter, buses struggle to access the area above Coronation Avenue due to the steep nature of the roads and lack of gritting by the Council. More people moving into the area will only place further strain on an already stretched bus service.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Lee Wilcock	Response-01670	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Lesley Bruce	Response-01397	The bus services around Stanton Road and Coronation Avenue already suffer dramatically from the narrow roads and lack of parking. The extra cars arriving at the schools would make this desperate situation considerably worse with greater congestion.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Lia Thims	Response-01766	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Linda Castledine-Davies	Response-00850	There is one regular bus service but the bus can only access the lower streets because of the steep terrain, parked cars, narrowness of the roads. The steepness especially towards the top is extreme making it impossible for many to walk to and from the bus stop. Personally, due to health issues - heart and respirator, I am unable to negotiate such a steep hill and like most have to rely on my car to travel. The bus is unable to complete its journey during icy weather again because of the obstructions, narrowness and steepness. When it passes down Beech Avenue vehicles have to mount the pavement to allow it to pass and the congestion from school run vehicles on Beech and Stanton Road often causes delays as the bus cannot get past. The bus often has to curtail its route because of access leaving folk stranded. It is a notorious route that bus drivers dread being allocated.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Lindsey Rawlinson	Response-01624	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	LISA ANNE GILLIGAN-LEE	Response-00710	Such a development would place immense pressure on local infrastructure?schools, GP surgeries, public transport, and emergency services are already stretched. Without serious and sustainable planning, these additional homes could lead to long-term issues for the entire community. In light of all these concerns, I strongly urge you to reject the proposed development. Instead, I ask that the Council consider alternative solutions that protect our green spaces and focus on improving, not undermining, the quality of life in Toton.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Lisa J Pearson	Response-01762	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Liz Woodhouse	Response-01584	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	L Mee	Response-01777	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Logan Fox	Response-00746	I take the bus each day and have to walk to the bus stop as it is a few mins away from the house. In winter, the bus cannot make it up the road when it freezes over and results in us having to walk on the icy roads to get closer to home. Surely with more people, this can be a risk particularly for older people having to walk in this situation?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Lorraine Hands	Response-00534	I have already mentioned that buses struggle to get through Coronation Avenue and down Beach Avenue, I say again safety of all pedestrians would be affected if the volume of traffic was to increase on such scale!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Louise dix	Response-00975	Buses already struggle to make it around the estate so the increase in traffic would make it a nightmare for buses and the resident with delays to service
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Louise Felfoldt	Response-01733	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Louise Harper	Response-01571	The buses are usually regular but in the snowy weather we had recently the bus didn't turn up at all due to the road going round coronation avenue not getting gritted, I usual leave my moped down there as chestnut doesn't get gritted at all but I was unable to use it to get to work at the road was dangerous
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Louise Harrison	Response-01719	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Louise Jacks	Response-01767	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Louise Libberton	Response-01693	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Lucy johnson	Response-01369	I do think the bus service in sandiacre is quite good! We get regular bus services to Nottingham and Derby! It helps out the community massively! We dont want to put a strain on that!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Luke Chein	Response-01779	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Lynda Morton	Response-01606	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Macie Brothwell	Response-01633	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Malcolm Dillon	Response-00722	Currently this greenbelt area does not need, or have, a bus service. The current road structure does not permit busses to go up to the start of the proposed development. The current bus system is limited in timings and route options. Journeys to Nottingham is the only option for current users. This limitation is unlikely to change due to the costs involved in running any bus service. This limitation of destination options will have a detrimental effect on the occupants of this proposed development.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Malcolm Fox	Response-00215	1 Bus, 1 route.... Again, very little consideration for current infrastructure. Trying to solve an issue further down the line (housing) without first supporting the key required elements - transport being one, is short sighted and shows lack of serious consideration.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Malcolm Riggs	Response-01680	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Malc Orbiston	Response-01673	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Mandy Rait	Response-01587	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Mark Gough	Response-00888	We need a bus service for people who don't drive , elderly people to get to their appointments and for shopping , so we don't want to loose that . However we could if the traffic increases and makes it even more difficult for the buses to get round Beech Avenue, Stanton Road . We need to use the buses more to save using cars and more pollution . This build of 180?more houses will add to the traffic chaos and could cause the bus company to either take the bus (i4) off altogether, or divert it making it harder for the elderly to walk to the stops. Especially in icy and wintry weather . This could add to falls and broken hips .
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Mark Leek	Response-01740	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	mark skelton	Response-01341	Already used during peak times. Hope the route won't have to have more busses to cope, have impact on air quality and heavy traffic down the road.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Martin Driver	Response-01387	Bus can hardly get through already due to traffic issues. NO MORE TRAFFIC!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Martin Hardy	Response-01413	We already have problems with bus access. At least a few times a week the buses are forced to wait honking their horns to get other vehicles to move when parked. There have been rumours that they will stop the bus loop up coronation avenue due to these issues. More traffic would only increase this problem.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Martyn Locker	Response-00903	This has been covered in previous sections.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Matt Hallam	Response-00476	No way could busses be able to travel up anywhere near this new estate, the bends on cloudside are too tight plus the 2 lanes are not the normal road width .Bad weather is near impossible to get down cloudside when it snows and we often have to grit this ourselves.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Matthew Buckland	Response-00615	The bus can only get as close as Coronation Avenue to the site. In winter, it struggles to access this road, and Beech Avenue due to ice. There are also a lot of occasions when the bus hasn't been able to drive round Coronation Avenue and Beech Avenue due to parked cars blocking the road. The way that new developments are built now, a bus wouldn't be able to drive round on a new route either.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Maurice Mason	Response-01617	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Maxine Sutton	Response-00471	Very few buses run through Sandiacre, I doubt they would be able to cope with more people. There are no links to the tram network which might help take traffic off the main roads.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	M Dougle	Response-01749	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	M Eastwood	Response-01757	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Melanie	Response-00586	While the current bus service is available, its coverage is limited and often unreliable, particularly in adverse weather. Other bus routes are located approximately 20 minutes? walk away, which is not suitable for many residents, especially the elderly or those with mobility issues.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Melanie Caumont	Response-01272	Current bus routes already struggle to navigate the estate due to narrow roads and parked vehicles. Additional housing will exacerbate this issue, making public transport less reliable and less attractive, further pushing residents towards car use and worsening congestion and pollution
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Melanie Howarth	Response-01621	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Michael Anderson	Response-00461	Main bus services to Ilkeston, Nottingham, Derby, and local facilities such as doctors, dentists, chemists are already a problem getting through will become even worse with the extra traffic. This will be particular concern to the ageing community.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Michell Birkin	Response-01657	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Michelle Alsop	Response-01645	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Michelle Cox	Response-01724	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Michelle Ledger	Response-00815	I get the i4 bus service most days and this is my experience at 10am in the mornings which i dare say is the quietest time of the week. Navigating the bend at Blue Bell/Sandiacre football club. Many occasions where cars parking on the road at the football club, and with it been almost a blind bend make bus passing very difficult School - school drops mean influx of drivers who then park outside school and up Beech Ave, sometimes right on the bend and on pavements..buses cannot get through many times. I have witnessed buses been at a standstill until parents have done there drop and returned to their car Coronation Ave -turning in from Stanton Road - cars often parked on pavement as road too narrow to park on both sides - with the cars that are parked on the road you can only drive 1 a time through there right the way round. (You can here the bus drivers chuntering to themselves under their breath lol) Bus stop bottom of Cloudside Road/Maple Ave..again noted cars resorting to parking on pavements but the bus ALWAYS have a nightmare navigating this bend (I think most of them feel they have drawn a short straw when they are given the Sandiacre route ) Beech Ave - again, buses noted having to weave their way through the parked cars. Given this is the main road up to Cloudside estate/Maple Ave etc etc this road along with Coronation is no where near wide enough as it is currently never mind more housing stock to support. Also to add on, the traffic queues at the crossroads even at this time of day waiting to turn from Lidl into estate is simply horrendous - I have noted this be worse last year or so clearly because of all the HGVs coming and going to the Stanton Works site. I have often wondered if i was ever to need an abulance or had a fire how on earth could the emergency services get to me at times? Or moreso in a urgent manner? We simply cannot support HGVs/building vehicles in this area - they can't get up there. (Not unless they make every resident move their cars which god forbid I hope they can't enforce that?? The fact of the matter is basically more or less of the whole estate does not have wide enough roads for traffic to flow both directions end of
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Michelle Wenham	Response-01650	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Mick Helm	Response-00021	See comments in road safety.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Mick Hughes	Response-01701	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Mike Darnett	Response-00698	A bus service couldn't get up there.This site is far from services.and fails to prioritise age friendly family housing
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Miss Garratt	Response-00905	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Miss R Cordon	Response-01648	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Misty McGrath	Response-01556	Already difficult and poor given the access roads and car parking, and will only get worse.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Mollie Snow	Response-01729	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Molly Newbold	Response-00486	The buses already struggle to get down beech Avenue. Imagine 180 additional cars to get in the way.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Mr & Mrs Turton	Response-01660	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Mr and Mrs R Skelton	Response-01274	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Mr and Mrs Wright	Response-01275	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Mr David Ainsworth	Response-00621	The buses already can't get around our narrow streets. The bus drivers are rude, and with so many cars parked on the pavements, I urge you not to increase the number of buses going round. They are a hazard and a nuisance.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Mr John Hickingbotham	Response-01431	All traffic from this proposed site must use either Coronation Avenue or Beech Avenue, both of which are the current, and only possible, route of the TrentBarton i4 bus service. As a regular user of this service I know of the difficulties experienced by bus drivers and the delays caused due to inconsiderate parking and sheer volume of vehicle movements, particularly during peak hours and school-run times. A significant traffic increase may well create intolerable delays which ultimately result in withdrawal of the bus service, to the detriment of anyone without access to a private car, particularly the elderly
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Mr K Turton	Response-01706	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Mr Luke	Response-01703	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Mr P J Tanner	Response-01728	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Mr R M Draper	Response-01856	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Mr R Widdowson	Response-01734	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Mr S. Haywood	Response-01585	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Mrs Christina Pope	Response-00732	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Mrs Donna C. Ball	Response-01594	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Mrs Griffin	Response-01698	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Mrs J. Cooper	Response-01596	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. The buses struggle to get through Stanton Road, Coronation Avenue and Beech Avenue. Cars being parked causing obstruction on narrow roads. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Mrs Joanne Thompson	Response-01690	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Mrs Lee Farabella	Response-01899	180+ houses will put pressure on local services & public transport.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Mrs Linda Cox	Response-01753	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Mrs Luke	Response-01704	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Mrs M. Rose	Response-01583	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Mrs Marie Draper	Response-01755	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Mrs M Burke	Response-01887	More houses will add more pressure on local services and public transport.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Mrs Rachel Coats	Response-01623	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Mrs R Cordon	Response-01647	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Mrs Rigby	Response-00641	The bus is unable to access roads above Coronation Ave because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Mrs Shani Wainwright	Response-00754	The bus service already has issues accessing the roads due to them being g narrow and windy with many parked cars along them. Accessing the new site would be impossible because of this and the steepness and terrain of that area. Many people at the top of the hill currently can't use the current bus service because of the above issues plus weather issues in winter, so any new residents will be forced to use cars not the unreliable limited public transport. Therefore the massive negative impact of number of cars will be terrible for the whole area.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Mrs Sheila Hickingbotham	Response-01338	The area north of Stanton Road is currently served by Trent Barton i4 bus which at times already experiences difficulty in accessing part of the route due to volume of traffic and parking issues. The addition of 180 additional homes will only increase these issues. If these problems resulted in the bus company withdrawing the service altogether, this would deprive anyone living north of Stanton Road access to nearby public transport.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Mrs Shirley Victoria Riggs	Response-01685	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Mrs Susan Bantle	Response-01612	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Mrs Turton	Response-01707	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Mrs Whittaker	Response-00595	The increase in traffic, will adversely effect the already congested route for the only bus service which operates in the immediate area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Natalie Bentley	Response-01646	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Neil Biddulph	Response-01891	
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Nicole Cooper	Response-01597	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Nikki Vincent	Response-00688	The i4 bus service serves our local area and there are already concerns around access due to the tight roads and problems caused by poorly parked vehicles. The increase in heavy duty & household vehicles will only add to this problem and my concern is that the bus company will stop serving this route as a result. Local people rely on this bus service and I personally use this as an alternative to driving myself.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Normn McCrea	Response-01754	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Oliver Marriott	Response-00679	Bus Services Bus The buses are unable to access a large part of sandiacre due to the nature of the steep roads and sharp turns, coronation avenue and larch road are particularly challenging. In winter and when we have previously had floods the buses have to find an alternative route missing out the more challenging areas including the proposed site access roads.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Paige Walker	Response-01669	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Pamela Bassett	Response-00608	I am worried as a pensioner that bus services will be reduced because they can't get through on the smaller roads due to the parking and the traffic
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Pam shepherd	Response-00453	Already stretched more buses more damage on the roads congestion
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Pat Hardy	Response-01739	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Paula Darnell	Response-00665	Buses cannot possibly get up the narrow congestion windy roads and it would be so dangerous.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Paula Luck	Response-01710	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Paula Sims	Response-01687	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Paul Randall	Response-00131	The existing bus service R4 is OK but limited as it only serves Nottingham direction. The bus service often doesn't serve Coronation Avenue in winter due to ice. Other bus services are a 20 minute walk away.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Paul Vleeton	Response-01770	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	paul wheeldon	Response-00582	Buses already have major problems navigating the roads used in the area due to congestion
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Peter Anthony	Response-01866	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Peter Nicholls	Response-01622	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Pete West	Response-01700	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Phil Creasey	Response-01342	As the current bus service is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue due to the steepness and parked cars it would not be possible to provide a bus service for a residents on an even higher site.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Philip Reed	Response-01449	I object to the proposed development of 180 new houses due to the strain it will place on existing local bus services. Current services already struggle at times to get around the Sandiacre estate due to resident parking. Increased demand could lead to overcrowding, reduced reliability, and inconvenience for current residents who rely on public transport for daily needs.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	P Sandes	Response-01682	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Rachel Crossley	Response-01661	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Rachel Skelton	Response-01241	Busses up Coronation Avenue and down Beech Avenue are already struggling, the extra traffic will add to this
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	R Barratt	Response-01664	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Rcahel Sharp	Response-00652	We have a really good bus service in the i4 which I use to go to work, to visit my Mum in her care home and also for leisure. I am worried with the increased traffic/development that the bus operator will stop serving Coronation Ave/Maple Avenue/Beech Avenue given the problems they already have negotiating the traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Rebecca Longmuir	Response-00253	Buses struggle to get through the tight and narrow streets with double parked cars now. And that?s without this ridiculous new building idea. More congestion and stuck buses will only add to more pollution and poor bus service.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Rhiannon Lowater	Response-01592	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	R Hibbitt	Response-01862	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Richard Broughton	Response-01352	Given the increase in residents, there will very likely be an impact on the bus service. What steps have you taken to ensure that the bus service will keep pace with any additional demand?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Richard Haines	Response-01674	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
			Richard Jenkins	Response-00264	Already struggling with local traffic issues.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Richard Marriott	Response-00675	Bus Services Bus The buses are unable to access a large part of sandiacre due to the nature of the steep roads and sharp turns, coronation avenue and larch road are particularly challenging. In winter and when we have previously had floods the buses have to find an alternative route missing out the more challenging areas including the proposed site access roads.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Richard Naylor	Response-00066	The bus will not be able to get around this estate.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Richard Shrimpton	Response-01301	the bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Ave because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Rob Lowe	Response-01768	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Roger Day	Response-00023	There are no buses serving the area covered by the proposed development.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Roger Fleck	Response-01083	The bus that currently runs around the estate leading up to the proposed site has often got stuck due to the narrowness of the roads and the amount of cars already in the area parked or passing. The bus would not be able to access the new proposed site due to the road structure therefore not offering easily accessible public transport for the residents of the new proposed site.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Rosemarie Gough	Response-00997	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Roy Drew	Response-01614	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Ruby Sharp	Response-00886	We have a really good bus service in the i4 which I use to for leisure and to go to the QMC. I am worried with the increased traffic/development that the bus operator will stop serving Coronation Ave/Maple Avenue/Beech Avenue given the problems they already have negotiating the traffic. Bus drivers often have trouble getting up Coronation Avenue and around Maple Avenue due to parked cars, I see it many times a week from my window. This route is essential for those with disabilities and the elderly who cannot walk down to the White Lion/Lidl to get the bus. If the bus route disappears due to traffic, there will be more cars on the road contributing to all points mentioned above: congestion, road safety and pollution.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Ryan Selby	Response-00479	Will effect the bus service, new routes and buses may need to be added, again adds to the pollution, air and noise.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	S. Brailsford	Response-00598	Bus service always under pressure as traffic in this area and surrounding streets means the busses often have to mount the kerb & are often unable to pass parked cars Bus services are often late because of this
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	S. Jones	Response-01615	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Sally Davies	Response-01294	Are bus services are very good but adding more routes will cause even more congestion.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Samantha Anne Whitney	Response-00757	The buses come onto the estate every 20 minutes at the moment, if they can make it up that far. They frequently get stuck once they reach Stanton Road, even with the amount of traffic we have now. Adding another 360 cars onto them roads means the busses will get stuck more frequently, the drivers won't want to come onto the estate and we'll end up with no bus service. There are a lot of older people on the estate, what will they do with no bus service? Have you walked from the centre of Sandiacre where the buses would then stop. It's a 20 minute walk from the centre of Sandiacre to Chestnut Grove, all up hill. My parents along with lots of local residents wouldn't manage that! I'm only 46 and even I would struggle doing that everyday.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Samantha Whildes	Response-01270	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Sam Buckland	Response-00600	The bus can only get as close as Coronation Avenue to the site. In winter, it struggles to access this road, and Beech Avenue due to ice. There are also a lot of occasions when the bus hasn't been able to drive round Coronation Avenue and Beech Avenue due to parked cars blocking the road. The way that new developments are built now, a bus wouldn't be able to drive round on a new route either.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Sam Fleck	Response-00821	Bus Service: I wish to raise an objection to the proposed development on the grounds of poor accessibility and inadequate public transport provision. There is already existing evidence that buses regularly struggle to navigate the narrow residential roads leading to the proposed site. In some cases, buses have become stuck due to parked cars and tight corners. Given the constraints, I am uncertain how a large service bus would be able to safely access the proposed site entrance, especially when accounting for construction traffic and future vehicle use. If a bus is unable to enter the site itself, residents particularly those who are older or have limited mobility would be expected to walk uphill to reach the nearest bus stop. This presents a serious accessibility concern, as the existing roads include a significant gradient, which would make walking difficult or even unmanageable for many, especially in poor weather. This directly conflicts with Paragraph 112 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which requires that developments give priority to pedestrian and cycle movements and promote access to high-quality public transport. It also contradicts Paragraph 130, which emphasises that developments should be inclusive and accessible, ensuring that they meet the needs of people with disabilities and reduced mobility. If the development cannot provide a site layout that enables safe and practical access for buses, it will result in a scheme that is not only poorly connected but excludes a significant portion of the population from being able to live there comfortably. For these reasons, I object to the current proposal and urge the planning authority to ensure that any approved development provides proper, accessible public transport links that serve all residents.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Sam Greatorex	Response-01695	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Sandra Cooke	Response-01613	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Sarah Harrison	Response-01658	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	S Bryne	Response-01677	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Sebastian Roberts	Response-01675	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Shanead Ligton	Response-01689	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Shannon moss	Response-00454	The buses already struggles to navigate the streets due to their narrowness, particularly towards the upper sections near the proposed development site. If a standard public bus finds it difficult to pass through these areas, it raises serious concerns about how heavy-duty machinery, such as cranes, concrete lorries, and grab hire trucks, would even begin to manoeuvre through these constricted roads. Even standard cars often struggle to navigate the tighter sections, meaning construction traffic would likely cause further congestion, damage to road surfaces, and an increase in safety hazards for pedestrians and existing road users.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Shannon Robinson	Response-01635	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Sharon weston	Response-00440	Buses getting stuck cus of traffic what would happen if emergency services couldn't get thro let's hope it's not your family
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Shaun Green	Response-01773	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Sheila	Response-00587	While the i4 bus service - Trent Barton, is available, its coverage is limited and often unreliable, particularly in adverse weather. Other bus routes are located approximately 20 minutes? walk away, which is not suitable for many residents, especially the elderly or those with mobility issues. There have already been complaints from people regarding the bus service and getting around the estate. Adding more people with more cars will only exacerbate this issue.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Sheila Payne	Response-01782	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Sian Knox	Response-01679	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	S Leek	Response-01737	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Sonya Birkin	Response-01656	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Sophie	Response-00472	They have struggles getting the buses around sandiacre especially in areas where there is already lots of people living with lots of vehicles
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Sophie Bennett	Response-01631	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Stephen Davies	Response-00214	i4 route currently has severe issues in negotiating roads once it leaves Derby Road and additional traffic in area would only worsen this. Given the constrains of parked cars as evidenced on page 65 of the EBC Neighbourhood Plan and the 3 x 90 degree bends required to access the development from the current i4 route the site is unlikely to be accessible by public transport resulting in making a lengthy walk to a bus stop essential. This would prove difficult or indeed unmanageable for many. This is contrary to paragraph 13 which empathises that developments should be inclusive and accessible, ensuring they meet the needs of people with disabilities and reduced mobility. If the development cannot provide a site layout that enables safe and practical access for buses it will result in a scheme that is not only poorly connected but excludes a significant portion of the population from being able to live there comfortably
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Stephen Sacker	Response-01598	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Steve Bilbie	Response-00285	Buses already are already struggling to navigate the existing estate. Buses have serious access issues in this area and will only get worse.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Steve Whittaker	Response-01781	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Sue Harrison	Response-01629	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Susanne Beaven	Response-01618	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Sylvia Plampin	Response-00624	The i4 bus often gets stuck on beech avenue because of badly parked vehicles, and struggles to turn out of beech avenue and also onto coronation avenue. I've been on the bus when it became stuck, and was unable to carry on the journey for 15 mins due to someone's inconsiderate parking at school drop off!! I'm surprised they still access the estate.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Tamara Partridge	Response-01780	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Tarnya Hinman	Response-01786	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Thomas Ilett	Response-01088	Bus services are generally good in Sandiacre, however the Sandiacre Neighbourhood Plan highlights that young couples moving to the area who require housing will likely work in the huge commercial developments in Ilkeston. At present, the area of Sandiacre proposed for development is serviced well by the I4 (although this regularly gets stuck and delayed due to poor parking), however this only connects Sandiacre with Nottingham and Derby. Other areas that new residents could need include Ilkeston, Long Eaton, East Midlands Airport and Leicester, which are not available by bus in this particular part of Sandiacre. Therefore, I propose the bus services in this area of Sandiacre are inadequate for 180 new properties.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Tim Derbyshire	Response-01681	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Tim Gough	Response-00996	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Toby Moran	Response-01769	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Tom Ball	Response-01672	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Tony Weston	Response-00990	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Tracey Howe	Response-01860	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Tracey Hughes	Response-01699	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Tracy Jones	Response-00436	The bus regularly gets stuck due to over congestion
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Trevor Rowston	Response-01678	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Try church	Response-00033	With more housing comes more people who will need more services, which will again mean more buses using the area around the proposed development. The roads cannot cope now let alone with more vehicles
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Tyler Hobbs	Response-00879	Building on the greenbelt in Sandiacre will put significant strain on the already limited local public transport infrastructure, particularly the i4 bus route, which is currently the only service operating in the area. This route is already well-used by residents commuting to and from Derby and Nottingham, and an increase in population from new housing developments would place additional pressure on this single line. Overcrowding, longer wait times, and reduced reliability are likely outcomes, making it harder for existing and new residents to rely on public transport. Without investment in expanded or additional transport services, this development would contribute to congestion, increase car dependency, and reduce the overall sustainability of the area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Vanessa Asbach	Response-00700	The bus service will certainly be impacted by these houses. Yes there is potential for more bus users, but realistically more people need to rely on cars to get to and from work. The bus transport already struggles going around the narrow existing corners of the roads, especially when cars are trying to come the other way. It is not only awkward, but also dangerous. Especially when the football club is open. Love the community, but hate the way they park long the entirety of the road making it unsafe for everyone else.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Verity Lamb	Response-01298	I've never envied the drivers having to negotiate the route by cloudside school, adding more cars is an accident waiting to happen
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Victoria Abraham	Response-01652	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Victoria Galpin-shrimpton	Response-01009	Bus Service ? the bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Ave because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Victoria Greatorex	Response-01730	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Victoria Marriott	Response-00674	Bus The buses are unable to access a large part of sandiacre due to the nature of the steep roads and sharp turns, coronation avenue and larch road are particularly challenging. In winter and when we have previously had floods the buses have to find an alternative route missing out the more challenging areas including the proposed site access roads.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Vivien Davis	Response-01582	The bus is unable to access the roads above Coronation Avenue because of the terrain, steepness and parked vehicles so would not be able to access the even higher new site. It also struggles up the hill during winter and regularly gets held up on Beech Avenue. Many at the top of the hill cannot use the current bus service because of the steep terrain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	Wayne Major	Response-00408	I wish to raise an objection to the proposed development on the grounds of poor accessibility and inadequate public transport provision. There is already existing evidence that buses regularly struggle to navigate the narrow residential roads leading to the proposed site. In some cases, buses have become stuck due to parked cars and tight corners. Given the constraints, I am uncertain how a large service bus would be able to safely access the proposed site entrance, especially when accounting for construction traffic and future vehicle use. If a bus is unable to enter the site itself, residents particularly those who are older or have limited mobility would be expected to walk uphill to reach the nearest bus stop. This presents a serious accessibility concern, as the existing roads include a significant gradient, which would make walking difficult or even unmanageable for many, especially in poor weather. This directly conflicts with Paragraph 112 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which requires that developments give priority to pedestrian and cycle movements and promote access to high-quality public transport. It also contradicts Paragraph 130, which emphasises that developments should be inclusive and accessible, ensuring that they meet the needs of people with disabilities and reduced mobility. If the development cannot provide a site layout that enables safe and practical access for buses, it will result in a scheme that is not only poorly connected but excludes a significant portion of the population from being able to live there comfortably. For these reasons, I object to the current proposal and urge the planning authority to ensure that any approved development provides proper, accessible public transport links that serve all residents.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Bus Services	William Marriott	Response-00676	Bus Services Bus The buses are unable to access a large part of sandiacre due to the nature of the steep roads and sharp turns, coronation avenue and larch road are particularly challenging. In winter and when we have previously had floods the buses have to find an alternative route missing out the more challenging areas including the proposed site access roads.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Aaron Locksley	Response-00711	Has analysis been done of how loss of natural drainage could affect the current flooding issues experienced around the canal in Sandiacre?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Adrian Randall	Response-00463	The site is known to have poor drainage, adding a large number of houses will put a huge strain on existing drainage systems
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Aimee	Response-00952	Flooding in recent years has been a significant problem in this area, all the concrete and impermeable surfaces all contribute to this and further housing will mean a further reduction in land that rain can soak into. The flooding causes devastating impact on individuals and families in the area leaving them homeless and paying rent for properties not safe or fit to inhabit. These residents will be further impacted by the run off water.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Alice Ilett	Response-00571	I live on Spencer avenue and my home has already been highlighted as a flood risk on the Sandiacre neighbourhood plan. I find it incredibly concerning that your looking at building houses on the boggy horse field that contains a lot of the water. There won't be anywhere for that water to go and my home is at the bottom of the hill putting us at an increased flood risk.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Amelia Loosemore	Response-00537	More flooding because more houses are being built
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Amy Cray	Response-01223	It floods all over this area already!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Amy Skinner	Response-01447	The site is at risk of flooding due to poor drainage.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Anastasia Anthony	Response-01865	No ground to absorb water, so it'll probably eventually flood the M1.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Andria Nyilasi	Response-00672	Extreme lengths to ensure the field has decent drainage and will not impact on residents already living in the area will be needed. The impact of so many houses will have a negative effect on flooding for those already living there and will put considerable pressure onto the local services. Sandiacre has been overwhelmed recently with extreme weather due to climate change and it has been evident that our current infrastructure cannot cope with flash flooding and very wet weather. The extra housing would put even more pressure on our poor drains and would see flooding further down the hill in our neighbourhood.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Anne Butler	Response-00385	This is the top of the hill so will not be flooded. However as we have learnt from the building on Springfield house, ripping out the trees which sucked up water before, and the wall to wall tarmac and concrete caused flooding to surrounding houses, because all the rain water that landed on the site was not absorbed and ran off causing flooding to gardens either side of the site, flooding to my garage, water running under my house and coming out at the bottom of my drive. Silt running off the site blocked drains, so excess rain water then ran down Longmoor lane and flooded under the A52 bridge. Reporting blocked drains meant that after 8 weeks I got them cleared. Extra drains on the site had to be put in, and a soakaway all the way along the side of my property to ameliorate the nuisance caused by this water. The old quarry had so much water land in it that all the trees in the middle died due to standing water. This has caused annihilation of the wildlife on this site.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Anne Castledine	Response-00499	In heavy rain, Poplar, Sycamore and Coronation become flooded. There have also been problems with the water supply, Severn Trent have had to repair pipes many times, and residents have been without water at times.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Anne Jenkins	Response-00350	I live on a hill and my garden gets flooded from water draining down from the woods. Disruption to the water table is only going to make it worse. The drains couldn't cope without a massive upgrade which would impact on the whole area

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Annette Jones	Response-00961	Flooding off the fields is getting worse and as someone who lives on the higher level this is quite concerning and feel for those on lower ground. The drainage is bad and not cleared as it should be so the system cannot cope with the extreme weather we have been experiencing. Water bursts are getting worse particularly on Stanton Road and the last time this happened we were without water almost a day. No plans to do major works so it won't get any better and more bursts likely. Sink holes are also starting to appear and the time it takes to repair is far too long and not safe to the public.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Ann Foxall	Response-00748	overloading facilities such as sewage
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Anthony Ford	Response-01921	The field absorbs water, if it is built on rain has to go somewhere & I am downhill. Kings Road suffers because the drains cannot cope. They are not deep enough & have insufficient fall. We regularly get blockages & overflows. The Severn cannot take any more sewage without causing us major health problems.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	April	Response-00469	The development of a high-population state in this area raises serious issues around flooding and inadequate drainage. Urban expansion often leads to the replacement of natural ground with concrete and asphalt, which greatly reduces the land's ability to absorb rainwater. Without a well-planned and upgraded drainage system, this can result in frequent flooding, property damage, and even health hazards due to standing water. Our community has already experienced drainage challenges during heavy rains, and additional pressure from new construction could make the situation far worse. Responsible development must prioritize sustainable water management to protect both the environment and residents.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	A R Gregory	Response-01918	
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Barbara Warton	Response-01886	More flooding will occur. Where is the rain water to go?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	B T Duke	Response-01900	Very concerned.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Callum binnall	Response-00460	All these houses will have a knock on effect for stoney clouds. The house are to be built on top of a hill. So naturally all that water will drop down onto stoney clouds and down too the old gold course
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	C A Partridge	Response-01903	The fields flood & when draining off the drainage system can't cope.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Caroline Blackmore	Response-00451	We need this land to absorb the rain water , too much concrete where does the water go .... it doesn't hence the increase in flooding. You see the drainage infrastructure struggle why add to it
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Caroline Driver	Response-00618	October 2023 saw horrific flooding, even Lidl was under water. As we are towards the top of steep incline, replacing green belt with concrete jungle is very likely to impact this and run off into the canal. You need to liaise with Broxtowe council for impact on stapleford as they have been battling to solve the flooding where houses and businesses were destroyed. You will both need to undertake a risk assessment involving Broxtowe council. The roads at every entrance to our estate were blocked due to flooding, trapping people in including the vulnerable. I have videos as we were supposed to be going to the airport but couldn't get out. Imagine if it was the hospital we needed! More houses would impact massively the severity of this, putting people's lives, homes and livelihoods at risk.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Carolyn Hallam	Response-00489	Sandiacre flooded last year. We were very close to being flooded ourselves. I am concerned that run off from the new housing development will cause our street to flood in the future. Green spaces are needed to offset this. Building is going ahead next to the canal and river now. On what was an open space. More housing higher up is almost certainly going to cause exacerbation of the floods in Sandiacre
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Catherine Richardson	Response-00531	There will be problems with flooding. The houses on the estate are all lower down from the proposed site
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Charlotte Hunter	Response-01376	This is flood prone field - natural disaster zone!!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Chris Hume	Response-01373	My garden floods during heavy rain, I back onto the field and the water gathers in the field and then runs off into the gardens on Chestnut Grove. It's sometimes like a river running down the garden path and sometimes floods my garage. There is 12" of top soil, then clay which prevents draining
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Christine Gough	Response-00578	The drainage will be a problem , houses built with no gardens , and the greenbelt areas all taken away , there will be flooding . These houses that are proposed to be built will be high up , and water will run down onto adjacent homes from Larch drive down to Laburnum , Cloudside , Maple , and Beech Ave . Blocking drains and causing more flooding and damage . We have concerns that we can smell sewage sometimes and worried that our drains on Beech Ave and maybe other roads maybe not emptying as quick , I would like the environmental team to check that the drainage is looked at , also concerns that the drainage may be affected more if more houses are built at the top 180 houses and then joined to ours Major concern of the build I have heard that the sewage could be a problem, does the sewage back up from the top ? Is it released in stages at night or day ? From Cloudside , Larch area down to Beech Ave , if so this would be a concern if more houses are joined into our drainage . I can smell sewage sometimes . I'm not sure how old the drainage is 1920? 1930 ?s . It would all needs replacing if more houses are built especially that many .
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Christine Ridgway	Response-00465	I walk my dogs in the nature reserve daily and have seen alot of standing water in the proposed housing development, this would be a significant worry when building houses there.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Claire binnall	Response-00459	There is serous risk of flooding here
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Clair Ellis	Response-00475	How will this effect the drainage for those of us at the bottom of the hill?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Colin Marriott	Response-00686	The infrastructure is over 60 years old and has been subject to burst pipes in recent times. More pressure on an already overstretched system could have a devastating effect. The land at the rear of Sycamore Crescent gets very boggy after heavy rain. Any reduction in land able to soak up rainfall could lead to more run off and potential flooding



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Courtney Bennett	Response-00593	The area already floods and there is no proper drainage plan. It's common knowledge that new build houses are so poorly built that they flood and have so many issues with flooding and removal of the increased heavy rainfall each year. Building on land where water escapes is only going to cause the flooding to increase in the area. The water has to go somewhere and has to drain somewhere.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Daniel	Response-00545	The area is on a slope and currently benefits from natural drainage through the green space. Removing trees and topsoil will increase surface runoff, heightening the risk of flooding for existing homes, especially those at lower elevations. Local drainage systems are already dated and often strained during periods of heavy rain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Daniel Hands	Response-00057	While drainage in the immediate area may not be an issue, the increased pressure on the systems downhill of the site cannot be overlooked. Areas at the base of the hill have seen increased flooding over recent years, with the river erewash regularly bursting its banks and the erewash canal bursting in 2023.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Danielle Harrison	Response-00568	180 houses increases surface runoff which off and puts more pressure on ailing sewer systems, flood defences drains. The flooding seen in Sandiacre with the bursting of the Erewash was unprecedented. This will only get worse, at a cost to the council
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Daniel Naylor	Response-00680	The proposed area currently holds flood water. Once this development is completed, the flood water will not have anywhere to soak away like it already does, so the risk of passing flood water running through nearby houses causes millions in damage and putting existing residents lives in potential danger, rises significantly.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Darran and Emma Rea	Response-00597	The area is already at capacity, when we get rain, the water runs down the middle of the road, the drainage has only been built for what housing we have in the area
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	David Tindsley	Response-00515	Whilst the proposed site is not in the designated flood zones identified by the council, nevertheless, I believe that any proposed development on the land could create major issues for residents in the area. Gardens backing on to the site on Larch Drive and Chestnut Grove (backing on to what are currently now stables) get flooded during heavy rain. I have been told by some residents on Maple Avenue and Elm Avenue that their gardens can flood with water and it can come up to the bottom of their front doors during heavy rain as the water finds its natural course down the hill. Nature reserves often act as natural drainage areas. With more tarmac/concrete making drainage less easy, developing this land could increase the risk of flooding to the existing houses, especially during extreme weather, which are becoming more frequent due to climate change. Severn Trent have not been at all helpful in providing any information about sewers in the area. However, a development of 180 houses will inevitably place significant stress on what is probably an already aged and stressed sewer system.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Dean Michell	Response-01343	Building on this space I am concerned about flooding.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Debra Michell	Response-01346	Building 180 I am concerned about flooding. The rain water will run down and the land what you want to build on his hightup.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Debra Scully	Response-00288	With removal of trees and soaking away areas there will be an increase of flooding in the local adjacent properties. A further 80 homes of clean and foul water. Does the local systems already have capacity to take that extra waste?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Denise Creasey	Response-00786	Increasing the density of housing with loss of green belt will increase the risk of flooding in the housing below this site.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Derrick Hunt	Response-00437	All the drainage from this goes down onto Stanton road 180 houses were is all that sewage and surface water capacity going to come from
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Diane Mcmorrow	Response-00433	We have had problems with drainage before especially with spells of heavy rain. Recently we've also had burst pipes as the old drainage system is crumbling/cracking in parts. My concern would be about the added use of construction vehicles on the roads
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Diane Meadwell	Response-00807	Whilst the area in question is not part of a flood zone, it acts as part of a soak away area to prevent rainfall running down the hills into the lower lying land. We are being told regularly of the threat to nature and flooding as a result of more and more people concreting over gardens, and yet the Council is willing to build over an area of Green Belt land.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Donna Steele	Response-00781	If these houses are built on the green belt land where will the rain go? It could cause flooding to area including my own house, it's very stressful thinking this could happen to me. We need green belt land for natural drainage.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Dorothy Deeprose	Response-00817	This area is prone to floods now. More buildings will make it worse
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	E Cooper	Response-01923	Currently soaks up water, changing to pavements/houses will cause additional run off.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Elaine Pickering	Response-00811	Is there capacity for this
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Emma Ryan	Response-00503	As seen with a lot of the new housing developments the heavily concreted areas that were once green have caused significant flooding and damage. Some of this damage has been to the new build houses, other areas it has caused flooding to homes that have never encountered this problem before now. That area being high up as it is will more likely cause issue for the homes already in situ below it.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Emma Wall	Response-00319	Currently drainage around this area is very very poor. I have friends on Chestnut and on Poplar/Larch back onto this field and they frequently get flooded through the houses. Also the drainage along Coronation Avenue is constantly needing to be fixed. It's always leaking on the road.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Ewan Snowdon	Response-00766	The flooding and surface water that I drive through on Stanton road will be even worse with more houses, concrete and pavements that green space. I already feel nervous about driving through the flooding and surface water at current levels.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Fay Cresswell	Response-00701	The drains already cannot cope with heavy rain fall they fill to the top and overflow causing huge puddles across the road. There is a rat issue in this area already this will only add to it

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Geoff Tindsley	Response-00755	1. Whilst I believe the proposed site is not in the designated flood zones identifies by the council, I am of the opinion that any proposed development on the land could create major issues for residents in the area. My understanding is that gardens backing on to the site on Larch Drive and Chestnut Grove (backing on to what are currently now stables) get flooded during heavy rain. Some residents further down the hill, on Maple Avenue and Elm Avenue, also can be flooded as the water finds its natural course down the hill. 2. Nature reserves often act as natural drainage areas. With more tarmac/concrete making drainage less easy, developing this land could increase the risk of flooding to the existing houses, especially during extreme weather, which are becoming more frequent due to climate change. 3. A development of 180 houses will inevitably place significant stress on what is probably an already aged and stressed sewer system.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Georgia C	Response-01296	I have already witnessed local areas to myself experience heartbreaking flooding, areas which have never flooded previously. The residents who lost homes and priceless possessions all seemed to believe the reason for this was the new housing development on former farmland, which at the time had only been half completed. It seems likely they will flood again, with potentially more homes and areas flooded as the development continues.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Gordon Bruce	Response-01455	There are artesian springs in this area which needs to flood in wet weather, and old drainage lower down the hill in Sandiacre that is unlikely to fare well with new housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Helen	Response-00883	Has a flood and drain survey been done!! Extra housing will cause issues as the drains will be unable to cope especially when we have heavy rain or storms! This will cause major flooding issues within the lower areas due to the water flowing down hill especially if the drains aren't renewed and advanced around the area
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Helen Gillain	Response-00964	Drains would be unable to cope with the increased number of homes, there would be no natural soak away and flooding would be inevitable
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Helen Thompson	Response-01356	There is already regular flooding along Ilkeston road as you leave Sandiacre and recently in Sandiacre itself. The proposed building will further restrict the amount of rain that is soaked up by replacing green fields with concrete and tarmac. Has the effects been calculated?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Helen whiteman	Response-00447	The water pressure in the house is very poor and if these house are builds it will be even worse. Further down the hill on elm avenue we are always having Severn Trent digging up and having to clear the sewers how will it be with extra housing up the hill
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Ian Bailey	Response-00505	This will affect the drainage as this area holds a lot of water in wet periods which will now flow down into the neighbouring streets and drainage system which is already poor
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Ian herbert	Response-00939	this will increase the pressure on the victorian sewer system draining down to town street.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	IAN TAYLOR	Response-00972	Sandiacre is already liable to flooding from the River Erewash. Any significant development will increase rain run off to the River and potentially increase this risk. Additional development will also create additional sewage which needs to be treated.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Isabelle Love	Response-00529	The area floods regularly, obviously not help by Erewash councils failure to maintain drains, but the site is a flood risk despite this. Building yet more houses on flood plains in this area will not only prove a poor investment for the people buying the house, it will just move the water onto areas people already live, or onto stones which will again affect the wildlife.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Isobel Ball	Response-01092	Rather straightforward but undeniably building an estate based on concrete and tarmac will not be good for flooding/drainage. Green areas almost naturally allow for flooding and soak up excess water and rain. Never mind what it?ll look like having to install drainage systems in this area, and the damage that will do.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Jack McQueenie	Response-01823	The hilltop acts as a giant sponge in the winter months, it is a marsh from November though to May. If built upon the houses will sink and the quickly released rain water will Flood Sandiacre Every Winter. Such as it did in the Floods of October 2023. Necessitating Insurance Companies paying out Hundreds of Millions of Pounds to homeowners and Progress Rail.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Jake Simpson	Response-00667	The loss of grass, plants and trees would put houses lower down in the Sandiacre area at risk of flooding
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Jane Dennett	Response-00965	More concrete affects drainage in areas.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Jane Elizabeth Tindsley	Response-00669	Whilst the proposed site is not in the designated flood zones identifies by the council, nevertheless, I believe that any proposed development on the land could create major issues for residents in the area. Gardens backing on to the site on Larch Drive and Chestnut Grove (backing on to what are currently now stables) get flooded during heavy rain. I have been told by some residents on Maple Avenue and Elm Avenue that their gardens can flood with water, and it can come up to the bottom of their front doors during heavy rain as the water finds its natural course down the hill. Nature reserves often act as natural drainage areas. With more tarmac/concrete making drainage less easy, developing this land could increase the risk of flooding to the existing houses, especially during extreme weather, which are becoming more frequent due to climate change. Severn Trent have not been at all helpful in providing any information about sewers in the area. However, a development of 180 houses will inevitably place significant stress on what is probably an already aged and stressed sewer system.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Jayne Rowley	Response-01279	This area is already at risk from flooding during periods of heavy rain. Cloudside road is already a run off for water and developing the proposed site would reduce drainage and increase surface water in this area. As it is at the top of the hill this would then impact the lower ground. In recent years Sandiacre has suffered from significant flooding and damage, resulting in people having to leave their homes for a number of months and also cutting off access into and out of the town due to the roads flooding, making them impassable.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Jeffrey Whittaker	Response-00594	Most of Sandiacres drains which the news houses would glow into would not take it, system is heavily outdated and it could not take anymore
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Jennifer Bailey	Response-01857	I am concerned the more we build on green belt, the houses lower down will be at higher risk of flooding.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Jennifer Tindsley	Response-00751	1. Whilst I believe the proposed site is not in the designated flood zones identifies by the council, I am of the opinion that any proposed development on the land could create major issues for residents in the area. My understanding is that gardens backing on to the site on Larch Drive and Chestnut Grove (backing on to what are currently now stables) get flooded during heavy rain. Some residents further down the hill, on Maple Avenue and Elm Avenue, also can be flooded as the water finds its natural course down the hill. 2. Nature reserves often act as natural drainage areas. With more tarmac/concrete making drainage less easy, developing this land could increase the risk of flooding to the existing houses, especially during extreme weather, which are becoming more frequent due to climate change. 3. A development of 180 houses will inevitably place significant stress on what is probably an already aged and stressed sewer system.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Joanna hardy	Response-01304	The area currently is fields and so easily soaks up rain water. By building on this area the run off would potentially damage surrounding properties and add it the flooding issues in the erewash valley in sandiacre and stapleford.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Joanne Johnson	Response-00765	The water coming off this area during times of heavy rain already affects local residents. The drains etc will not cope with further concrete/tarmac etc.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Joanne Lambert	Response-00494	Over the last few years Sandiacre has seen a rise in flooding, extra housing will add to less natural water retention and which in turn can increase local flood issues.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Jodie Shrive	Response-00601	Natural reserves such as this one act as natural drainage areas. Developing this land WILL increase the risk of flooding to existing houses, especially during extreme weather which is becoming more and more frequent due to climate change. The drainage in this area has not been updated in almost 80 years and there is no plan in this development to update it. Sandiacre is becoming more and more under pressure with floods in recent years, you will be destroying pre-existing homes just to create new ones. Why?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Joe Sells	Response-01924	The site already suffers from water logging, development will worsen drainage & increase flood risk for downstream homes & properties.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Jo Gerhardt	Response-01286	I'm concerned with future flooding caused by rainwater not being able to absorb into the ground due to the proposed building development. We had floods last year around the Lidl area and what with future 'global warming', the weather systems are already changing. In the height of heavy rain, Starch Lane becomes a torrent of water that collects at the bottom onto Ilkeston Road, making it even more hazardous. Building the proposed houses on the green belt would lead to more rainfall not being able to be absorbed, ultimately leading to more flooding in the area. Not acceptable.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	John Hibbitt	Response-01855	Flooding on Ilkeston Road frequent now
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	John whiteman	Response-00450	Drainage and water pressure are bad enough now Severn Trent are always working down the hill on elm Ave clearing the sewers etc so what will it be like with extra houses
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Judith A Pulfer	Response-01863	I strongly object to the proposed development. My home is adjacent to the site and two properties away from the only entrance and exit to this site. I live at the highest point of the hill and in the really wet weather my garden floods. I cannot get down the path next to the conservatory and the roads are awash with running water. The horse field is also very much waterlogged. Climate change being what it is I do not know what can be done about this matter - perhaps you do but I doubt very much that any more roads, buildings and hard landscaping will resolve this problem.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Judith Blackburn	Response-01928	Land can flood, even up hill, underground drainage chokes causing road flooding.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Karen Evans	Response-00523	Any extra building will add pressure to the system.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Karen Pitts	Response-00643	An extra 180 houses will produce 180 houses worth of extra sewage. The system will not cope. Sandiacre suffers flooding each year, being at the top of the hill may be an advantage to the new houses, but what about the areas below? Losing the land full of vegetation which absorbs rain, replacing with concrete roads. Heavy rain has nowhere to go but down into the rest of Sandiacre. Just look at what happens in Risley every year.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Kathryn Martin	Response-00527	We already have drainage issues in this area
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Katie Morrice	Response-00664	Increasing the density of housing with loss of green belt will increase the risk of flooding in the housing below this site.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Katie Robinson	Response-00943	I have spoken to a number of people that have lived here a number of years and they have reported and spoken of flooding and drainage problems in the winter or when we receive high volumes of rainfall. I was walking to Stoney Clouds in the winter after a heavy down pour - up Cloudside Road and past Larch Dr and the amount of water that was pouring from the drives was quite shocking. I initially thought it had flooded peoples houses or they had an issue with burst pipes but this was draining from the hill and off the space you are proposing to build on. Now if this natural drainage system was taken away where would that rain water go? now all of it goes into the pipes? only a couple of years back it flooded extremely badly around Lidl and on the corresponding streets which caused a lot of damage in the area. If we have increased use of the pipes with 180 houses using water as every house does and then using the pipes for increased rain water to go down is very likely going to cause this issue to happen again. I also have a man hole in my garden which requires access for Severn Trent to use at any point - this also concerns me the damage that could be caused to my property if the sewers and pipe work was put under further pressure. We also have to remember these pipes are not new pipes also - this is a service that has been there for a long while and were not built to manage this volume of properties. Severn Trent my say its ok but they are not the most trustworthy - try asking people that live on the estate that have these problems already.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Katrina	Response-00628	Stanton road has already been known to flood if more concrete is added to the top of the hill, more water will flow down the hill causing an even greater likelihood of flooding in less extreme weather
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Kelly Randall	Response-00591	Existing sewer and drainage infrastructure is already under strain, and downstream flooding is a known issue. Without significant investment, increased surface water run-off will exacerbate local flood risks and impact the M1 motorway. Existing sewer is a 12" pipe down Stanton Road. Will this 1940s sewer be upgraded?

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Kerry stokes	Response-00769	We already experience flooding at the bottom of Stanton road when we have heavy rainfall, how is adding more houses going to cope with this?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Kim Helm	Response-00632	Drainage will not cope with that amount of houses It floods quite easily along that road and the fields
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Kirk Moss	Response-00439	The fields currently act as a natural soakaway, helping to manage rainwater. Even with this buffer, the area experiences recurring flooding. Removing this drainage will increase flood risk, placing local properties and infrastructure in danger.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Kirsty Handa	Response-00445	The roads surrounding this development already struggle with the drainage system. The pipes are all old and there have been several occasions in which the pipes have burst. Adding on an additional 180 properties will cause undue stress to these pipes and this could then cause undue damage to nearby properties. The pipes cannot sustain this development. Flooding, although we are on a hill the nearby properties to the development have previously be subjected to flooding to the weather, this is already taking into account the green belt land absorbing much of the water and still this was not enough. If this land is built on, where does this water go? this will flow down to the nearby streets causing flooding to properties and damage to those properties. This cannot happen
	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Kirsty Meredith	Response-01462	The greenbelt regularly floods and this filters down into gardens and down the roads, Drainage is already an issue.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Lesley Bruce	Response-01397	The site contains a number of artesian springs which regularly appear in wetter weather and which would suffer from the concrete and tarmac which accompanies high density housing. The sewers in the older part of Sandiacre can not cope when there is heavy rain, as evidenced several times recently. The proposal would further add to the problem as the site is on a hill and the drainage and sewerage would flow down into inadequate Victorian and older drains. The
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Lesley Morral	Response-01920	Reduction of green space will increase localised flooding.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Linda Castledine-Davies	Response-00850	There are a number of properties on Cloudside and Coronation Avenue who have problems with flooding. Severn Trent have regular problems with the water pipes on both Maple Avenue and Town Street which also floods regularly. The sewer that these existing properties feed into is at full capacity and could not take waste from an extra 180 houses/500 estimated people.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Linda Ocroft	Response-01927	In times of severe storms & torrential rains Stanton Road can give the appearance of resembling a river in flood. It seems there is insufficient depth of sub soil on the rock of high ground to control run-off & could not cope with more buildings & tarmac. Plus the council does not relieve water run-off flooding by street drains cleaning.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	LISA ANNE GILLIGAN-LEE	Response-00710	1. Sandiacre has a documented history of flooding, including recent serious flood events. Adding new homes o Stoney Cloud, with significant hard surfacing (roads, driveways, rooftops), will dramatically reduce natural drainage, increasing surface runoff into nearby lower-lying areas like Sandiacre. 2.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Lisa Heppell	Response-00878	More surface runoff means increased flow into the Erewash Canal and its connecting drainage systems. Without major investment in flood defences and water management infrastructure, this development could worsen overflow risks during heavy rain. Green spaces currently act as natural soakaways, absorbing rainwater and reducing flood peaks. Replacing these with housing removes that natural buffer, leading to faster water flow into drainage systems that are already under strain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Lisa Heppell	Response-00878	We need to keep fields for drainage,not for more houses to be built
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Lorraine Hands	Response-00534	As mentioned before every piece of Green space is important during times of heavy rainfall!, building on this space could have a negative effect on houses surrounding and lower down Sandiacre!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Louise dix	Response-00975	A lot of the houses up there flood when it rains heavy so making more houses where it floods makes no sense would make more sense to buy next to lidl where the land has been derelict for at least 20 years
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Louise Harper	Response-01571	If you build on this green belt land, adding more and more concrete, which doesn't soak up rainfall , where will it go ? downwards into the middle of sandiacre where the canal flooded not long ago flooding whole street and lidl car park even, this will get even worse as the drainage is very old and unable to cope, how will it cope with more housing where the only place for excess water it to go downwards
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Lucy johnson	Response-01369	I've read somewhere the drainage up there already is bad! Adding more houses and more families are going to make it worse and in the long run cause more and more issues and cost more and more money! Use your head!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Malcolm Dillon	Response-00722	The proposed development is on ground higher than the existing properties. This development would inevitable give increased run off of rainwater. This increased run off will effect existing properties. The trend to have increased rainfall in much shorter time periods will inevitable give need to improve the existing drainage systems. No plans have been published to cover this aspect. The speed of this proposal throws up more questions than answers.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Malcolm Fox	Response-00215	I can make the assumption that due to the location and incline of the proposed site, this is a natural drainage area. Who knows what impact this will have to the proposed properties and the current ones. What will happen is that the homeowners will be left to deal with any impact we might experience with drainage or flooding.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Malcolm Riedlinger	Response-00743	We have noticed poor drainage, particularly during heavy rainfall on Stanton Road ever since we moved into the area. I am concerned that this will increase significantly with the introduction of so many new houses on the green belt nearby. I would imagine that poor drainage further compromises the safety and integrity of the road along our street.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Mark Gough	Response-00888	Flooding is already a problem. Heavy rain coming down Beech Ave floods the drains , causing more problems . The houses on the side (number 50 where we are ) is built down from the road so water floods down to our front door . The drainage in this street is old , 1930's on our road , and to our knowledge hasn't ever been updated . So with more houses being built this is going to add more pressure on our drainage systems . I know there is already a problem as sometimes can smell sewage. This is going to be more of a detrimental health hazard in the future . Taking up fields and building on them will cause more flooding as the water will have nowhere to run , can't soak into the fields , it's already a problem and this will make it 100 times worse. I mentioned about the smell of sewage earlier , this is only occasionally and not enough for us to contact anyone as yet . Just wanted to voice a concern going forward thank you
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	mark skelton	Response-01341	More surface water to remove from hard standing area. Could cause flooding down the roads and hill. Already lots of home at the top.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Marta McManus	Response-00646	I have concerns for surface water and drainage from this area
			Martin Driver	Response-01387	Drainage network is struggling as it is, without another 180 houses
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Martin Hardy	Response-01413	This area acts as a soakaway for rain water and prevents it from flowing into the residential area. We already have issues with the roads turning into rivers during heavy rain, but removing this vital soakaway and building on the area would increase this problem. Also this water all flows into the erewash river, which is prone to flooding. This causes damage to homes, businesses and services.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Martyn Locker	Response-00903	I'm no geologist so am unsure of any potential implications in this area. I can only speak from experience that rainwater during heavy rain and storms accumulates into streams and large puddles in my neighbours' and my gardens and on the streets, flowing down the hill from the green belt land where work is proposed. How would this be exacerbated by the proposed plans?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Matt Bancroft	Response-00916	The land proposed already has drainage issues, making more of the land impermeable to rain (tarmac etc) will only make this worse.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Matt Hallam	Response-00476	having 180 more houses, the 1940's sewer on Stanton Road wouldn't be able to cope as it struggles now, especially in stormy weather. It's 4.5 meters deep and approximately 12 inches in diameter, how on earth can this be sufficient to take waste from another 180 houses . It's all ready over capacity years ago . It's ludicrous. We often see the drains spilling out which you can see the tissue paper or tanpoms. I've been told it would cost hundreds of thousands if not up to 1million to replace it.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Matthew Buckland	Response-00615	Although not on the flood plain maps, in winter when there is heavy rain, the water flows down from the nature reserve, flooding area where the stables currently are, the public footpath, and gardens of houses on Larch Drive. If the houses go ahead, the flooding problem will increase, as trees, hedging and the fields will be removed reducing drainage further.
			Maxine Sutton	Response-00471	We already get flooding in Sandiacre, building in more land, especially green belt, would only worsen the risk.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Melanie	Response-00586	The local area has a history of flooding, particularly downstream of the proposed site. Increased surface water runoff from additional impermeable surfaces will likely overwhelm existing drainage infrastructure. The capacity of local sewers and drainage systems has not been demonstrated, nor have mitigation measures been adequately detailed. Properties on lower ground, such as those on Sycamore Crescent, could face heightened flood risk.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Melanie Caumont	Response-01272	There are already known drainage and flooding problems affecting this area. The greenbelt currently serves as a natural soakaway. Developing over it would remove this function and likely worsen flooding on neighbouring properties, especially during heavy rainfall. Sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) would not be sufficient to mitigate the risk, especially given the known poor drainage conditions on the site.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Michael Oscroft	Response-01926	In times of severe storms & torrential rains Stanton Road can give the appearance of resembling a river in flood. It seems there is insufficient depth of sub soil on the rock of high ground to control run-off & could not cope with more buildings & tarmac. Plus the council does not relieve water run-off flooding by street drains cleaning.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Misty McGrath	Response-01556	The role of the wider Erewash Basin is essential to reduce flooding at lower levels. The places of higher land, like this one, should be planted with trees to help the water table. As we enter a period of natural warming, when the environment is going to be subject to greater levels of rain, we need to reduce building on land that is green and increase tree planting.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Mr and Mrs R Skelton	Response-01274	Please note that there has been no mention of the drainage and sewage from the site. It is my understanding that the newest house development along Cloudside Road has to have their sewage held until the early hours to be released as the existing sewage pipes are inadequate for the purpose. What will be done about that ???
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Mr John Hickingbotham	Response-01431	Surface water run-off from this proposed development will, it would appear, simply be added to the existing sewers, which in this area are combined foul and storm flows, eventually reaching the main sewer in the vicinity of Sandiacre market place. This area, around the Co-op store frequently experiences flooding during high intensity storms. The continual addition of more housing to infrastructure that is unable to adequately cope with intense storms, and given that climate change is likely to increase such severity, is of very great cause for concern to all who live in the affected area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Mrs Froggatt	Response-00449	Sandiacre has always been an area subject to flooding in areas. More housing will effect the natural drainage and cause more problems
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Mrs J. Cooper	Response-01596	Development of this land could increase the risk to existing houses due to weather/climate change.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Mrs Lee Farabella	Response-01899	Development of this land could risk increase of flooding to existing houses.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Mrs M Burke	Response-01887	Developing this land could risk flooding to existing houses.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Mrs N Taylor	Response-01896	Development could risk flooding existing houses.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Mrs Rigby	Response-00641	The majority of the time the River Erewash is always affected with flooding when heavy and bad weather conditions are forecasted. its banks have burst a few times in the past year causing significant damage to peoples homes and putting them having to leave their homes because of them being un habited. The canal also dried out in summer 2024 causing concern for all wildlife etc.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Mrs Shani Wainwright	Response-00754	The green belt area acts as a natural drainage area.And so the loss of this will increase the risk of flooding to the existing houses especially during extreme weather events which have already impacted Sandiacre in recent years even before this additional burden has come to fruition.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Mrs Sheila Hickingbotham	Response-01338	Developing this land could increase the risk of flooding to existing houses especially during extreme weather events which are becoming more frequent. Man made surfaces e.g. roads and driveways will result in more water run-off which will eventually have to enter the sewerage system which is already struggling to cope with excess rain water at certain times. This will not only affect people in the immediate vicinity but also anyone living north of Derby Road.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Mrs Whittaker	Response-00595	The local inferstructure will struggle to deal with the extra capacity, with out it causing significant issues for other properties.
	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Nasim Rashid	Response-01103	Will building on the site affect lower properties as less absorption of rain in fields?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Oliver Marriott	Response-00679	Flooding / Drainage Drainage / flooding We seem to experience flooding at times and particularly in heavy bouts of rain it?s been known for the rain/ flood to run down Stanton road in particular, it has previously caused partial road closures and standing water, affecting traffic and sometimes causing road closures.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Pam shepherd	Response-00453	Flooding in the area has increased by 100% already with the houses that have already been built over the years this will be increased it is total impractical
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Paula Darnell	Response-00665	Already water runs down stanton road on to spencer avenue and surrounding areas like a river when it rains, can you imagine how much worse this will be .?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Paul Randall	Response-00131	What is the design limit for the existing sewer infrastructure (# of homes)? What will the impact be of the extra homes? Downstream of this area, flooding has been a problem. What will be the method of resolving surface water run-off that may impact Sycamore Crescent? Additionally, how will the site prevent run-off onto the adjacent M1 motorway? The site currently absorbs most of the surface water, with some running down Cloudside Avenue under heavy rain conditions. This would clearly increase. My neighbour has a manhole that blows under heavy rain and in the past water has entered their property. How will this be prevented with extra load? The sewer system already blows manholes during periods of heavy rain, bearing in mind this is at the top of a hill. If more houses were to be built, who will upgrade the sewer system (which runs under existing property and not down the roads)? I am sure it was sized for the number of properties built at the end of the 1990s with no expectation of more. Cloudside Road is often a run off for rain water flooding off the existing fields. If there was to be housing, the paving of the area would make this significantly worse, adding strain to an already stretched sewer system.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	paul wheeldon	Response-00582	The field has poor drainage with at least one spring rising in it
	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Phil Creasey	Response-01342	Increasing the density of housing with loss of green belt will increase the risk of flooding in the housing below this site.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Philip Reed	Response-01449	Building houses on greenbelt land disrupts natural drainage, increasing flood risk. Impermeable surfaces replace absorbent soil, reducing rainwater absorption and overwhelming local drainage systems. This can cause water runoff, soil erosion, and damage to nearby ecosystems. Protecting greenbelt areas is essential for sustainable water management and community flood prevention
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Rcahel Sharp	Response-00652	The flooding and drainage aspect is a real worry. I was really shocked with the severity of the flooding in recent times of the area around the canal and Lidl. It was terrible to hear first hand from people affected. Sandiacre was basically inaccessible affecting business and individuals. Before this the "lanes" - the road running at the bottom of Starch Lane and the road near over the M1 at Stanton Road have often been flooded. The land up at Stoney Clouds also turns into a bog and does not clear for a long time after heavy rainfall. Therefore it is clear that this area and the area for development area are key flood plain areas. Already after heavy rain, water runs for days down Coronation Avenue and Church Drive. With the increase in wet winters this situation is only going to become more regular and with less land to hold the rainfall it will impact surrounding areas.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Rebecca Longmuir	Response-00253	There isn?t anywhere for water to drain away properly if you keep taking up the fields, most of it will probably run into people?s houses that were already here. Also the local sewerage works will become overwhelmed and most like block or burst. How much ground disruption will occur to foundations of already existing homes with drilling and vibrations through the ground. This isn?t good for the homes here now or the wildlife.
	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	R Hibbitt	Response-01862	Front garden gets flooded front house field now
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Richard Broughton	Response-01352	Yet more land being built on and tarmacked over can only mean more run off
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Richard Deeprose	Response-00816	More buildings will mean less natural managment of water equaling more flooding.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Richard Jenkins	Response-00264	I live on Elm Avenue which is a steepish hill. (It is certainly steep when I walk up it!) My garden has soil on top of clay on top of sandstone on top of clay. Despite living on a hill, my garden regularly floods. I dread to think what will happen if there are disruptions to the current fragile drainage scenario. Development on this site could exacerbate local flooding issues by reducing natural drainage and increasing runoff, endangering both new and existing homes. From my own experience living on Elm Avenue, which is on a steep incline but downhill from the development site, I regularly suffer from a flooded garden in times of heavy rain. How much worse will this become if the development goes ahead? What evaluation has EBC done with regard to flooding in the area? What evaluation has EBC done with regard to sewage capacity in the area?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Richard Marriott	Response-00675	Flooding / Drainage Drainage / flooding We seem to experience flooding at times and particularly in heavy bouts of rain it?s been known for the rain/ flood to run down Stanton road in particular, it has previously caused partial road closures and standing water, affecting traffic and sometimes causing road closures.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Ruby Sharp	Response-00886	The flooding and drainage aspect is a real worry. I was really shocked with the severity of the flooding in recent times of the area around the canal and Lidl. Many homes were flooded on and around Regent Street and residents had everything taken from them. It was terrible to hear first hand from people affected. Sandiacre was basically inaccessible affecting business and individuals. Before this the "lanes" -the road running at the bottom of Starch Lane and the road near over the M1 at Stanton Road have often been flooded. Fields surround the lanes, which should prevent flooding. But many times, these fields become too saturated. There will be no reduced greenland if the houses are built, increasing the risk of flooding. The land up at Stoney Clouds also turns into a bog and does not clear for a long time after heavy rainfall. Therefore it is clear that this area and the area for development area are key flood plain areas. Already after heavy rain, water runs for days down Coronation Avenue and Church Drive. It is like a river. With the increase in wet winters this situation is only going to become more regular and with less land to hold the rainfall it will impact surrounding areas.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Ryan Selby	Response-00479	Building in the green belt increases the chances of run off water and puts pressure on the drainage, it was only the other year when there was bad flooding. Learn from the past.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Sally Davies	Response-01294	Closing is an important issue. Building on this land will not allow water to escape.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Sally Peake	Response-01893	The land already floods where the new development is proposed. The water will be displaced into local houses.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Samantha Anne Whitney	Response-00757	Stoney Clouds floods in Winter, it goes into the gardens backing onto the fields. This land isn't suitable for building due to the flooding. It will only get worse if you build on it and the water has nowhere to go.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Sam Buckland	Response-00600	Although not on the flood plain maps, in winter when there is heavy rain, the water flows down from the nature reserve, flooding area where the stables currently are, the public footpath, and gardens of houses on larch drive. If the houses go ahead, the flooding problem will increase, as trees, hedging and the fields will be removed reducing drainage further.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Shannon moss	Response-00454	Flooding is a recurring issue in the area, and the fields in question currently act as a natural soakaway, helping to mitigate excess water. Even with this natural buffer, flooding remains a serious risk. If these fields are developed, their ability to absorb excess rainwater will be lost, increasing the likelihood of severe flooding in Sandiacre and surrounding areas. This would place additional strain on local flood defences and increase the potential for property damage, insurance claims, and displacement of residents.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	sharon thornhill	Response-00448	as you are probably aware flooding is becoming a real issue nowadays and i fear that the more concrete and bricks we introduce the worse that risk will be
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Sharon weston	Response-00440	Flooding has already been an issue, the fields act as a soak away and to concrete/ tarmac over this on the top of a hill well the water is only going to go in one direction.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Sheila	Response-00587	The local area has a history of flooding, particularly downstream of the proposed site. Increased surface water runoff from additional impermeable surfaces will likely overwhelm existing drainage infrastructure. The capacity of local sewers and drainage systems has not been demonstrated, nor have mitigation measures been adequately detailed. Properties on lower ground, such as those on Sycamore Crescent, could face heightened flood risk. You are stealing green belt land.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Sophie	Response-00472	As I'm sure you are aware sandiacre has dealt with some major flooding especially the last couple of years. Which caused some real devastation to families and residents. The area where the build has been suggested Also gets very bogged/flooded in wetter months
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Stephen Davies	Response-00214	Not aware of any issues currently but extensive development likely to increase water run off down Larch Drive. The current green area regularly floods and the water runs off through existing gardens Additional houses can only make this worse Also bear in mind recent severe flooding to properties within Sandiacre and as such at a lower level which again can only be made worse by water running down from the proposed development
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Steve Bilbie	Response-00285	As already stated it will affect the whole of Sandiacre especially the town centre.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Stuart Pensom	Response-00049	Already getting flooding around the area
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Sylvia Plampin	Response-00624	At present, water pours off the fields and down cloudside road when it rains.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Thomas Ilett	Response-01088	Housing allocation in the location stated will create significant and increased flooding risk to properties in North-West Sandiacre. I refer you to chapter 16, paragraphs 136, 140, Map 10A and Policy 9 of the Sandiacre Neighbourhood Plan. Paragraph 136 states 'The extent of flood risk from surface water is a consideration. This collects on areas of hardstanding such as road surfaces and parking areas in dips or flows along escape routes after periods of heavy rainfall. This type of flood risk is distributed in pockets throughout the settlement. Map 10A shows the extent of the Flood Zones and the streets liable to surface water flooding'. The referenced streets liable to surface water flooding include, but are not limited to; Cloudside Road, Maple Avenue, Beech Avenue, Stanton Road, Coronation Avenue, Sycamore Crescent and Spencer Avenue. As Map 10A shows, these streets are adjacent or near to the proposed housing allocation. They are also directly downhill; 60m lower in extremis. In addition, paragraph 140 states 'Sustainable drainage systems in the context of Sandiacre Parish, will include increasing the amount of permeable surfaces allowing water to soak away. The impact of paving over front gardens and the lack of permeable surfaces along the main streets has been noted in the Design Guidance and Codes 2023, especially around the local centre. This not only erodes the character of streets but is a contributory factor in the extent of surface water run-off. SuDs can only be required as part of major planning applications however, implementing Neighbourhood Plan Policy 7a Greening the Streets and Policy 7b Improving Biodiversity will help to alleviate the extent of surface water run off as well as improving landscape character and biodiversity'. This leads to the implementation of Neighbourhood Plan Policy 9, section 7 'Surface water management should be undertaken through the utilisation of appropriate techniques which mimic natural drainage patterns and, where appropriate, achieve net gains for nature including through green infrastructure provision such as the planting of native trees and bushes'. As such, the proposed housing allocation directly contravenes Neighbourhood Plan Policy 9, section 7 as it will decrease natural drainage patterns and achieve net losses for nature. It will also decrease permeable surfaces at higher ground level, substantially increasing risk of surface water runoff flooding for streets already highlighted as 'liable to surface water flooding' as well as decreasing sustainable drainage solutions exacerbating a prevalent problem. Further to the above, the increased flooding risk will also likely threaten the Sandiacre Cloud Conservation Area. The Sandiacre Cloud Conservation Area is adjoined to the East of the proposed housing allocation, with a large proportion being downhill from the proposed housing allocation. With a decrease of permeable surfaces, increased surface flood water will likely be directed to Sandiacre Cloudside Conservation Area, which is already a floodplain for Sandiacre. Chapter 9, paragraph 46 of the Sandiacre Neighbourhood Plan highlights topographical significance of the area 'The HER (Derbyshire Historic Environment Record) notes that there are significant medieval ridge and furrow earthworks that can easily be seen on LIDAR mapping. The Conservation Character Appraisal notes that this area (which is also a floodplain) makes a positive contribution to the setting of the Conservation Area'.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Thomas Ilett	Response-01088	area with its agricultural character and with long views afforded to St Giles' Church'. Increased surface water flooding will threaten the heritage of Sandiacre Cloud Conservation Area, by threatening the aforementioned 'significant medieval ridge and furrow earthworks'. The proposed housing allocation therefore contravenes Policy 2 of the Neighbourhood Plan, specifically sections 1a and 1b. It contravenes 1a, as it will not 'conserve, enhance or better reveal those elements which contribute to the heritage significance and/or its setting'. It contravenes 1b as it does not 'respect any features of special architectural or historic interest, including where relevant the historic curtilage or context'. As evidenced, Sandiacre's current (Victorian built) drainage system is under immense stress and ultimately failing. Building the proposed housing development will add even further stress to an already failing system. Aside from the issues already highlighted, it is likely the council will need to significantly improve the drainage system. The cost effective mitigations currently in place and those proposed in the Neighbourhood Plan will be eradicated, consequently costing the council large financial quantities now and in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Tony Price	Response-00977	Where will the added sewage go from this proposal? Bessel Lane STW is at full capacity and having to pump to Toton would represent a mammoth task in putting new rising mains in. This works does not have digestion capability so there would be increased sludge levels being taken by road tanker for treatment
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Tony Weston	Response-00990	Development on this site could exacerbate local flooding issues by reducing natural drainage and increasing runoff, endangering both new and existing homes.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Try church	Response-00033	Every winter since 2017 the land has flooded badly. The footpath is unusable and a large lake area collects at the entrance to the footpath from cloudside. It floods into people's gardens and once the first heavy rain of winter occurs there will be sitting water Until April.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Tyler Hobbs	Response-00879	Building 180 houses on the greenbelt in Sandiacre, particularly next to and above the M1, could exacerbate the area's existing flooding and drainage issues, leading to significant environmental and property damage. Sandiacre is already prone to extreme flooding, with its low-lying areas and overburdened drainage systems struggling to cope during heavy rainfall. Developing on this land would replace natural, permeable surfaces such as grass and fields with impermeable surfaces like roads and rooftops, which would increase surface water runoff. This additional water would have nowhere to go, potentially overwhelming the already strained drainage infrastructure and causing greater flood risks for the local community. Furthermore, building near the M1, which is a heavily trafficked area with complex drainage systems, could disrupt natural water flow, leading to increased runoff that could affect both the development itself and surrounding areas. This could result in flooding of homes, roads, and public spaces, particularly during storm events, causing property damage, environmental harm, and public safety risks. The development would also further degrade the natural water absorption capacity of the greenbelt, making it even harder to manage extreme weather events in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Vickie Wright	Response-01552	The current infrastructure can severely flood in the autumn and winter months. The development will worsen this situation. The excess rain flows down into streets across sandiacre
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Vicky	Response-00485	The drainage is rubbish , every time we have heavy rain we get floods where it's running straight down from stoney clouds



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Victoria Galpin-shrimpton	Response-01009	Sandiacre Flooded extensively in 2023 with all water running to the crossroads of Derby Road and Longmoor Lane. Numerous houses and businesses were flooded and destroyed and this is not the first time. It has been proven that Green land can minimise the effects of flooding.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Victoria Marriott	Response-00674	Drainage / flooding We seem to experience flooding at times and particularly in heavy bouts of rain it?s been known for the rain/ flood to run down Stanton road in particular, it has previously caused partial road closures and standing water, affecting traffic and sometimes causing road closures.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	Wayne Major	Response-00408	While I am not aware of any direct evidence of flooding on the site itself, I am concerned about the potential for increased surface water runoff due to the gradients of the land. The natural slope of the area could lead to water runoff onto existing roads and houses, which presents a real risk of localised flooding during periods of heavy rainfall. Given the topography of the site, it is essential that proper flood mitigation measures are put in place to prevent water from flowing onto surrounding properties and infrastructure. These measures should include sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) and other appropriate solutions to manage and control water flow effectively. This is particularly important in line with Paragraph 163 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which states that developments should avoid increasing flood risk and ensure that any residual risk is safely managed. I urge the planning authority to require a comprehensive flood risk assessment and ensure that effective measures are in place to protect surrounding properties from flooding before any development is approved.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Flooding / Drainage	William Marriott	Response-00676	Flooding / Drainage Drainage / flooding We seem to experience flooding at times and particularly in heavy bouts of rain it?s been known for the rain/ flood to run down Stanton road in particular, it has previously caused partial road closures and standing water, affecting traffic and sometimes causing road closures.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	A Harby	Response-01684	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Aimee	Response-00952	The green belt land needs protecting, our green belt land provides local residents with green spaces to walk surrounded by nature. It's one of the reasons I decided to buy a property here with easy access to countryside pathways and woodland. If this land is used for housing what's to stop further green belt land being used in the same way. It will ruin the area and those who can afford to move away from here will leave. The wildlife that lives in these green belt areas will be left without a home and may die as a result of this. We have birds of prey, many other species of birds, bats and countless insects. Our land is being sold off to foreign owned businesses and shell companies. Our country will not benefit from this nor will our people.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Alexander Love	Response-00626	Building on the green belt
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Alex Lord	Response-00946	I would like to keep the greenbelt as it a nice break away form the built up area Sandiacre finds itself to be now. And it is important to our community.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Alice Cooper	Response-01721	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Alice Ilett	Response-00571	Greenbelt is cherished and used by locals. It's our green space to use and enjoy nature as it should be used. Once this is gone it cannot be reversed. This area is incredibly treasured by locals and visitors and the horse field for me contains many beautiful memories. It upsets me that I can't protect this for my daughter to enjoy.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Ali Harrison	Response-00947	Green belt land should be protected and preserved for now and for future generations
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	A Malinski	Response-00620	Whilst I agree we need more homes for our families building on Green Belt should be the last resort!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Amanda Leech	Response-01625	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Amy Cray	Response-01223	It should be kept gelesen but yet more houses stacked up everywhere
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Amy Skinner	Response-01447	Green belt land should be protected at all costs. There are already existing brown and grey lands that would be far more suitable for this proposal. Green belt land is necessary for the sake of the environment - both for the wildlife and for the people that reside here. It is beneficial to our physical, mental and emotional health and this became much more apparent during the Covid pandemic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Anastasia Anthony	Response-01865	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites. The Countryside Charity (in regard to Erewash Core Strategy Review) contends more robust Green Belt Assessments are necessary prior to building (via Google). Planning + Compulsory Purchases Act 2004 requires local plans to be justified, effective + consistent with National Policy. Most up-to-date evidence has been produced by residents, not the council. Ultimately, are circumstances exceptional enough to justify housing, when other sites are available? I would argue not. (NPPF para. 141). Sandiacre Cloudside Conservation Area was designated in 1984 to protect the landscape. The proposed building site is a historic + visual backdrop to the town, something our predecessors shared a sentiment with when giving it greenbelt status. On 2%. of new addresses in 2021/22 were built on greenbelt land and it would be unfortunate to see Erewash be an exception to the nationwide commitment in preventing the urban sprawl. 1 Ministry of Housing 2023-2024 Statistical Release Accessed via gov.uk
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Andrew Davies	Response-01295	Any development will put extra pressure on Cloudside and other open spaces
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Andrew Marvin	Response-00255	So so sad to even think of this lovely green belt area disappearing Shame on this Government and Erewash borough Council
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Andrew Meadwell	Response-01654	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Andrew Solloway	Response-00958	No more local countryside

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Andria Nyilasi	Response-00672	There are many brown sites available in our local area which could be used instead of this site. A Green site could never return to its original status once its been built on. An example of this is currently happening next to the canal in Sandiacre, where a factory has been demolished and a housing development is currently being constructed. It is having very little impact on local wildlife, as it's self contained and wasn't originally green belt. If you build on this site you'll be disturbing badgers and bats, amongst many others forms of wildlife and the entire ecosystem connected with them. Once it's gone, it's gone forever.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Andy Martin	Response-01761	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Angela Whitehead	Response-00544	The people of Sandiacre do not live by the sea or the Peak District etc so we have to make the most of what greenery and countryside we have got. We are sandwiched between the A52 and the M1 we cannot continue to erode on the little bit of greenery we have left to walk dogs children and stroll across to local villages. This is our pleasures you seem fit to destroy despite the fact they have already been deemed as conservation already. What has changed!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Annabel Marriott	Response-00760	Me and my family enjoy this space to exercise and is good for our mental wellbeing. We often use this space to walk up through to Stanton by Dale and Dale Abbey. If the plans go ahead I don't think we would have the desire to no longer walk in this space we enjoy! Because who would choose an housing estate over green space to go walk?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Anne Butler	Response-00385	This is green belt and should not be built on. There are poor quality buildings in Long Eaton that should and could be demolished to provide site for social housing, with better facilities for those without transport in the town centre.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Anne Castledine	Response-00499	It's green belt and can be boggy in places, not large enough to take the amount of houses planned. Why not use other areas with easier access roads?
			Anne Jenkins	Response-00350	Green belt land is exactly that. There are brown field sites which could be used
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Annette Jones	Response-00961	You should be protecting this area even more so now that the widening of the motorway which no one was compensated for and the industrial development at Stanton. There are other areas more suitable in the area and should be looked at first. This is a special place for many people of Sandiacre and somewhere we can escape to and enjoy the surroundings. Why were areas/buildings that were council owned especially residential not earmarked to be re-developed or does that have a special clause.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Ann Harrison	Response-01602	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Anthony Pearson	Response-01760	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
			Anthony Smedlewick	Response-01877	We need spaces to walk & destress in.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Antony M Ingram	Response-01626	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	A R Gregory	Response-01918	
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Awson Wheldon	Response-01649	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Barbara Michell	Response-01787	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Barbara Warton	Response-01886	All the above is being swallowed up with building etc. Build on brown belt not green belt land.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Barry Partridge	Response-01778	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Ben Hollins	Response-01651	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	ben riley	Response-00607	It's protected Green Belt for a reason. In what way is it protected if you can just build on it?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Beverley Gardner	Response-01692	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Beverley Green	Response-01686	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Bill Hartley	Response-01696	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Britta Solloway	Response-00959	Soon there won't be any nature left
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	B T Duke	Response-01900	Criminal to build there.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	B T Keen	Response-01735	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	c/o The Equalised Club	Response-01603	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Callum binnall	Response-00460	Protect the green belt
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Caroline Blackmore	Response-00451	Save the Green Belt quite simply it's been there for years with good reason we need our green spaces

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Caroline Driver	Response-00618	You should be protecting the green belt, as instructed by all constituents and voted for over and over again. As elected officials you should be doing what the electorate and tax payers want and sticking up for the local people, not blindly acting on instruction of the government who know nothing of our area. I'd be interested to know how many of the people proposing this live in any of the areas. The green belt provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians (often have lots of frogs in my garden) and birds, so many different birds.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Carol Marshall	Response-00736	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Carolyn Hallam	Response-00489	The houses are being built on green belt land. Downgrading it to grey belt to enable building is despicable.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Catherine Richardson	Response-00531	Green belt land should remain greenbelt and not be downgraded to just to slap up houses to meet the targets. More thinking needs to go into this. There are other sites available. Behind Lidl for a start
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Charlotte Hunter	Response-01376	Green belts are protected areas, this should NOT be built on,
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	C Holmes	Response-01620	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Chris Hume	Response-01373	Iv lived in this area for 20 years, if you go ahead with this ridiculous development you will ruin what is a beautiful area. Do not reclassify this green belt, look at the brown field sites of which there are many, you don't need to do this
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Chris Jones	Response-01718	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Chris O Connor	Response-01641	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Christian Rearson	Response-01763	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Christine Anderson	Response-00484	A beautiful area enjoyed by so many people - Green belt. Surely there are other areas that can be used.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Christine Gough	Response-00578	It is Green belt area and that should be protected at all costs . England is a small nation and the UK has over 68 million people living here . 1. Stop immigration- too many people here 2. There are 1800 homes empty in this area Use these homes for people , not build more . Green belt is for wildlife , heritage and of course our health and wellbeing , you cannot put a price on that , once gone we can never get that back . Stop the greed , because it?s about money , that they are taking the Green belt , it?s not for need when there are far too many homes empty!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Claire binnall	Response-00459	There are plenty of brown spaces that could be used this is a ridiculous proposal
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Clair Ellis	Response-00475	I do not want to lose this green belt! I regularly walk my dog here. I can't bear the thought of this space being destroyed. Not to mention the horses that currently live here.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Clare franks	Response-00498	There are many brownfield sites in eh area, why is greenfield being used?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Clare Green	Response-01751	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Cole Hawkins	Response-01714	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Colin Billington	Response-00227	Why not build more near the old golf course
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Colin Cox	Response-01716	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Colin Marriott	Response-00686	This has been a greenbelt since 1951 when the land was sold to Westerman. We don't have enough green space now and once built on they don't come back
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Connor Murfin	Response-00926	The green belt needs to be protected at all costs. If this allocation gets approved then what's to stop more allocations being permitted and then they'll be nothing of the green belt left.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	C Owen	Response-01917	This green belt has been part of my life since childhood. It's a nature reserve & needs to be protected.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Craig Freeman	Response-01561	It's clearly taking green belt away, and in such a way that it is immediately adjacent to a conservation area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Craig Richards	Response-01638	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Craig Thims	Response-01765	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Cristina Jenkins	Response-01588	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	C Thompson	Response-01634	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	DAllen	Response-00525	The land should be kept as green belt to preserve the habitats that exist there
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Dana	Response-01173	We shouldn't be destroying wildlife habitats and local beauty spots
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Daniel Downes	Response-01630	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Daniel Hands	Response-00057	The idea of greenbelt land is to prevent urban sprawl. By removing, reducing or reclassifying green belt goes against the core principles of establishing protected areas and boundaries in the first place, especially as there are already derelict and undeveloped brownfield sites in and around the local area. These remain undeveloped and unused, which not only creates an eyesore on the community but also attracts various anti social behaviours and incidents. To ignore these blights on our community landscape while we are expected to engage and agree to further loss of natural and green spaces for residents to enjoy, seems a little far suited to cost over common sense OR the views and opinions of local residents.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Danielle Harrison	Response-00568	Green belt should be protected at all costs and never built on while brown field sites in the local community exist. Why isn't the area at the side of the Lidl site being developed instead. We are destroying this planet.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Daniel Naylor	Response-00680	Simply shouldn't be building on greenbelt anyway. What's the point in greenbelt if the local council refuse to protect it?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Darran and Emma Rea	Response-00597	The fact that they want to build on the green belt is abhorrent, it is green belt for a reason, the impact on the services and wildlife to the area is going to be detrimental, there has to be other sites other than green belt that must be considered
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	David Casey	Response-01608	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	David Cater	Response-01756	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	David Fry	Response-00596	Why is it even a consideration to build on greenbelt land when there are other options available
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	David Ruddock	Response-01776	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	David Thompson	Response-01324	We need green belt
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	David Tindsley	Response-00515	The land in question is currently classified as green belt, and it also adjoins the Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve. Whilst the Revised Strategy document requires that 'a suitable green buffer between development and the adjoining Stony (sic) Clouds Local Nature Reserve?', I am highly sceptical that this would be adhered to by the developer, or properly monitored and enforced by the Council. Using green belt land when there are suitable brownfield sites in Sandiacre (and particularly Stanton) available is completely unacceptable.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	David Yeo	Response-01705	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Dawn Glennis Smith	Response-00510	This area is GREEN BELT land. Part of it has already disappeared to house building, the rest should protected so that it can be enjoyed by everyone. It is a wonderful area of natural beauty which SHOULD NOT BE BUILT ON! I strongly object to destruction of green belt land!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Dean Bosworth	Response-01665	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Dean Lavelle	Response-01774	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Dean Michell	Response-01343	Stoney Clouds is a well used area by the locals community. This is something that is needed for people wellbeing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Dean Peake-Whitehurst	Response-00488	Just stop trying to ruin the countryside. Just have a bit of a grow up and stop it...
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Debra Michell	Response-01346	We need more open spaces for our mental health and our wellbeing . Open space are so important. Once we lose this land we never get it back The Princess of Wales even said how nature help her with her illness. Having gone through cancer myself walking and being with nature was the best medicine. We don't have many foot paths in sandiacre so we don't want to be walking through a housing estate to get to our destination. Green belt land should NEVER be built on.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Debra Scully	Response-00288	Green belt land already adjoins Nature reserve and the urbanisation will remove the break from the M1
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Debs Washer	Response-00487	I'm amazed that this is even being considered as a viable option. Get a grip!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Denise bennett	Response-00030	How can you guarantee that the loss of green belt will not result in ever worsening flood threats
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Denise Creasey	Response-00786	Green belt should be protected from construction in order to provide recreation and wellbeing to everyone. Also to protect the habitat for all our animals, insects, birds and plants and trees.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Denise Lingard	Response-01759	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Dennis Watts	Response-01726	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Derek Morton	Response-01607	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Derrick Hunt	Response-00437	The lang is green belt as a buffer from the motorway there is a well used footpath that gives access to and from Stanton
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Destiny Jade-Blake	Response-01636	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Diane Gillborn	Response-00983	It is a disgrace that building on green belt land is even an option. It will stop the area being used for recreational walks, damage the wildlife and create even more pollution.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Diane Jones	Response-00852	Green Belt is precious. Local people have enjoyed this area for hundreds of years ie the walks to Stanton Village , the Monks Path to Dale Abbey and the ancient field systems.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Diane Mcmorrow	Response-00433	Feel strongly about green belt and conservation area they are there for a reason having their own ecosystems and habits to support the local wildlife. Having green areas in towns and cities give tranquil escapes to the local residents therefore green belt areas should be left alone
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Diane Meadwell	Response-00807	I quote from the Council's website: To adapt meaningfully to the changing climate and its impacts we need to restore the natural habitat and biodiversity to our borough This includes linking up green spaces to enable plant and animal species to flourish and find refuge Erewash Borough Council will be assessing all our parks and wild places to see where restoration can be made to the benefit of nature and the community We will be liaising closely with the County Council as part of the Derbyshire Local Nature Recovery Strategy. By destroying Green Belt land you will jeopardise this vision. Mitigation of climate change is being sought urgently. Leaving this area of Green Belt to nature, as it has been for many years, will surely contribute to this. Why plant trees and create green spaces when at the same time destroying what we already have?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Diane Turner	Response-01744	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Donna Steele	Response-00781	I just don't understand how Green belt land isn't protected from building houses on. I always believe it was but suddenly councils can change this to build houses on. Stop and think, if this carries on we will be left without any beautiful green belt land and what happens to our wildlife?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Dorothy Deeprise	Response-00817	If you destroy the green belt its gone for good.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	D Pallett	Response-01627	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	D Simpson	Response-01712	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Elaine Pickering	Response-00811	Green belt land should be protected
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Eleanor Moseley	Response-00799	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Eleanor Newman	Response-00718	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Emily	Response-01880	More & more green belt gone for housing which is wrong.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Emily Milnes	Response-00470	Erosion of greenbelt
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Emma Peterson	Response-00491	This should remain green belt
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Emma Wall	Response-00319	This is greenbelt. This is an archaeological space that connects to stony clouds and I'm sure has archaeological connotations. I will be searching for an archaeological specialist to look at this land. It also has a public right of way across the motorway to the golf course.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Emma Wilson	Response-01222	Shouldn't be building on green belt EVER
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Esther Cook	Response-01861	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Fay Cresswell	Response-00701	This development is next to the beautiful Stoney Clouds nature reserve and would severely affect the landscape and wildlife. This is a hugely popular location used by 100s of people walking dogs. Taking exercise birdwatching mushroom picking etc. This land has changed to grey belt from green in a very unhandled way where none of the rest who back onto the fields were never contacted
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Gail and Tony Orme	Response-00805	There are not many places left as it is for people to walk and enjoy . Especially for the young . Please please leave the Green Belt land alone .
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Gail Berry	Response-01644	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Geoff Tindsley	Response-00755	The land in question is currently classified as green belt, and it also adjoins the Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve. Whilst the Revised Strategy document requires that 'a suitable green buffer between development and the adjoining Stony (sic) Clouds Local Nature Reserve', I am highly sceptical that this would be adhered to by the developer, or properly monitored and enforced by the Council. Using green belt land when there are suitable brownfield sites in Sandiacre (and particularly Stanton) available is completely unacceptable.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Georgia C	Response-01296	This is vital for both human and wildlife. If we keep encroaching and destroying our natural world I truly believe people's mental health will suffer. We are not built to sit behind screens 9-5, we need fresh air and green spaces to breathe. If we keep building in every area here and there every year to meet so called housing targets, we will be left with little to no areas of green space.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Georgia Marvin	Response-00261	What once was a lovely, peaceful and charming area. A place where you could appreciate nature at its finest. During lockdown we got a real feel for what was on our doorstep, we appreciated everything nature had to offer and we've never taken it for granted again, to have that taken away from us is a disgrace and dishonour. A nature reserve no more, an absolute disgrace.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Gill West	Response-01725	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Glyn Holner	Response-01697	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Gordon Bruce	Response-01455	This green belt is one of very few that side of the M1 in the huge conurbation. The amenity of green space is well known now as a positive for mental health.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Gordon Daris	Response-01639	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Greg Cox	Response-01702	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Gregg Bartrum	Response-01591	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Greg Watts	Response-00733	The site lies within designated Green Belt, which plays a crucial role in preventing urban sprawl, preserving the openness of the countryside, and maintaining a clear boundary between communities. Development here would undermine the very purpose of the Green Belt designation. At a time when local and national planning policy emphasises the re-use of brownfield sites and the protection of open countryside, this proposal appears premature and lacking in justification. It does not align with the principles of sustainable development.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Harriet Farnsworth	Response-01914	Popular spot for local dog walkers, including us, offers a wide, fresh green space to walk pets & take mindfulness walks.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Helen Gillain	Response-00964	The area is green belt and it is important to keep it so ... we need green space for both physical and mental wellbeing
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Helen Richardson	Response-00432	I strongly object to the proposed development of 108 new homes on Green Belt land. This development directly undermines the fundamental purpose of the Green Belt, which is to prevent urban sprawl, protect the countryside, and maintain the distinct character of settlements like Sandiacre. Building on this land sets a dangerous precedent and erodes the vital buffer between urban areas.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Helen Thompson	Response-01356	This is an important part of the Green Belt for Sandiacre. There is not a clear break in building between Sandiacre, Long Eaton and Risley and only the canal between Sandiacre and Stapleford ; therefore people value the green countryside including this site , the Nature reserve and the fields along the canal as they form literally a green belt in this area. Attempts by the council to reclassify sections of Green Belt don't sit well with common sense and fail to recognise the importance of our Green Belt for leisure activities beneficial to health and happiness.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Helen whiteman	Response-00447	For goodness sake let's have a bit of green belt. This green belt which is next to Stoney clouds should be left well alone let the residents of sandiacre have one thing they can be proud of We have to put up with hundreds of Lorrie's trundling down the roads, from the Stanton site. No one care about the residents of sandiacre at all especially the local council
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	H Foster	Response-00714	Greenbelt is sacrosanct and to be able at the click of a button to change parameters to suit this council that is going against all the wishes of the sensible majority holds dear It won't be long before the whole of our area is covered in concrete and tarmac and the people of this area will have to drive to get a breath of true countryside Please look for more suitable, non arable land
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Ian	Response-00493	Building on green space during a climate crisis is not a good idea, find a brownfield site to develop on
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Ian herbert	Response-00939	this land should stay as green buffer between sandiacre and the motorway.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	IAN TAYLOR	Response-00972	The site adjoins the Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve and is essentially part of the same ecosystem. Together with surrounding farmland they form part of the green belt around Sandiacre and should be treated equally.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Ian telfer	Response-00991	We need some green land within the conurbation. There's loads of suitable land between Sandiacre and Borrowwash. Most of which isn't actually growing food but exercising horses!!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Ian Ward	Response-01628	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Irina Anthony	Response-01867	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Isabelle Love	Response-00529	There are so many brown field sites that can be developed on that is so confusing that the land grab seems to be for the greenbelt - an area that SHOULD be protected for the good of the community as well as wildlife. Removing all lush land for uniform houses is detrimental to wildlife and to the mental health of the residents who enjoy breathing fresh air.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Isobel Ball	Response-01092	It is absolutely absurd to be building on green belt areas when there are so many brown belt areas in dire need of usage. Green belts are beautiful places full of wildlife and colour and many of us adore this particular spot. It is greedy and selfish, especially in the position we are currently in with climate change and deforestation, destruction of habitats the list goes on. Building here will most likely entail destruction of grass and concreting over it and chopping down trees to make room. Why do it? When there are so many empty spaces where many many more houses could be built? It is hardly a thought through plan and i know of no one local who endorses it. It's destroying beauty and animal habitats, trees we require to survive.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	J. E. Lord	Response-01601	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Jack Greatorex	Response-01731	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Jacob Whitt	Response-01748	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Jacqueline Marshall	Response-01436	Houses SHOULD NOT be built on the GREEN BELT until ALL other options have been investigated and in this instance I do not believe that this has happened. Residents should be informed where else was looked at before it was decided that this was the only option.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Jade Smith	Response-01783	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Jake Simpson	Response-00667	Losing green open space would be a negative thing to the area

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	James goddard	Response-01204	Trying to destroy one of our few remaing Green Belts, and creating urban sprawl, the very thing our Green Belt serves to protect us from -Absolutely disgusting, and very underhanded.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	James Meadwell	Response-01653	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	James Roberts	Response-01708	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	James Seward	Response-01683	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	James White	Response-01883	Green belt land should be protected ahead of alternatives such as Mark Street.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Jane Dennett	Response-00965	Keep as green belt it is our heritage and right to roam on
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Jane Elizabeth Tindsley	Response-00669	The land in question is currently classified as green belt, and it also adjoins the Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve. Whilst the Revised Strategy document requires that ?a suitable green buffer between development and the adjoining Stony (sic) Clouds Local Nature Reserve?, I am highly sceptical that this would be adhered to by the developer, or properly monitored and enforced by the Council. Using green belt land when there are suitable brownfield sites in Sandiacre (and particularly Stanton) available is completely unacceptable.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Janet Whildes	Response-01869	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Jane Warton	Response-00662	losing heritage and country side
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Janice Taylor	Response-01743	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Janice West	Response-00989	There will soon be no green belt areas for future generations to enjoy. You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Janine Holmes	Response-01595	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Jason Deeprose	Response-00818	Keep the green belt
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Jason Harwood	Response-01667	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Jason Webb	Response-01637	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Jayne Rowley	Response-01279	We should be protecting our green belt and if anything enhancing this with the planting of more trees to not only protect the habitats of our wildlife but help to reduce air pollution and flood risks. Trees can help reduce flood risks by absorbing the rainwater and also slowing down the run off to other areas. The root system of trees allow more water to infiltrate and be stored underground. They also play a huge part to mitigate air pollution which is much needed in the area to improve air quality. Greenbelt land also plays a huge part in providing a recreational area for the local community, improving health and wellbeing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	J Cates	Response-01750	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Jeanette O Connor	Response-01640	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Jeffrey Whittaker	Response-00594	Should be kept as green belt
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Jennie Handley	Response-00723	Green Belt land was created for a reason and should be left alone. There are plenty of options to redevelop run down empty properties And knock down old industrial buildings that are sat empty. If building on green belt land is allowed as a cheap option there will soon be no Green Belt left.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Jennifer Bailey	Response-01857	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites. I do feel it will be a great shame to lose even more green belt. Why can't you build on brown and grey areas? I thought that was what Labour were looking to do. To even consider classing Stoney Clouds as grey belt is dishonest at best. How can a nature reserve be considered grey belt?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Jennifer Saville	Response-00516	The land should still be green belt, no consultation as far as I am aware with residents to change this
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Jennifer Tindsley	Response-00751	The land in question is currently classified as green belt, and it also adjoins the Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve. Whilst the Revised Strategy document requires that ?a suitable green buffer between development and the adjoining Stony (sic) Clouds Local Nature Reserve?, I am highly sceptical that this would be adhered to by the developer, or properly monitored and enforced by the Council. Using green belt land when there are suitable brownfield sites in Sandiacre (and particularly Stanton) available is completely unacceptable.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Jenny Stephens	Response-01723	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Joanna hardy	Response-01304	Our greenbelt is a vital part of the British landscape. It has been protected for many years and should continue to be so. This proposed removal of greenbelt land is a direct attack on what makes Britain a green and pleasant land. It is our heritage.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Joanne Guyatt	Response-01784	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Joanne Johnson	Response-00765	Loss of green belt is unacceptable anywhere. We have very little in the way of greenbelt in this area, all major routes such as the M1 should not be built up to. Yes there is an embankment but no doubt children will be living there, safety aspects need considering.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Joanne Lambert	Response-00494	There are lots of unused buildings in erewash which could be used for housing instead of biluinding close to green belt land which will disturb the wildlife.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Jodie Owen	Response-01688	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Jodie Shrive	Response-00601	In Labour's manifesto, you claim that you will prioritise freeing up 'grey-belt' land for development and prioritise saving green-belt land. You are contradicting your own manifesto, the ONLY thing that even enabled you to be in the position of power that you are. There is already so much uproar regarding Labour retracting everything that they promised and you are ensuring you will NEVER be re-elected in this area. Approving such a project goes against not only what is in your own manifesto, but the national and local commitments to fight climate change, protect green spaces and promote sustainable development. THERE IS NO PLANET B!!!!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Jo Gerhardt	Response-01286	Building on our precious Green Belt is not the answer. Cramming in all the those houses in an already overpopulated area would cause all kinds of problems as already mentioned in other sections. In my opinion, using the Green Belt would be a detriment to the local area next to the nature reserve. There is plenty of brown belt land in the area to use. All it appears to be is a cheaper way by the Government to use Green Belt rather than brown belt. Money would have to be spent decontaminating the old ironworks, then so be it. I don't mind paying more tax if that's what is required., so that Green Belt is not built on.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	John Gardner	Response-01694	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	John G Brown	Response-01752	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	John Hibbitt	Response-01855	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	John Ledger	Response-01605	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	John Payne	Response-01785	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	John whiteman	Response-00450	Please leave the green belt alone. It is the government that wants this not the people of sandiacre
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Jon Burn	Response-01722	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Josh Williams	Response-01632	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	J Pearson	Response-01772	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Judith A Pulfer	Response-01863	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites. Brown field sites - These areas I believe to be proposed building land. Why do the council not use them when they are designed as such? These areas could possibly need cleaning up due to their previous site history. This could prove costly in both time and money to the council and the developer. The Labour led council need a 'quick fix' to the alleged housing problem. This area of land once part of green belt and now designated as grey belt at an Extraordinary meeting of the Borough Council, grey belt being land that can be built upon with the appropriate planning permissions. We are all aware that all councils are a bit short of funds these days but surely it would be cheaper to pay for it (cleaning up) now than in years to come when the remedials will obviously cost more. It makes sense.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Judith Blackburn	Response-01928	This must be saved for everyone, residents and newcomers. It is well researched that outdoor pursuits are beneficial to mental and physical well being. It is possible to run+jog, walk dogs, met neighbours and friends, have picnic and play areas and educate children to appreciate and protect wildlife.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Julie Hill	Response-01643	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Julie Taylor	Response-01503	This area is a lovely dog walking or just a walking area that alot of people use on a daily basis, we want to look at greenery not concrete.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	June Daniels and Terence Hancox	Response-00847	NO !!!!! Totally against the plan to build on Sandiacre green belt.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Karen Alldread	Response-01868	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Karen Blain	Response-01732	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Karen Evans	Response-00523	Please stop destroying this. We need it to survive.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Karen Harwood	Response-01668	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Karen Pitts	Response-00643	Why use green belt when there are plenty of brownfield sites eg near Lidl and also the amount of empty housing throughout Sandiacre
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Kathryn Martin	Response-00527	There are alternative sites that will not require building on green belt, behind Lidl for example. Closer to services and more easily accessible.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Katie Morrice	Response-00664	Green belt should be protected from construction in order to provide recreation and wellbeing to everyone. Also to protect the habitat for all our animals, insects, birds and plants and trees.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Katie Robinson	Response-00943	This is the biggest shock - that there are plenty of other build opportunities in the area that are brown belt but the choice to remove green belt was the first choice. The effect it has on the local population that moved to be closer to area's like this let alone the destruction it will cause to the wildlife in the area also. Brown belt is sat there and waiting to be developed on - most not in use anymore and causing eye sores. My understanding it was proposed to use the site to the rear of Lidl and also there is all the brown belt in Stanton.....Why is this not being progressed or used? In addition to brown belt there are a number of properties/old factories/buildings just sat empty - again why are these sites not being looked into? why is the first choice always the green belt - we can take bits and pieces here and there and think its only a small bit but every time some is taken that's a bit more and soon there will be no more to take!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Kelly Randall	Response-00591	The proposal directly contravenes the Neighbourhood Plan and national policies aimed at protecting the green belt. Brownfield sites, such as Stanton, remain underutilised and present a more appropriate development opportunity.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Kelsey Green	Response-01666	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Kenneth Cooper	Response-01720	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Kern-Paul Lewis	Response-01715	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Kerry Meadwell	Response-01655	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Kerry Smith	Response-01271	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Kerry stokes	Response-00769	We need to keep the land as Greenbelt. Why are we losing our greenbelt when there is still brown belt to be used.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	KH Taylor	Response-01663	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Kim Helm	Response-00632	It is important to keep the green belt to help the environment and reduce pollution
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Kirk Moss	Response-00439	The land is designated greenbelt and should be protected from inappropriate development. This proposal contradicts long-standing policies designed to safeguard greenbelt areas. It also disregards past planning rejections on similar grounds. Permitting development here would set a dangerous precedent for further greenbelt erosion.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Kirsty Handa	Response-00445	Green belt land should be protected at all costs and should never be built on. Green belt land has so many uses such as absorbing rain water, protecting wildlife, creating new wildlife, stunning scenery, reducing air pollution from tree etc. Any development on green belt land will have a negative impact and should not be built on
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Kirsty Meredith	Response-01462	We must protect our greenbelt, not destroy it. There were reasons why planning permission has been refused in the past. these along with all the current objections cannot just be swept under the carpet.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	K Reynolds	Response-01916	This must be protected. Loosing it for development is so wrong. We ALL have to think of our planets health. Not just our greed for wealth!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Kristie Rugers	Response-01864	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Kyle Jones	Response-01764	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	L A Keen	Response-01659	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Laura Hallam	Response-01711	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Laura Thompson	Response-00702	A clear breach of regulations to build on green belt land when it is supposed to be protected for local wildlife and people. We would lose a natural resource which is irreplaceable.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Laurence Luck	Response-01727	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Lauren Rose	Response-01446	There are plenty of other sites to build upon without having to sacrifice this area of green belt. There are plenty of brownfield sites that could be developed instead, removing unsightly derelict buildings and bringing homes to areas where they are needed, rather than building on shrinking green space. Whilst we are being encouraged to be outside more for our mental health - remember during lockdown for example? - removal of these green spaces is limiting that. Myself and my dog walker use the current land for walking and getting outside, but if this is housed over, yet more green space will be lost.
			Leah morral	Response-00712	Stoney clouds is a much loved area of Sandiacre and its people are very proud of it! It needs protecting for our people and our wildlife

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Lee Wilcock	Response-01670	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Lesley Bruce	Response-01397	There is very little accessible green belt left on the Sandiacre side of the M1. This precious commodity of Stoney Clouds should not be even considered by the council given its position buffering the M1 and giving home to such a diverse range of wildlife. Sandiacre, Stapleford and Long Eaton are already a huge conurbation. To extend it further is wanton destruction of a natural wild area much needed by the community.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Lesley Carter	Response-00536	Green belt should not be prioritised for development when there are brownfield sites available. This site is also adjacent to a nature reserve. It will cause significant harm to biodiversity. It is an important buffer from the motorway for pollution and nature.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Lesley Morral	Response-01920	There are other available brown field sites to build on.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Lia Thims	Response-01766	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Linda Castledine-Davies	Response-00850	There are sufficient brown or grey sites in this area all of which have better access and are closer to facilities. The council have reversed their decision to build on a huge brown field site just a mile or so down the road this site could take up to 1000 houses and there is sufficient infrastructure already in place or being built. Green Belt land must be protected. This site at 13.5 acres is a beautiful landscape that provide recreation for locals and visitors alike. You cannot replace green belt once it has gone and it is apparent that this is the thin end of the wedge and if breached phases 2 3 and more will gobble up all the land. The council refuse to say why they are so intent of destroying our green land and our heritage and why they are in favor of this rather than the many brown sites available to them. Having just driven through Risley towards Borrowash I am astonished by how many thousands of acres of green belt land is untouched and no sign whatsoever of any housing estates having been flung up since I moved to this area. How can that be? Why has Risley not been targeted bearing in mind the land is right next to a flat road that runs for miles towards Derby and Nottingham, has a great bus route, the school is not fully subscribed and services are right next to this road. Why is our small bit of leftover green belt being deliberately targeted.? Easier, safer less logistically difficult land yet not considered? If you have to target green belt then it should be shared across all parishes and not leave the richest to enjoy their lovely countryside. However there is no need for any green belt we know this, you know this./ Green Belt actually exists to serve five key purposes, as outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF): To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land None of the above are being adhered to with this proposal. In accordance with your own commissioned report from Derbyshire Wildlife Trust "many mobile species are likely to be moving between these (nature reserve) sites through a matrix of brownfield land and countryside". "Unimproved acid grassland has been significantly reduced in extent and distribution in lowland Derbyshire and only an estimated 22ha now occurs in Erewash and only 250ha in lowland Derbyshire (outside of the Peak District). The presence of this habitat is therefore significant for the site."
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Linda Oscroft	Response-01927	We assume this land was entitled heritage land for a reason. Presumably people passed a motion for it to be categorised as such & exorcized some foresight. It requires time for generations to benefit for it to truly become a heritage & should be allowed that maturity.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Lindsey Rawlinson	Response-01624	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	LISA ANNE GILLIGAN-LEE	Response-00710	Green Belt aims to prevent urban sprawl and protect the countryside from inappropriate development. It plays a crucial role in carbon sequestration, flood mitigation, and urban cooling. Removing it and replacing absorbent green land with hard surfaces will increase water/ surface runoff and make the area more vulnerable to flooding in extreme weather especially nearby areas such as the A52. Natural flood defences, such as undeveloped land, are being recklessly sacrificed. The proposal to lose green belt land for housing will have significant, long-lasting negative impacts to the environment and for current and future generations. This space serves as an important recreational area that contributes to mental health and physical well being.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Lisa Heppell	Response-00878	The area is Green belt surely that should be taken into consideration.No building should happen on any green belt
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Lisa J Pearson	Response-01762	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Liz Woodhouse	Response-01584	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	L Mee	Response-01777	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Logan Fox	Response-00746	We need to protect our open spaces, not take them away. All wildlife needs to be protected and have a place to live. It helps with air quality and our mental health having these open spaces available. There is no good reason to take them away, not one.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Lorraine Daly	Response-00495	The importance of the green belt for protecting biodiversity and for the importance of mental well being to residents is widely recognised. This development is just vandalism.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Lorraine Hands	Response-00534	Pieces of land that are Green belt should be preserved!!!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Louise dix	Response-00975	We can't keep on changing green belt to grey just when we want they are green for a reason and we need to keep our green spaces so we can enjoy in the future
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Louise Felfoldt	Response-01733	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Louise Harper	Response-01571	There should be green belts surviving, if all green belts go what about the amount of trees and wildlife will we have, places to walk when you want with no concrete, trees block some of the noise from the motorway, the grass soaks up the rainfall so it doesn't flood downhill
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Louise Harrison	Response-01719	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Louise Jacks	Response-01767	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Louise Libberton	Response-01693	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Louise Robinson	Response-00647	It's green belt for a reason. Other sites should be found first. Especially those which have better road infrastructure.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Lucy Johnson	Response-01369	Green belts are sacred! More and more are getting built on! And it's heart breaking! To see them get destroyed! They are plenty and plenty of brownfield sites to build upon! Why choose green belt land? I just don't understand! What the purpose is to destroy our countryside? Have you no morals
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Lucy Victoria Garner	Response-00949	We note that the reference of type of land has been conveniently changed from green to grey belt. Destroying wildlife habitats and totally inappropriate area for development. Much research available on the importance of open space, access to countryside and green land to health, welfare and mental health. There are other options on brown and grey sites that would serve better purpose.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Luke Chein	Response-01779	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Luke Hinchley	Response-00699	Green belt land should not be used for building houses, the conversion of this green belt to a grey belt is not acceptable & other brownfield sites in the local area should be utilised for housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Lynda Morton	Response-01606	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Lynsey Blackburn	Response-01227	Stop selling off our greenbelt spaces for housing developments, this is a much loved green space.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Macie Brothwell	Response-01633	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Malcolm Dillon	Response-00722	The value of greenbelt land in so many respects is already well known. We should not need to defend it but sadly profit and selfish, but powerful, people are willing to take away what is not theirs to take! Clearly this loss of greenbelt land should not be allowed. Physical, mental health of citizens must take priority of any other considerations for this greenbelt land.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Malcolm Fox	Response-00215	Why remove a green belt??? This is still a question not answered when there are other sites available, including brown belt sites. Removing a green belt should not be considered, especially one that is linked to a local nature reserve which support a multitude of wildlife.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Malcolm Riedlinger	Response-00743	The whole point of green belt land (apart from preventing urban sprawl) is to protect the countryside, that will clearly disappear with the introduction of this build. It is well known by the residents of Sandiacre that building housing on green belt land should be under special circumstances. I can personally think of more suitable sites that are available that wouldn't compromise the environment to this extent (so I am sure the planning department would know this too), and they should be explored instead.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Malcolm Riggs	Response-01680	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Malc Orbiston	Response-01673	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Mandy Rait	Response-01587	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites. There is a reason why the greenbelt is protected. It provides us with the countryside and home to natural habitats. The proposed development would undermine the purpose of the greenbelt and should be protected.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Marcel Janovsky	Response-00481	Green belt=green belt !
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Mark Gough	Response-00888	Green belt is protected . That protection should not be removed. Our country is not that big and what Green belt we have should be preserved for future generations . There is land that's not Green belt , places with derelict factories and buildings , these should be used for building new housing . Once our Greenbelt has been built on , it will never return . Travesty for future generations , who will never know what it's like to walk across a field , see the wildlife and experience freedom on their door step . We cannot let that happen !
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Mark Leek	Response-01740	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Mark Skelton	Response-01341	We can't keep biting away at it. This is so important to the area around us to help our wildlife.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Mark Thompson	Response-00750	Green belt land should be preserved . There is a very small amount between sandiacre and the motorway and this will make it worse
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Mark Warton	Response-00693	Destroying beautiful Green Belt Land
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Martin Driver	Response-01387	Ruining green belt and protected species habitats. Once it's gone, it's gone forever!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Martin Ford	Response-01908	Being lost.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Martin Hardy	Response-01413	I strongly believe that green belt land should be protected. Not just for wildlife, but as it acts as a buffer between urban areas and the M1, farmland and our nature reserve. It not only increases local biodiversity, but also helps to improve air quality, stormwater drainage and gives local somewhere to enjoy nature without trespassing on private land.
	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Martyn Locker	Response-00903	Mentioned above. The loss of green belt land is devastating and can not be overstated due to impact on wildlife and human life alike.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Martyn Maxted	Response-00435	My objection pertains to the change of status from Green Belt to Grey Belt of the three horse fields that I understand will be site of the 180 house development. Can the council simply redesignate land at will? If so, could this redesignation be subsequently applied to the Stoney Clouds Local Nature Reserve or any other Green Belt in the EBC controlled area? I also object to the council using valued Green Belt to build houses, when there are several acres of Brown Belt on the Stanton site which were destined for 2000 homes but which appears now to being developed for only commercial use.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	M A Smith	Response-01889	No building on green belt.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Matt Bancroft	Response-00916	Encroachment of the green belt is a last resort only. There are other options.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Matt Hallam	Response-00476	You know your not supposed to build on greenbelt, especially when you have 100s of houses that are vacant but will need doing up. This is alot cheaper than just building houses and upsetting your community. For example, behind lidl has been accepted by the land owner in a area of disused warehouses.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Matthew Buckland	Response-00615	I find it particularly disappointing that this has been proposed when there are other local areas of brown belt which could be used instead. The whole point of green belt was to preserve these areas from development. According to Local Government Association Empty Homes Week 2025, UK Currently, nearly 700,000 homes sit empty and unfurnished, with over 265,000 classed as long-term vacant. 1800 empty properties identified by Erewash Council. No doubt the empty houses would be small numbers spaced around the area, therefore there would be less impact on roads, schools, and healthcare.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Maurice Mason	Response-01617	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Maxine Sutton	Response-00471	There is plenty of land to build on, less than 5% of land is the UK is present,y built on. Why choose green belt land? It seems to be a lazy solution and reckless for the environment. Using green belt land instead of other available land in Erewash, which will destroy the natural habitat of countless flora and fauna. The Council have a duty to protect the environment for residents and to not add to the problems of climate change.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	M Dougle	Response-01749	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	M Eastwood	Response-01757	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Melanie	Response-00586	This proposal conflicts directly with the Neighbourhood Plan and planning principles aimed at protecting the Green Belt. The site serves a clear role in maintaining the character and openness of the landscape and should not be compromised when alternative sites are available. Development here would result in irreversible loss of valuable green space. You already build on land off Longmoor Road.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Melanie Caumont	Response-01272	This is a clear breach of longstanding greenbelt protections. The area provides environmental benefits including carbon capture, air purification, and recreational value. Government policy outlines that greenbelt should only be built on in ?exceptional circumstances,? which have not been demonstrated here. Once lost, greenbelt cannot be restored. This development would set a dangerous precedent for future urban sprawl and irrevocably damage the rural character of Sandiacre.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Melanie Howarth	Response-01621	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Michael Anderson	Response-00461	This is Green Belt land. There will are many other ways to accommodate people. Utilise properties that are not being occupied. Are there any Brown Belt areas that could be used?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Michael Darnell	Response-00648	There is enough building opportunities in the area without having to use green fields that have provided a pleasant walking area for locals for years. This development will also impact the nature reserve that is close by.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Michael Oscroft	Response-01926	We assume this land was entitled heritage land for a reason. Presumably people passed a motion for it to be categorised as such & exorcized some foresight. It requires time for generations to benefit for it to truly become a heritage & should be allowed that maturity.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Michell Birkin	Response-01657	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Michelle Alsop	Response-01645	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Michelle Cox	Response-01724	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Michelle Ledger	Response-00815	THIS IS A GREENBELT AREA WHICH YOU SHOULD BE PROTECTING!!!! During lockdown especially the increase of people out walking went up tenfold, and many walkers use this area, i often stroll over to walk into Stanton and enjoy a pub lunch there. You should be protecting the green belt, it provides recreation & wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Michelle Wenham	Response-01650	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Mick Helm	Response-00021	Obviously theory trumps practice when this area is to be classed as "grey belt". Why please?

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Mick Hughes	Response-01701	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Mike Darnell	Response-00698	This is GREENBELT AND NEEDS TO BE PROTECTED, NOT A DISUED GARAGE BROWNBELT SITE
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Miss Garratt	Response-00905	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Miss R Cordon	Response-01648	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Misty McGrath	Response-01556	We need to improve and expand the greenbelt, and this land would be ideal for the nature reserve.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Mollie Snow	Response-01729	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Molly Newbold	Response-00486	Of course 180 new houses will ruin the area
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Mr & Mrs Turton	Response-01660	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Mr and Mrs R Skelton	Response-01274	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Mr and Mrs Wright	Response-01275	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Mr Colin Key	Response-01841	Green Belt land must be protected especially when so many alternative sites are available and have been rejected.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Mr David Ainsworth	Response-00621	Do not touch green belt when other areas are available, including brown belt and the grey belt. It is unnecessary and unacceptable.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Mr Ivan Stevenson	Response-01875	Green belt land was created, so as not to build on.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Mr John Hickingbotham	Response-01431	The primary function of land designated as Green Belt is to prevent continual development until the point is reached where existing separately identifiable settlements coalesce into continuous urban sprawl. I strongly object the redesignation of approximately 4.8 hectares of land which the Sandiacre Neighbourhood Plan clearly regarded as green open space. Indeed, why bother creating and adopting a Local Neighbourhood Plan if it is to be totally disregarded the moment that any parcel of land is suddenly considered to be a prime development location?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Mr K Gubb	Response-01838	Green Belt land must be protected especially when so many alternative sites are available and have been rejected.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Mr K Turton	Response-01706	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Mr Luke	Response-01703	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Mr P J Tanner	Response-01728	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Mr R M Draper	Response-01856	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Mr R Widdowson	Response-01734	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Mr S. Haywood	Response-01585	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Mrs Christina Pope	Response-00732	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Mrs Donna C. Ball	Response-01594	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Mrs Froggatt	Response-00449	If this goes ahead there will be hardly any greenbelt left in Sandiacre. People need greenbelt for their own welfare giving them somewhere to enjoy and a healthy environment to walk rest and play in
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Mrs Griffin	Response-01698	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Mrs J. Cooper	Response-01596	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Mrs Jennifer Fry	Response-00581	Stoney Clouds is an awesome place where I walk my dog and escape to the peace and quiet of nature, I've been walking there for 11 years and always think how lucky I am to have this on my doorstep
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Mrs Joanne Thompson	Response-01690	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Mrs J Reeder	Response-01909	This will be destroyed for future generations.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Mrs Lee Farabella	Response-01899	Approving such a project goes against national & local commitments to fight climate change & protect green spaces.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Mrs Linda Cox	Response-01753	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Mrs Luke	Response-01704	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Mrs M. Rose	Response-01583	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Mrs Marie Draper	Response-01755	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites. We need to protect this landscape and green belt as little by little we are losing it in the area, especially due to the Stanton development.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Mrs M Burke	Response-01887	Approving such a project goes against national & local commitment to fight climate change & protect green spaces.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Mrs N Taylor	Response-01896	Approving this project could go against national & local commitment to fight climate change & protect green spaces.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Mrs Rachel Coats	Response-01623	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Mrs R Cordon	Response-01647	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Mrs Rigby	Response-00641	You should be protecting the Green Belt, it provides recreation and well being for every ones mental health, as well for animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. You can also benefit from wild berries, herbs and plants grown by nature.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Mrs Shani Wainwright	Response-00754	In my opinion the council should be protecting this wonderful green belt as it provides recreation and well being to all residents and is heavily used. It The animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and many birds that inhabit the area should be protected for us and future generations to enjoy. There are many more suitable sites that will have a less devastating impact on our residents and wildlife in Sandiacre.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Mrs Sheila Hickingbotham	Response-01338	This area was designated as Green Belt for good reason, including preventing urban sprawl, and is situated next to the Stoney Clouds Local Nature Reserve. This development goes against national and local commitments to protect green spaces and will result in the loss of a public amenity which benefits both people and wildlife.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Mrs Shirley Victoria Riggs	Response-01685	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Mrs Susan Bantle	Response-01612	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Mrs Turton	Response-01707	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Natalie Bentley	Response-01646	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Nicole Cooper	Response-01597	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Normn McCrea	Response-01754	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Oliver Marriott	Response-00679	Green Belt Landscape & Green belt I'm confused as to why this site was selected, it only is it very limiting in terms of the access but also the fact it's on a nature reserve. Surely, this is going to affect a whole area for people, animals and nature. We are so lucky to have such a special place on our doorstep the views are incredible and it's so widely used I'm sure there must be more suitable alternatives available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Paige Walker	Response-01669	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Pamela Bassett	Response-00608	Wildlife as I've already alluded to are affected in addition wildlife that's transitional that you don't register while checking the wildlife on this land in your consultation wasn't available at the time of this. It's my understanding that greenbelt is greenbelt for a reason not because we can change it to a grey belt at any of the government.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Pat Hardy	Response-01739	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Patricia Ancliff	Response-00948	This area to the north east of Sandiacre is well used for exercise/ recreation. As an Erewash Tree Warden I have volunteered to improve the area. I object to its use for housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Paula Darnell	Response-00665	To build on our greenbelt sites is tragic, we rely on these areas so much for our mental and physical health and we must do all we can to protect it for our sakes and our wildlife.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Paula Luck	Response-01710	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Paula Sims	Response-01687	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Paul Randall	Response-00131	Well the proposal is to build in the green belt in direct conflict with the Neighbourhood Plan and your own guidance since brown field sites already exist that you choose to ignore. Build J25a and develop Stanton instead. This really is a no-brainer.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Paul Vleeton	Response-01770	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	paul wheeldon	Response-00582	This is an essential piece of green belt land bordering on to a nature reserve, there is a public footpath running through the site. there is plenty of brown fields land still available at the former Stanton Iron works site
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Paul Wilkes	Response-00599	This area has not been developed before in this quantity and we do not have infrastructure to support this many homes.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Peter Anthony	Response-01866	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
			Peter brown	Response-00671	We need to preserve our Greenland and we use it everyday to walk our dogs and children play there
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Peter Nicholls	Response-01622	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Pete West	Response-01700	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Phil Creasey	Response-01342	Green belt should be protected from construction in order to provide recreation and wellbeing to everyone. Also to protect the habitat for all our animals, insects, birds and plants and trees.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Philip Reed	Response-01449	I strongly object to the proposed development of new homes on greenbelt land. This area is vital for wildlife, local biodiversity, and community wellbeing. Destroying greenbelt sets a dangerous precedent, undermining environmental protections and sustainable planning principles. Alternative brownfield sites must be prioritised to preserve our natural heritage for future generations.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Polly Cernelley	Response-00715	NO !!!!! Totally against the plan to build on Sandiacre green belt.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	P Sandes	Response-01682	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Rachel Crossley	Response-01661	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Rachel Skelton	Response-01241	There are more appropriate sites that are not in green belt land. Once built on it is lost forever. Future generations in the area will be detrimentally affected by a lack of green space.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	R Barratt	Response-01664	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Rcahel Sharp	Response-00652	I cannot believe this area is seriously being considered. Once greenbelt land is used it is gone forever and where will it end? Developers should be finding areas that are not greenbelt land. They just want to make larger scale developments to increase their profits. This area should be a definite no go given it's proximity to the nature reserve and also we already have too much concrete in the area with the M1 and Stanton Industrial Park.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Rebecca Longmuir	Response-00253	Labour needs to listen! No to the build in Sandiacre! Protect the green belt. The nature reserve/stony clouds . Don't destroy the wildlife and our homes. We all love the nature reserve as it is, Unspoiled land without adding housing. Please leave Sandiacre alone! How much more greenbelt/nature are you prepared to ruin. And where does it stop? If you allow this, then No greenbelt or wildlife is safe. Stop before irreversible damage is done.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Rhiannon Lowater	Response-01592	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	R Hibbitt	Response-01862	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Richard Broughton	Response-01352	There has already been encroachment on the green belt in this area,
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Richard Chambers	Response-00745	It will shrink the green belt, and their plenty of 'brown belt' land nearby - the old rail yard for example.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Richard Deeprise	Response-00816	Please dont take away the green belt. Once its gone its lost for good
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Richard Haines	Response-01674	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Richard Jenkins	Response-00264	Once green belt is gone, it is gone forever. We have so little Green belt. Why cannot existing brownfield sites be developed?? The benefits to mental and physical well-being are well known and understood. (Else why are there parks in London when land is so expensive??) These benefits will diminish/disappear if existing Green Belt is developed. This development will reduce the recreational areas available for families and individuals and visitors alike. Allowing one development would set a precedent for further encroachments on green belt land, leading to a gradual loss of these essential spaces. The development would change the character of the local community and disrupt the aesthetic appeal of the area, which is often valued for its natural beauty. Green Spaces play an enormous part in combating climate change by absorbing carbon dioxide and reducing heat islands in urban areas. Conversion to housing would reduce these benefits. Building on this green belt land will eliminate vital green spaces that act as carbon sinks, contributing to increased carbon emissions and worsening local climate conditions."
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Richard Marriott	Response-00675	Green Belt Landscape & Green belt I'm confused as to why this site was selected, it only is it very limiting in terms of the access but also the fact it's on a nature reserve. Surely, this is going to affect a whole area for people, animals and nature. We are so lucky to have such a special place on our doorstep the views are incredible and it's so widely used I'm sure there must be more suitable alternatives available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Richard Naylor	Response-00066	You're destroying some of the green belt in Sandiacre, but you don't care about that.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Richard Shrimpton	Response-01301	You should be protecting the green belt, it provides recreation & wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Robert Mee	Response-01791	My main reason for objecting to these developments is that I do not believe that the criteria set out in the NPPF has been met justifying any encroachment into the Green Belt at this time. The Core Strategy and this Amendment are developed in order to meet the housing targets allocated to the council by central government. I do not believe that the number of houses required by government constitutes, in itself, the ?exceptional circumstances? which are required under the Framework. This is particularly so in view of there being no published objective basis for the numbers allocated to each authority. The term ?exceptional circumstances? does include ?instances where an authority cannot meet its identified need for homes?. The waiting list for social housing in the general area might suggest that this is the case, but I do not accept that these plans will go far to address this issue ? the vast majority of the planned housing allocations are not even for affordable housing, let alone social housing. Additionally, I do not remember seeing evidence that Erewash has specifically quantified local (i.e. Erewash) housing needs. I also do not believe that much, if any, of the Green Belt selected for development would fit the definition of ?Grey Belt?. As a concept, I can support the idea of Grey Belt as originally reported, i.e. pieces of land within the Green Belt which have previously been developed ? indeed, I can think of a few locally, though they are all fairly small. I find the arguments that I have heard over distances between the edge of Derby and the edge of other towns, and how these distances will still be maintained, extremely spurious. The Green Belt in its entirety exists to prevent Nottingham and Derby from merging ? while building on any of these sites does not immediately make the two cities any closer to each other, it does reduce the green space between the two cities, which is precisely what the Green Belt was established to prevent. The Green Belt is a regional initiative, covering two counties and several local authorities. With Erewash having such a high proportion of its land earmarked as Green Belt it is incumbent on the region as a whole to find a solution to the housing shortage, rather than to expect our authority to have to sacrifice its green spaces.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Robert Mee	Response-01506	My main reason for objecting to these developments is that I do not believe that the criteria set out in the NPPF has been met justifying any encroachment into the Green Belt at this time. The Core Strategy and this Amendment are developed in order to meet the housing targets allocated to the council by central government. I do not believe that the number of houses required by government constitutes, in itself, the ?exceptional circumstances? which are required under the Framework. This is particularly so in view of there being no published objective basis for the numbers allocated to each authority. The term ?exceptional circumstances? does include ?instances where an authority cannot meet its identified need for homes?. The waiting list for social housing in the general area might suggest that this is the case, but I do not accept that these plans will go far to address this issue ? the vast majority of the planned housing allocations are not even for affordable housing, let alone social housing. Additionally, I do not remember seeing evidence that Erewash has specifically quantified local (i.e. Erewash) housing needs. I also do not believe that much, if any, of the Green Belt selected for development would fit the definition of ?Grey Belt?. As a concept, I can support the idea of Grey Belt as originally reported, i.e. pieces of land within the Green Belt which have previously been developed ? indeed, I can think of a few locally, though they are all fairly small. I find the arguments that I have heard over distances between the edge of Derby and the edge of other towns, and how these distances will still be maintained, extremely spurious. The Green Belt in its entirety exists to prevent Nottingham and Derby from merging ? while building on any of these sites does not immediately make the two cities any closer to each other, it does reduce the green space between the two cities, which is precisely what the Green Belt was established to prevent. The Green Belt is a regional initiative, covering two counties and several local authorities. With Erewash having such a high proportion of its land earmarked as Green Belt it is incumbent on the region as a whole to find a solution to the housing shortage, rather than to expect our authority to have to sacrifice its green spaces.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Rob Lowe	Response-01768	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Roger Day	Response-00023	There are areas within Sandiacre that could be built on without using greenbelt land. What about the parcel of land behind Lidl? That is an eyesore and has been derelict for many years. The proposals to improve the canal side and create a park has never materialised so why not build houses on it. There are factory units around the area which may be able to absorb some of the additional population.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Roger Farnsworth	Response-01910	Popular spot for local dog walkers, including us, offers a wide, fresh green space to walk pets & take mindfulness walks.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Roger Fleck	Response-01083	There are a number of brownfield sites readily available to build these houses on which for some reason have been overlooked particularly a sute next to lidl which has already gone through public consultation. Why has the green belt been prioritised over these sites?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Rosemarie Gough	Response-00997	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites. My husband and I have loved it and walked this area several times a week for many years. During Covid this nature reserve and surrounds was an absolute god send. Nature and being outdoors was what kept us sane during those dreadful days. Since then, more and more people are turning to the outdoors for their health and mental wellbeing. We should be cherishing this green belt.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Roy Drew	Response-01614	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Ruby Sharp	Response-00886	I cannot believe this area is seriously being considered. Once greenbelt land is used it is gone forever and where will it end? Developers should be finding areas that are not greenbelt land. Greenbelt land is essential for our ecosystems and local wildlife, providing food and photosynthesis. This area should be a definite no go given it's proximity to the nature reserve and also we already have too much concrete in the area with the M1 and Stanton Industrial Park. This concrete is an eye sore, particularly in cloudy weather, all the grey. The green belt land gives Sandiacre colour and makes it vibrant.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Ryan Selby	Response-00479	We should be protecting the green belt areas, there isn't many left and destroying these is awful. Effects the local areas with flooding and rain fall, effects the wild life and eco system. The Knock on effect it has to everything
			S. Brailsford	Response-00598	Green belt land should be saved for our future generations.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	S. Jones	Response-01615	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
			Sally Davies	Response-01294	Green belt should be green belt. Should not be allowed to be built on.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Sally Peake	Response-01893	Disappearing fast, yet another development on green field site. Why can't the new houses be built at the Stanton site - less impact locally.
			Samantha Anne Whitney	Response-00757	This land should be left as Green Belt, it's one of the prettiest places in Sandiacre, with lovely views. It's well used by local children to play on and dog walkers who walk their dogs everyday. This is exactly how it should be used and should stay as it is.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Samantha Whildes	Response-01270	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Sam Buckland	Response-00600	I find it particularly disappointing that this has been proposed when there are other local areas of brown belt which could be used instead. The whole point of green belt was to preserve these areas from development. According to Local Government Association Empty Homes Week 2025, UK Currently, nearly 700,000 homes sit empty and unfurnished, with over 265,000 classed as long-term vacant. 1800 empty properties identified by Erewash Council. No doubt the empty houses would be small numbers spaced around the area, therefore there would be less impact on roads, schools, and healthcare.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Sam Greatorex	Response-01695	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Sandra Cooke	Response-01613	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
			Sarah Favell	Response-00038	Green belts should never be built upon
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Sarah Harrison	Response-01658	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	S Bryne	Response-01677	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
			Sebastian Roberts	Response-01675	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Shanead Ligton	Response-01689	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Shannon moss	Response-00454	The fields in question are actively used by the community, with over 20+ people?runners, walkers, and families?frequenting the area daily. On certain days, local running clubs use the footpaths, which also serve as an essential link between the adjacent golf course and Stoney Clouds. The removal of this land for development would strip the community of an important recreational area, affecting both physical and mental well-being. Destruction of Greenbelt for Profit This proposal seeks to override existing greenbelt protections simply to push forward a profit-driven agenda. In the past, local residents have had planning applications rejected due to the area?s natural beauty. It is wholly unacceptable that large-scale developers are now attempting to circumvent these protections by reclassifying the land from greenbelt to grey. This is a blatant attempt to manipulate regulations, disregarding the community?s interests for financial gain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Shannon Robinson	Response-01635	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
			Sharon Grant	Response-00219	Why are we not building on other sites, why use the green belt. it was classified as this for a reason.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	sharon thornhill	Response-00448	Greenbelt areas should remain untouched. we are losing site of the necessity to keep these areas whilst rushing to fill every available space in this country with more and more housing
			Sharon weston	Response-00440	It's greenbelt land simple, is nothing sacred anymore.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Shaun Green	Response-01773	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Sheila	Response-00587	This proposal conflicts directly with the Neighbourhood Plan and planning principles aimed at protecting the Green Belt. The site serves a clear role in maintaining the character and openness of the landscape and should not be compromised when alternative sites are available. Development here would result in irreversible loss of valuable green space. Once it is gone we can never get it back. The whole development is shameful.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Sheila Payne	Response-01782	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Sian Knox	Response-01679	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	S Leek	Response-01737	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Sonya Birkin	Response-01656	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Sophie Bennett	Response-01631	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
			Sophie Farnsworth	Response-01913	Popular spot for local dog walkers, including us, offers a wide, fresh green space to walk pets & take mindfulness walks.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Stephen Barlow	Response-01808	I understand the need for new houses to be built but feel that this site is really not suitable and should be kept as greenbelt.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Stephen Davies	Response-00214	EBC appear to strongly support biodiversity and green spaces yet you want to build 180 homes on the only break between Larch Drive and M1. The site lies adjacent to a designated nature reserve and contains a significant number of mature trees. The development would result in the loss of both green space and trees and place additional pressure on the adjacent nature reserve. This conflicts with paragraph 180 which states that planning decisions should ensure that developments do not result in significant harm to biodiversity. Paragraph 179 requires planning authorities to protect and enhance sites of biodiversity value. Paragraph 131 further states that trees should be retained wherever possible. Given the proximity to the nature reserve the environmental cost of the proposed development would be high and irreversible
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Stephen Sacker	Response-01598	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Steve Bilbie	Response-00285	This is part of the small area of green belt left in sandiacre and should be preserved. This is the last remaining green belt of significance in Sandiacre.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Steve Whittaker	Response-01781	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Stuart Pensom	Response-00049	Why has it got to be green belt land
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Sue Harrison	Response-01629	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Susan Heinke	Response-00468	Enough destruction of green spaces
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Susanne Beaven	Response-01618	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Sylvia Plampin	Response-00624	Green belt should remain green belt. There are plenty of other sites, and even empty houses that could be renovated.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Tamara Partridge	Response-01780	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Tarnya Hinman	Response-01786	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Thomas Ilett	Response-01088	The NPPF states ?inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances? (paragraph 147) and ?when considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. Very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt, by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations? (paragraph 148). These statements alone justify rejection of the proposed housing allocation. However, within this context; Map 6e, Appendix E and chapter 12, paragraph 78 of the Sandiacre Neighbourhood Plan confirm that Stoney Cloud Nature Reserve meets the above NPPF criteria. As a result of the proposed housing allocation?s proximity to Stoney Cloud Nature Reserve and the surface water flood risk highlighted, the proposed housing allocation contravenes the NPPF criteria above (paragraphs 147 and 148). The proposed housing development is purported by Erewash Borough Council to increase social housing, in accordance with a target of 5000 new social housing solutions assigned by the current government. Currently, a maximum of 30% of the 180 houses to be built on this site are proposed for social housing. I propose that destroying the Green Belt to build a maximum of 54 houses towards a target in the Borough of 5000 is disproportionate and inappropriate, directly breaching the NPPF.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Tim Derbyshire	Response-01681	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Tim Gough	Response-00996	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites. My wife and I have loved it and walked this area several times a week for many years. During Covid this nature reserve and surrounds was an absolute god send. Nature and being outdoors was what kept us sane during those dreadful days. Since then, more and more people are turning to the outdoors for their health and mental wellbeing. We should be cherishing this green belt.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Tim Nichols	Response-00504	Eating up more green belt land that provides quality of views and separates housing and roads from countryside. The walk across to golf course is nice and will be destroyed with development
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Toby Moran	Response-01769	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Tom Ball	Response-01672	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Tony Weston	Response-00990	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites. Warn that allowing one development could set a precedent for further encroachments on green belt land, leading to a gradual loss of these essential spaces. developing green belt areas contributes to urban sprawl, leading to increased traffic congestion and strain on local infrastructure and services. If we allow this housing development, it sends a message that any green belt can be developed, which could lead to a domino effect damaging the entire region's green spaces.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Tracey Howe	Response-01860	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Tracey Hughes	Response-01699	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Trevor Rowston	Response-01678	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Try church	Response-00033	The green belt land is one of the only green spaces left in sandiacre. It forms a space between the housing estate and the M1. This would be lost with the development. The land is used by ramblers, dog walkers, cyclists and many families. The footpath itself that goes across the land was diverted (officially) by the tenants on the land to make it easier for people to cross and enjoy. Labours 2024 election manifesto started quite clearly that NO greenbelt would be used for building on.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Tyler Hobbs	Response-00879	Building on greenbelt land in Sandiacre would have a deeply damaging and irreversible impact on the environment, local character, and long-term sustainability of the area. The greenbelt exists specifically to prevent urban sprawl, protect natural landscapes, and preserve the character of rural and semi-rural communities like Sandiacre. Once this protected land is lost to development, it cannot be recovered?resulting in the permanent destruction of open countryside that provides vital habitat for wildlife, absorbs carbon, mitigates flooding, and offers residents a space for recreation and wellbeing. The loss of greenbelt would also weaken the natural buffer between built-up areas, leading to further creeping development in the future. Granting permission to build on this land sets a dangerous precedent that undermines national planning principles and the long-term protection of the countryside. In short, allowing this development to go ahead would sacrifice a unique and irreplaceable asset for short-term gain, at the cost of environmental health and community integrity.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Verity Lamb	Response-01298	We can't keep building on every piece of land available especially when there are brown sites available
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Vickie Wright	Response-01552	The green belt stoney clouds is a place where we as residents enjoy walking our dogs. I do this twice a day every day for mine and my dogs wellbeing. It is also a place for community engagement. It is lovely walking around the nature reserve hearing all the birds and seeing many different types of wildlife. Approving such a project goes against national and local communities to fight climate change, protect green spaces and promote sustainable development
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Vicky	Response-00485	Why destroy more green belt when there are houses empty!! We already have the local hotels filled with immigrants where does it end
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Victoria Abraham	Response-01652	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Victoria Galpin-shrimpton	Response-01009	Green Belt ? You should be protecting the green belt, it provides recreation & wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Victoria Greateorex	Response-01730	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Victoria Marriott	Response-00674	Landscape & Green belt I?m confused as to why this site was selected, it only is it very limiting in terms of the access but also the fact it?s on a nature reserve. Surely, this is going to affect a whole area for people, animals and nature. We are so lucky to have such a special place on our doorstep the views are incredible snd it?s so widely used I?m sure there must be more suitable alternatives available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Vivien Davis	Response-01582	You should be protecting the greenbelt. It provides recreation and wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Wayne Major	Response-00408	I wish to object to the proposed development on the grounds that it would result in the loss of Green Belt land, which is protected by national planning policy. Green Belt land plays a vital role in preventing urban sprawl, protecting the countryside, and preserving the setting and special character of the area. The development of this site would undermine the fundamental purposes of Green Belt protection, as outlined in Paragraph 137 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which states that development should only occur in the Green Belt in exceptional circumstances. I urge the planning authority to refuse this application in order to protect this important Green Belt land for future generations.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	William Marriott	Response-00676	Green Belt Landscape & Green belt I?m confused as to why this site was selected, it only is it very limiting in terms of the access but also the fact it?s on a nature reserve. Surely, this is going to affect a whole area for people, animals and nature. We are so lucky to have such a special place on our doorstep the views are incredible snd it?s so widely used I?m sure there must be more suitable alternatives available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Green Belt	Zoe Hughes	Response-01919	This is a beautiful area that people use for recreation & enjoyment, it's also home to wildlife. It should be protected.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Adam Shooter	Response-01925	It is already challenging to get drs appointments and pharmacy lines are often into the street. Current services are insufficient for this increase.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	A Harby	Response-01684	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Alex Corns	Response-01151	Healthcare facilities will of course be affected. Sandiacre has one small drs and dentist, which are already stretched as it is. Residents will struggle to get appointments with at least 500 extra residents needing appointments.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Alex Lord	Response-00946	Adam's House is already at capacity, and terrible to fit appointments in, and are clearly over worked. Adding new patients for the area, would see an increase health care issues for the locals, especially the elderly.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Alice Cooper	Response-01721	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Alice Ilett	Response-00571	I had free dental throughout my pregnancy but couldn't get a NHS dentist anywhere in Nottingham. I complained to PALS and was told that they were unable to assist and are telling people to call 111 if they are in pain. I've called the local doctors for my daughter and been sent to sawley as they have no appointments when the appointment line opened at 8am and I get through at 8.04. We don't have a pharmacy and often struggle to get local healthcare. What infostructure will be in place to support the new houses? We can't get healthcare now!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Amanda Leech	Response-01625	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Amy Cray	Response-01223	Minimal GPs - it's 2 months for a phone call from a doctors currently!!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Amy Skinner	Response-01447	There are very few healthcare facilities in Sandiacre itself, with the only pharmacy having recently closed. GP surgeries and dentists are at full capacity and even further afield in Stapleford you would be hard pressed to be able to register with any. Furthermore, it is already often extremely difficult to get a GP appointment and I fear this would only get worse with 180+ new households who would be needing to use these facilities.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Anastasia Anthony	Response-01865	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available. Town + Country Planning Act 1990 indicates planning authorities must ensure developments are supported by adequate infrastructures. GPs, Dentists are already overcrowded but the public hasn't been presented with plans to combat this.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Andrew Bishop	Response-01186	The local facility already cannot cope with the population within Sandiacre therefore we're sent to other areas - how can increasing the volume of housing help this?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Andrew Davies	Response-01295	To access these would need journeys to Ilkeston, Long Eaton or Derby. The 14b will give access to the Community hospital and is a good hourly service however does not start until 9:30
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Andrew Marvin	Response-00255	We already have huge problems with doctors and dental appointments the area cannot cope now Its an absolute disgrace
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Andrew Meadwell	Response-01654	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Andria Nyilasi	Response-00672	We are currently struggling to access GP appointments as it is in Sandiacre, so unless a surgery is being built there, new residents will also have to travel elsewhere to access health services.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Andy Martin	Response-01761	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Angela Whitehead	Response-00544	You can't get doctors or dentist appointments now this only increases the difficulty for existing residents
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Annabel Marriott	Response-00760	The local GP surgery is very small and doesn't offer a great service which is knowledge from local residents reviews/opinions. Many residents of Sandiacre actually use GP surgeries in surrounding areas. A good local health service is not what Sandiacre has to offer. We have no pharmacy either.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Anne Butler	Response-00385	There are no full time doctors in Sandiacre, the local Pharmacy run by Boots has shut down, There are no local dentists taking on NHS patients. Ambulance access to the site will be slow.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Anne Castledine	Response-00499	One doctors surgery for Sandiacre, try getting an appointment.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Anne Jenkins	Response-00350	It's already to get appointments at the one gp surgery that serves the area. D the same goes for dentists
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Annette Jones	Response-00961	The doctors surgery cannot cope with the population this area. I already go the Stapleford Health Centre as the Sandiacre/Stapleford doctors formed a community medical service for Stapleford and Sandiacre many years ago. I cannot even see a doctor now at the surgery as bottom of the postcode list and should be using a doctors in the Derbyshire area. I was going to change over to the Sandiacre surgery but no joy. No good saying that a new surgery will be part of the deal as no doctors to fill the positions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Ann Harrison	Response-01602	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Anthony Ford	Response-01921	I already struggle to get a doctors appointment, despite having serious illnesses. Extra pressure on the surgery will make it worse.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Anthony Pearson	Response-01760	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Antony M Ingram	Response-01626	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	April	Response-00469	The current healthcare infrastructure in our area is not equipped to handle the demands of a rapidly growing population. Local clinics and hospitals already face long wait times and limited availability of specialists and emergency services. Adding a large number of new residents without a parallel expansion of medical facilities and staffing will only worsen access to essential care. This is especially concerning for families like mine, where ongoing health issues require consistent and timely medical attention. Overburdening our healthcare system puts both new and existing residents at risk and threatens the overall well-being of the community.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	A R Gregory	Response-01918	
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Aleen Corns	Response-01146	I am concerned that the healthcare facilities will suffer, we have one small drs and one small dentist, that are already stretched. Very difficult to get appointments at either.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Awson Wheldon	Response-01649	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Barbara and John Morrell	Response-00509	As a life long resident of Sandiacre I know how difficult it is to get to see a Doctor in this area! Should this development go ahead it would become more difficult, if not impossible, to get an appointment. I do hope this matter will be addressed.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Barbara Michell	Response-01787	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Barbara Warton	Response-01886	Can't facilitate any more. Doctors will be even more overcrowded. No chemists in Sandiacre at all.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Barry Partridge	Response-01778	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Ben Hollins	Response-01651	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Ben Snowdon	Response-00428	I moved to the area 2 years ago and struggled to get in with a GP. So much so I have had to go to Nottinghamshire to get in (stapleford)
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Bethany Oakes	Response-00960	Our local pharmacy was closed, and it's incredibly hard to get Doctor's appointments as well as dentist appointments in the village. How are we meant to support over 200 more people?!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Beverly Gardner	Response-01692	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Beverly Green	Response-01686	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Bill Hartley	Response-01696	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Bill Meadwell	Response-00864	There is only one doctor and one dentist in Sandiacre. We have to ring at 8am to get an appointment and very often by the time we get through all the appointments are gone. It is virtually impossible to see a GP, only the nurse will see us. The nearest alternative surgery is in Stapleford, and they no longer take patients from Sandiacre. There is no chemist in Sandiacre any more, with Stapleford being the nearest.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Britta Solloway	Response-00959	Infrastructure is bad now and you can't get appointments, no chance if additional 180 household need to use service
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	B T Duke	Response-01900	No doctors.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	B T Keen	Response-01735	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	c/o The Equalised Club	Response-01603	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Callum binnall	Response-00460	Adams house is a joke at the moment so is any dental practice. How do expect it to carry on with more residents?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Caroline Blackmore	Response-00451	Can you get a Dr's appointment ?? Again how are they meant to cope with the increase I refer back to the new home off Longmoor Lane and also ones being built on the old gas works
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Caroline Driver	Response-00618	Again when I moved to beech Avenue 5 years ago, had to go to doctors in stapleford and dentist in long Eaton. The current 1 GP practice and 1 dentist is insufficient for the number of people already living here, never mind potentially another 180 families. Total madness.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Caroline Roy	Response-00945	Local Doctors are already a pain to get appointments at, adding this many extra residents to the area without additional GP facilities is just madness
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Carol Marshall	Response-00736	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Carolyn Hallam	Response-00489	It is already extremely difficult to get a GP appointment in Sandiacre. There is no pharmacy and no plans to have one
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Catherine Greenaway	Response-00429	We struggle already to get appointments at the doctors. There are only two in the area. How will these surgeries cope?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Catherine Richardson	Response-00531	Doctors and dentist are already creaking at the seams. It is hard enough already to get an appointment. So many new patients could not be accepted so would have to travel further afield
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Charlotte Hunter	Response-01376	It's already hard enough trying to get a doctors appointment- having more houses means more of a LOTERY getting one!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	C Holmes	Response-01620	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Chris Hume	Response-01373	Getting a doctor for routine appointment takes a month, NHS dentists spaces don't exist, this development will make it worse for everyone
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Chris Jones	Response-01718	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Chris O Connor	Response-01641	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Christian Rearson	Response-01763	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Christine Anderson	Response-00484	Our Doctors service is already fully stretched. We are unable to attain appointments without queuing at 8:00 on the day for a possible appointment. 180 new families will bring this service into a dangerous situation - they will not be able to offer a safe amount of medical care.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Christine Gough	Response-00578	Only one doctors surgery in Sandiacre, where you can't get an appointment , no chemist , how do people look after their health when there are not enough facilities . One dentist who can't take on anymore . Sandiacre is bursting at the seams . Where are the facilities for new mothers and babies ? Where can they take their babies to be weighed and get their immunisations? Where can a child go for a health check up ? Have their teeth looked at ? Where can the people with diabetes go , to be checked and get their insulin ? With no chemist ! And there are potentially another 180 homes being built with people needing these non existent services . Absolutely crazy !!!!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Christine Ridgway	Response-00465	I have had to register at Stapleford for my doctors even though it would be easier to be in Sandiacre however they have no availability and it is still a struggle to get a appointment when needed.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Claire binnall	Response-00459	Absolute joke you cannot get a dra appointment at afam house and there are no NHS provisions locally if you want an appointment you have to wait until November and go to a different county you are an absolute shambles hang your heads In shame so called councillors lining your pockets you are all a disgrace
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Clair Ellis	Response-00475	Our local doctors struggle to fit you in for an appointment as it is. Will there be another surgery to accommodate the rest of the new residents?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Clare Green	Response-01751	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Cole Hawkins	Response-01714	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Colin Cox	Response-01716	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Colin Marriott	Response-00686	One surgery, full in, one dentist that doesn't accept NHS patients, no pharmacy, A ?ot of residents use the facilities in Stapleford due to the lack of facilities in Sandiacre. Another reason for keeping the bus services
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Courtney Bennett	Response-00593	As like the schools, the healthcare sector is also already overran, underfunded, understaffed, unsupported. Are you building an additional 2 doctors practices and pharmacies to aid the increased proposed population? You are just adding and causing more physical and mental problems to the current residents by increasing the amount of people in the area when the education and health care sectors in this area are already struggling.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	C Owen	Response-01917	The area does not have the infrastructure for all the proposed construction & the people going to live there.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Craig Freeman	Response-01561	Adam House is the only health service in Sandiacre and it is already almost impossible to get an appointment, especially if you work full time. Increasing the demand on this poor facility will only cause more frustration, more delays to primary care and increased cost for remedial action and treatments.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Craig Richards	Response-01638	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Craig Thims	Response-01765	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Cristina Jenkins	Response-01588	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	C Thompson	Response-01634	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	DAllen	Response-00525	Doctors surgeries locally will be affected by this as at present there is an overload of dr to patient ratios
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Dana	Response-01173	Not even a chemist in Sandiacre now
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Daniel	Response-00545	GP surgeries and local NHS services are already overstretched, with long wait times and limited availability. An increase of potentially hundreds of new residents will put further pressure on these essential services without any guarantee of expansion or additional funding. Are you going to build a new GP office or hire more doctors?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Daniel Downes	Response-01630	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Daniel Hands	Response-00057	All local doctors, dentists and other health care facilities such as mental health services and pediatricians are already overloaded. We already have to wait weeks or months to see professionals and receive the help and care needed to protect our families. QMC hospital often sees waiting time of several hours, with many residents reporting A&E waiting times exceeding 8 hours.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Danielle Harrison	Response-00568	Adam House Surgery struggles to meet the needs of locals as it is. On average we have waited up two weeks to get a doctors appointment in our household and rely on the 111 helpline because the service is so poor. The dentists are also at total capacity and we are unable to have NHS appointments at all so have to travel outside Sandiacre, to Derby!

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Daniel Naylor	Response-00680	Doctors, dentists and chemists (there already is no chemist in sandiacre) are already in short supply, without 180 new homes adding to this problem. Will guarantees be made create more doctors surgeries etc to handle the added residents to the area id this development got pushed through? In addition to schools, there's the issue with available doctors, dentist and chemists. There is already only 1 doctor and 1 dentist practice in sandiacre so the local residents already struggle to get a doctor's appointment in reasonable time, then have to travel to nearby Stapleford to collect their vital medication as there is no chemist in sandiacre. An extra 180 homes to add the this already existing problem would do the existing and the proposed new residents no favours whatsoever when requiring medical assistance.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Darran and Emma Rea	Response-00597	Local residents already struggle to get into the doctors, the impact of this development will put further pressure on the healthcare facilities, even local dentists aren't able to take on NHS patients, the services are already stretched
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	David Casey	Response-01608	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	David Cater	Response-01756	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	David Ruddock	Response-01776	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	David Tindsley	Response-00515	I wish to object to the proposed development due to the lack of sufficient healthcare provision in the local area. I currently use Adam House Medical Centre, and I am very aware of the challenges already facing our local GP services. Although there are no patient quotas at GPs, it is extremely difficult to get an appointment, and patients are often required to call at exactly 8am, or personally attend the surgery, to stand any chance of being seen. If you call even 30 minutes later, all available appointments for the day are typically gone. This has become the norm, not the exception, and it reflects the level of pressure the practice is already under. Adding another 180 homes to the area will place further strain on a system that is already at breaking point. Without additional investment in local healthcare infrastructure, this development risks worsening access for both existing and new residents. There is a similar situation relating to dentists, where it is almost impossible to register for an NHS dentist at any local dentist with the Erewash BC This concern aligns with Paragraph 95 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which states that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments are supported by the necessary infrastructure, including health facilities. It is also supported by Paragraph 8, which highlights the importance of promoting healthy and safe communities as part of sustainable development. Until there is a clear and funded plan to expand healthcare capacity locally whether through additional GP provision, clinic space, or staffing this development is premature and would place an unacceptable burden on already overstretched services. For these reasons, I strongly object to the application and urge the planning authority to ensure that adequate health infrastructure is in place before any further large-scale housing developments are approved.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	David Yeo	Response-01705	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Dean Bosworth	Response-01665	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Dean Lavelle	Response-01774	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Dean Michell	Response-01343	You cannot get appointments at the doctors now, so how will building more homes help.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Dean Peake-Whitehurst	Response-00488	Getting an appointment at the local GP surgery is already hard enough. We do not need more competition for healthcare
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Debra Michell	Response-01346	Adam House doctors , it almost impossible to get an appointment if you are not on the phone at 8 am. We don't have no chemist no more which is very much needed. The dentist is good , but I don't know if they are taking on new patients.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Debra Scully	Response-00288	Already no healthcare provisions for local residents with the local gp due to close. Already unable to get GP a appointments without adding further residents
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Debs Washer	Response-00487	Adam House is a joke and virtually impossible to get an appointment, adding more houses won't help.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Denise bennett	Response-00030	There is one doctor at full capacity, no NHS dentist, no pharmacy
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Denise Creasey	Response-00786	Consideration needs to be made for health care facilities such as GP surgeries and dental practices. Currently there is only one of each which are both occurrently over subscribed.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Denise Lingard	Response-01759	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Dennis Watts	Response-01726	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Derek Morton	Response-01607	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Derrick Hunt	Response-00437	The healthcare service is terrible you are very lucky if you can get an appointment at the doctor's if they'll register you. And good luck trying to even get registered with a NHS dentist So maybe add in some incentive for people to take out private medical insurance.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Destiny Jade-Blake	Response-01636	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Diane Jones	Response-00852	We only have one Doctor's surgery in Sandiacre. There used to be two chemists, one on Station Road and one on Derby Road, now there are none . If more houses are to be built we need increased services.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Diane Mcmorrow	Response-00433	Gp surgeries and Dentists are vastly overwhelmed Gp in Sandiacre really struggle to allocate you an appointment lines open at 8am by 8.05am all appointments have gone. Many of my friends have resorted to going to a surgery's in nearby Stapleford. I've not been able to get into a Dentist since lock down Health Care Facilities are not good at all
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Diane Meadwell	Response-00807	Sandiacre has only one doctor?s surgery and one dental surgery. There is no pharmacy. Our local health provision is over subscribed and there are no walk in centres or minor injury and illness centres in the near vicinity.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Diane Turner	Response-01744	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Donna Steele	Response-00781	Our doctors surgeries and local dentist do not have the capacity to take more patients. I am still trying to find a dentist to take me as a patient.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Dorothy Deeprise	Response-00817	I hope you will build more GP practices for these people. It already takes weeks to see a GP. Also, GP's are only open during the week meaning you cant be ill at weekends but yet you can by a TV! This is crazy
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	D Pallett	Response-01627	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	D Simpson	Response-01712	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	E Cooper	Response-01923	Cannot access these already (family live in area). No dentist/doctor appointments already.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Elaine Pickering	Response-00811	Have they provided extra health care services to cope the extra residents
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Eleanor Moseley	Response-00799	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Eleanor Newman	Response-00718	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
			Emily Milnes	Response-00470	GP surgery already struggling and no pharmacy in Sandiacre
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Emma	Response-00492	The doctor appointments are very hard to get into at the moment taking several days. This will add extra stress to the Doctors facilities making it even harder to get appointment.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Emma Ryan	Response-00503	There is one GP in Sandiacre, one dentist and no pharmacy. At that a lot of residents are already accessing services like this from Stapleford. Again, there is a lack of services as it is for the current residents, let alone bringing in potentially 180 more families. When these people can't get seen at the GP they end up in the local emergency department which is then a further strain on the healthcare system.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Emma Wall	Response-00319	I work in general practice and I know uniquely that all services in this area are overstretched and over registered already. The general practice is around this area will not cope with an influx of extra people. I very much doubt that the ICB have been consulted about this. Knowing the planning issues where I am practice manager at , there is no understanding by development or by planning officers that a single plot of land will be enough for one surgery. General practice cannot do branch surgery anymore. It cost too much money and if they are intimating that they will cover it with a plot just for a surgery. You are incorrect and completely out of date with how the health service can run in primary care.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Emma Wilson	Response-01222	Can't get a GP appointment now without adding a further 3000 plus people to the area
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Esther Cook	Response-01861	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Fay Cresswell	Response-00701	We have no pharmacy in Sandiacre at all you have to travel to Stapleford the nearest to get your prescription. It?s difficult to get appointments now at the GP you have to phone at 8 am and queue. Frequently you are offered appointments at a different practice in Sawley which is great if you drive but not if you can?t as from this side of Sandiacre it?s 2 buses there and 2 back and when your unwell that is not appropriate at all
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Gail Berry	Response-01644	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Geoff Tindsley	Response-00755	I wish to object to the proposed development due to the lack of sufficient healthcare provision in the local area. 1. I understand that there is currently only one GP surgery and one dentist in the village. Although there are no patient quotas at GPs, I am told that is extremely difficult to get an appointment, and patients are required to call at exactly 8am, or personally attend the surgery, to stand any chance of being seen. If you call even 30 minutes later, all available appointments for the day are typically gone. This has become the norm, not the exception, and it reflects the level of pressure the practice is already under. Adding another 180 homes to the area will place further strain on a system that is already at breaking point. Without additional investment in local healthcare infrastructure, this development risks worsening access for both existing and new residents. 2. There is a similar situation relating to dentists, where it is almost impossible to register for an NHS dentist at any local dentist with the Erewash BC For these reasons, I strongly object to the application and urge the planning authority to ensure that adequate health infrastructure is in place before any further large-scale housing developments are approved.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Georgia C	Response-01296	NHS is already on its knees and keeps getting worse under the Labour government. As a tax payer you cannot afford to be ill, as you will not receive the care you have contributed to all your working life.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Georgia Marvin	Response-00261	The residents of Sandiacre still don?t all have a place within a GP or dentist. Dentists in the local area are not taking on any new patients. You have to wait 2+ months to even get a doctors appointment as it is. The current residents of Sandiacre are neglected so how is adding 180 new households going to solve this issue?



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Gill West	Response-01725	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Glyn Holner	Response-01697	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Gordon Bruce	Response-01455	They are already over subscribed and Stapleford is not taking new patients from Sandiacre. This situation is already so difficult for locals.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Gordon Daris	Response-01639	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Greg Cox	Response-01702	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Gregg Bartrum	Response-01591	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Greg Watts	Response-00733	The proposed number of houses would place unsustainable pressure on local infrastructure, including healthcare facilities
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Harriet Farnsworth	Response-01914	The residents of Sandiacre already can't get into the doctors/dentist, more residents will make this worse & detriment peoples health due to long wait times.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Helen	Response-00883	Can't get a Drs appointment now so further housing will increase the issues. Provisions or plans to create another surgery need to be considered. If Drs aren't taking on new patients due to capacity then again there will be more vehicle movement within Sandiacre which is already congested
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Helen Gillain	Response-00964	Doctors are already struggling to cope with waits of approx 6 weeks for an appointment ... extra patients is not a viable proposition for this area
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Helen Richardson	Response-00432	My objection to this development is based on the apparent lack of consideration for the increased demand on healthcare services. The proposal for 108 new homes makes no mention of how the additional residents will be accommodated by local healthcare facilities. Without a clear plan and commitment to expanding the capacity of GP surgeries, dental practices, and other essential health services, this development is unsustainable and will negatively impact the health and well-being of the entire community.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Helen whiteman	Response-00447	We have limited health resources. The local health centre is adamant house and already is no 10 out of 10 of the Erewash surgeries. Where are all the extra people going to go and be treated. Putting extra work on already overloaded doctors surgeries The less we say on the local dentists the better
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Ian	Response-00493	More strain on Adam house GP surgery which already struggles to see current patient numbers
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Ian Bailey	Response-00505	There are already no healthcare facilities in sandiacre suitable and stapleford as it is currently is difficult to get an appointment
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Ian herbert	Response-00939	the only medical service, adams house, is already full and overstretched.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	IAN TAYLOR	Response-00972	If the development goes ahead with 180 units, it is unlikely that the current healthcare providers in the area will be able to absorb the increased numbers of people expected to be living in a development of that size. There are currently no dentists places available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Ian telfer	Response-00991	Can't get in at the doctors already.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Ian Ward	Response-01628	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Irina Anthony	Response-01867	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Isabelle Love	Response-00529	Again, an obvious issue but one that is more pressing. Adams house surgery has been running a dismal service for the past 20 years, a service that has gone from bad to worse with you not even being able to get through in the morning for an emergency appointment. Whilst pregnant (the midwife service thankfully was forced to make room for me) I witnessed no end of elderly patients who would walk into the facility begging to be seen. The one chemist we had in Sandiacre - at this surgery - has now closed. It is obvious that surrounding pharmacies are also struggling as they often have no stock, forcing patients to make multiple trips to pick up one prescription - and issue that will also only exasperate the traffic congestion this building site proposes.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Isobel Ball	Response-01092	Adam house is sandiacres dominating GP choice. Now patients are already being redirected to sawley due to the strain and excess pressure on the NHS. Those in south sandiacre will almost 100% be sent to sawley permanently if these plans are followed through with, as they will be closest out of the catchment for adam house. This is absolutely unfair, we should not be building additional housing in a village already oversubscribed.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	J. E. Lord	Response-01601	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Jack Greatorex	Response-01731	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Jacob Whitt	Response-01748	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Jacqueline Marshall	Response-01436	We don't have enough Healthcare facilities in Sandiacre at present. A lack of GP surgeries, NHS Dentists. No Pharmacy Are Doctors advised in advance when new developments are proposed? What facilities have been included in the proposed plan?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Jade Smith	Response-01783	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	James Meadwell	Response-01653	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	James Roberts	Response-01708	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	James Seward	Response-01683	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	James White	Response-01883	More pressure on local public services. Will local residents see better services or will the council just pocket the extra council tax???
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Jane Dennett	Response-00965	Where the Gps going to be Adam House will not cope. As a complicated patient I need to know I can use my GPs. Putting people at risk no resources to support building new homes. No Dentists disaster
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Jane Elizabeth Tindsley	Response-00669	I wish to object to the proposed development due to the lack of sufficient healthcare provision in the local area. I currently use Adam House Medical Centre, and I am very aware of the challenges already facing our local GP services. I have spoken directly to staff at Adams House, and they tell me that there are there are no patient quotas at GPs. However, it is extremely difficult to get an appointment, and patients are often required to call at exactly 8am, or personally attend the surgery, to stand any chance of being seen. If you call even 5 minutes later, all available appointments for the day are typically gone. This has become the norm, not the exception, and it reflects the level of pressure the practice is already under. I feel that any addition patients registering from this development would only exacerbate the current situation. Without additional investment in local healthcare infrastructure, this development risks worsening access for both existing and new residents. There is a similar situation relating to dentists, where it is almost impossible to register for an NHS dentist at any local dentist within the Erewash BC. There is currently only one dentist in Sandiacre, on Derby Road. Having contacted them, I am advised that there are three dentists about to leave, and only access to 2-3 private dentists. If successful in getting registered, you can go private and either pay-as-you-go or personalise a dental plan appropriate to your individual needs. This concern aligns with Paragraph 95 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which states that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments are supported by the necessary infrastructure, including health facilities. It is also supported by Paragraph 8, which highlights the importance of promoting healthy and safe communities as part of sustainable development. Until there is a clear and funded plan to expand healthcare capacity locally whether through additional GP provision, clinic space, or staffing this development is premature and would place an unacceptable burden on already overstretched services. For these reasons, I strongly object to the application and urge the planning authority to ensure that adequate health infrastructure is in place before any further large-scale housing developments are approved.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Janet Edwards	Response-01906	Services are already overstretched & the proposed building would put even more pressure on them.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Janet Whildes	Response-01869	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Jane Warton	Response-00662	A strain on GP's, dentist's
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Janice Taylor	Response-01743	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Janice West	Response-00989	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Janine Holmes	Response-01595	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Jason Deeprise	Response-00818	Where will the extra people go? There are too many people.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Jason Harwood	Response-01667	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Jason Webb	Response-01637	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Jayne Rowley	Response-01279	There is just one doctors and one dental practice in Sandiacre. This development would potentially mean that a further 300-400 people would need to access healthcare putting the health and welfare of existing service users at risk due to appointments being at a premium. Also with the proposed developments in neighbouring towns their services too will see a significant increase in demand making it virtually impossible to register
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	J Cates	Response-01750	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Jeanette O Connor	Response-01640	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Jeffrey Whittaker	Response-00594	Over stretched as it is you can not see a doctor in person anymore and gave to wait days for a call back
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Jennifer Bailey	Response-01857	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Jennifer Saville	Response-00516	Only one surgery in Sandiacre which is already struggling to cope, not chemist at all

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Jennifer Tindsley	Response-00751	I wish to object to the proposed development due to the lack of sufficient healthcare provision in the local area. 1. I understand that there is currently only one GP surgery and one dentist in the village. Although there are no patient quotas at GPs, I am told that is extremely difficult to get an appointment, and patients are required to call at exactly 8am, or personally attend the surgery, to stand any chance of being seen. If you call even 30 minutes later, all available appointments for the day are typically gone. This has become the norm, not the exception, and it reflects the level of pressure the practice is already under. Adding another 180 homes to the area will place further strain on a system that is already at breaking point. Without additional investment in local healthcare infrastructure, this development risks worsening access for both existing and new residents. 2. There is a similar situation relating to dentists, where it is almost impossible to register for an NHS dentist at any local dentist with the Erewash BC For these reasons, I strongly object to the application and urge the planning authority to ensure that adequate health infrastructure is in place before any further large-scale housing developments are approved.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Jenny Stephens	Response-01723	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Joanna hardy	Response-01304	Despite being a resident of sandiacre my family has been forced to keep our medical and dental places in stapleford due to a lack of availability of healthcare in the local area. More homes means more people so would overwhelm our already over stretched healthcare.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Joanne Guyatt	Response-01784	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Joanne Johnson	Response-00765	Our healthcare provisions are already stretched , please don't put more pressure on them. We struggle to get seen some days as it is at the doctors when needed. There are no NHS dentist places anymore, be damned if we as a household are paying privately to see one! This pressure on these services will only increase, it isn't fair on the residents already living here.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Joanne Lambert	Response-00494	It is already a challenge to get a gp appointment, there are queues on the phones when you need to be seen and even if you get through it is unlikely that you will be seen. 180 extra households could mean around 720 extra patients for the GP practice to care for. Extra strain will also be put on community nursing and dental practices.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Jodie Owen	Response-01688	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Jodie Shrive	Response-00601	There is only ONE GP practice in Sandiacre, and they are not accepting new patients. The same as dentist - not accepting new patients. So where are you expecting the new people who will be moving to the area to go? Do you expect them to live without essential healthcare? Do you expect it's current residents to do the same? Local residents are already fighting for GP appointments, and that's with the high number of residents the town already has. Forcing this upon us will mean it will be impossible to get access to vital healthcare.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Jo Gerhardt	Response-01286	There is only one doctors surgery, Adams House, for the population of Sandiacre. Its already very difficult to ring and get an appointment. Adding a possible 400 patients to there list would not be acceptable in an already busy surgery. Plus one Dentist leading to more problems as mentioned above.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	John Gardner	Response-01694	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	John G Brown	Response-01752	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	John Hibbitt	Response-01855	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	John Ledger	Response-01605	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	John Payne	Response-01785	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	John whiteman	Response-00450	The doctors are rammed already. Try getting an appointment it's bad enough now without hundreds of extra patients Don't even mention the dentists they are non existent
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Jon Burn	Response-01722	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Josh Williams	Response-01632	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	J Pearson	Response-01772	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	J Telfer	Response-01876	Can't get into doctors already.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Judith A Pulfer	Response-01863	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Judith Blackburn	Response-01928	Non existent - do it yourself! No chemist in the area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Julie Hill	Response-01643	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Julie Taylor	Response-01503	Getting an appointment at the doctors is already a challenge without adding more people to the list.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Karen Alldread	Response-01868	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Karen Blain	Response-01732	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Karen Evans	Response-00523	More pressure on already stretched services.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Karen Harwood	Response-01668	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Karen Pitts	Response-00643	At the moment, it is almost impossible to get a doctors appointment, an increase in the number of people requiring health care will inevitably add to this problem. We have already lost the local pharmacy in Sandiacre which was adjacent to Adam House surgery.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Kathryn Martin	Response-00527	It is already impossible to get a doctors and dentist appointment
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Katie Robinson	Response-00943	There is not enough doctors and appointments for this level of housing - 180 housing will have on average 2 people which is approx. 360 extra appts needed and that's not even including if there are children or elderly in the houses also. In addition there is a real issue with dental appointments across the country and has been in this area for some time. I have been without a dentist since 2023 - my dental practise went private and since then I have been looking for a new practice. I have now been put on a waiting list for one in Chilwell however one appointment was cancelled and now I don't expect to be seen until August at the earliest. I have to travel to see a dentist after a 2 year wait to find one that is excepting NHS patients and I currently still go to the practise in Long Eaton for my GP as well. There is just not enough in terms of health care to sustain this amount of houses to be built.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Kelly Randall	Response-00591	The sole GP surgery in Sandiacre may lack the capacity to accommodate an influx of 400 new residents. Have healthcare providers been consulted? Cross-boundary impacts on Stapleford facilities must also be considered.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Kelsey Green	Response-01666	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Kenneth Cooper	Response-01720	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Kern-Paul Lewis	Response-01715	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Kerry Meadwell	Response-01655	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Kerry Smith	Response-01271	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Kerry stokes	Response-00769	I have to go to a doctors in a neighbouring town because I can't get an appointment at the local doctors. Local doctors/ dentists are full to capacity & not taking on NHS patients. Adding more residents will only add so much pressure to our services. I already have to go to facilities out of the area to accommodate this.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	KH Taylor	Response-01663	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Kimberley Selby	Response-00478	You already can't get into a doctors or dentist in the local area never mind get an appointment. Is there going to be extra facilities built to support this?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Kim Helm	Response-00632	An average family is 2.2 x 180 so over 400+ needing health care facilities It is hard to get GP appointments without these extra numbers and it is near impossible to get an NHS dentist
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Kirk Moss	Response-00439	Public services such as GP surgeries and dental clinics are already at capacity. Further residential development would increase pressure on these essential services, worsening wait times and reducing quality of care.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Kirsty	Response-00970	Already too difficult to get a doctors appointment
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Kirsty Handa	Response-00445	Their is only 1 GP Surgery and 1 dentist in Sandiacre. The current GP can already not cope with the current residents in Sandiacre and many of the residents are already forced to go elsewhere such as Long Eaton and Stapleford. Having your GP in another area already causes different issues as the CCG is different These different areas are also having issues coping with the amounts of residents they have. There are more and more developments being built but no additional GP surgeries. It is already extremely difficult to get a GP appointment and this has forced people to go to A&E for problems they shouldn't have had to go for. This proposed development is not going to be sustainable in terms of GP surgeries, there simply is not enough of them nor space for their needs to be looked after as they should be. The same goes for dentists, there are no NHS patient appointments anymore and no space at dental surgeries often waiting months for appointments. This development is not sustainable
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Kirsty Meredith	Response-01462	I understand that the local dentists and doctors are already at nearly full or full capacity... where will all the people in these new houses be expected to register?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Kristie Rugers	Response-01864	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Kyle Jones	Response-01764	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	L A Keen	Response-01659	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Laura Hallam	Response-01711	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
			Laura Thompson	Response-00702	Lack of local gp, nhs dentists for new residents to access. Already very difficult for locals to get appointments.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Laurence Luck	Response-01727	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
			Lauren Freeman	Response-01562	Sandiacre has one drs surgery and it is already incredibly difficult to get a drs appointment.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Lauren Rose	Response-01446	1 dentist and 1 Doctors surgery currently serve the area of the proposed development, both of which struggle to cope with the current number of patients. A further 180 homes and people that come with those homes will simply find getting an appointment nigh-on impossible as current residents struggle!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Leah morral	Response-00712	Getting an appointment at sandiacre doctors is hard enough now without adding hundreds of more patients
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Lee Wilcock	Response-01670	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Lesley Bruce	Response-01397	The chemist next to Sandiacre Health Centre has recently closed reducing amenity. Stapleford is not accepting Sandiacre overspill patients. Local dentists are full. To consider the stresses extra new housing would put on local services is completely unfair to all residents.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Lesley Carter	Response-00536	The healthcare in this area is already failing. You have to queue outside by 8am if you want an appointment as the phones are so busy they cant answer them. Appointments are really hard to get. Some Sandiacre residents go to Stapleford surgery but I have been told that it is very bad there too. I don't believe that increasding the number of patients by 180 households will be a tenable situation. There are no local NHS dental places.
			Lesley Morral	Response-01920	Lack of infrastructure already unable to get a doctors appointment.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Lia Thims	Response-01766	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
			lilly stokes	Response-00767	I struggle very much to get in an appointment in my local doctors and adding 180 more houses will certainly not help this point.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Linda Castledine-Davies	Response-00850	There is only 1 doctor practice and 1 dental practice (private ). To obtain a doctors appointment patients have to queue from as early as 7.45am outside in all weathers, even the most atrocious, and wait for the surgery to open. At times there can be 12-20 people waiting outside. It is no point ringing the surgery at 8.00am as it stipulates because phones are not answered until the queue have been dealt with by which time no appointments are left. This ridiculous rigmarole has to be continued even if the doctor tells you to make another appointment. Some of the doctors at the practice only work limited hours/days and the main doctor, Dr Ali, at the Sandiacre and Stapleford practices rarely sees anyone these day. Personally despite being very ill I have repeatedly had to stand in the pouring rain, hurricane winds and snow to get seen to, There was a pharmacy attached to the surgery but this closed and the parish council refused to allow another to open. Total lack of health facilities without venturing into Stapleford. A bus now goes to Ilkeston Hospital from the bottom of Stanton Road but again because of the steepness of the hill most cannot negotiate the roads. Dentist is across the road both of which are on a steep hill with little parking and no bus service to from this site or area. Even though private and expensive it is difficult to obtain an appointment. There is no longer a pharmacy in Sandiacre medication and advice has to be sought from other towns. If you cannot get a doctors appointment there is nowhere to obtain help and advice.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Linda Oscroft	Response-01927	We see no spare capacity in the health care facilities, nor schools to accommodate increased demand generated from the addition of high density housing residents.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Lindsey Rawlinson	Response-01624	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Lisa Heppell	Response-00878	There is a doctors in Sandiacre that never has enough appointments for you if you need to see a doctor, and also no chemist
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Lisa J Pearson	Response-01762	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Liz Woodhouse	Response-01584	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	L Mee	Response-01777	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Logan Fox	Response-00746	MY parents have always struggled to get appointments at the doctor, even calling on the day, on most occasions we cannot get an appointment. And for a dentist, we have to travel outside the area. How will more people be helped when the current doctors are struggling and us as well?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Lorraine Daly	Response-00495	There are no NHS dentists and access to services is patchy. There is no pharmacy either.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Lorraine Hands	Response-00534	I don't? feel there are enough facilities in Sandiacre to take on such a volume of patients, again taking time away from residents in the area!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Louise dix	Response-00975	The local doctor can't cope with the number they have now let alone another 180 house . Getting a appointment that none urgent is already a month waiting .
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Louise Felfoldt	Response-01733	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Louise Harper	Response-01571	The gp in sandiacre is very small with losing the pharmacy next to it, I use linden medical with not much hope of getting an appointment as I used to live in stapleford before moving to sandiacre 25 years ago

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Louise Harrison	Response-01719	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Louise Jacks	Response-01767	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Louise Libberton	Response-01693	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Lucy Johnson	Response-01369	Our doctors on a whole aren't that bad! (Adam House Medical Centre) I've never personally had an issue with them, but I've read a lot of people's negative reviews about them! And adding more stress to this service isn't right! Don't let the people of Sandiacre struggle! Just for some houses!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	lucy victoria garner	Response-00949	what health care facilities. Sandiacre doesn't have an adequate surgery now. Last CQC report for Adam House advised needs improvement <a href="https://www.cqc.org.uk/location/1-553055514?referrer=widget3">https://www.cqc.org.uk/location/1-553055514?referrer=widget3</a> Pharmacy recently closed down. other local providers in stapleford also poor. QMC under pressure already and absolutely dire provision of health care. No one is able to get a GP appt now. Adding another 300-500 people to those unavailable resources.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Luke Chein	Response-01779	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Lynda Morton	Response-01606	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Lynsey Blackburn	Response-01227	Extra developments cause extra strain on public services. No more GP places are made available for the additional housing being created.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Macie Brothwell	Response-01633	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Malcolm Dillon	Response-00722	There is only one doctors surgery in the Sandiacre township. There used to be one dispensary in the township but this closed last year. The addition of 180 families to the area, without additional service facilities will inevitably put a strain on existing health care systems.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Malcolm Fox	Response-00215	We all know the NHS is not just under pressure but failing. In the last year I have only needed the odd support from our registered GP - good luck! Even on the odd occasion, I simply gave up trying to secure an appointment and self medicated both myself and children. NHS dentist is non-existent as well. When we moved into the area, we were unable to register with a doctor that was within 3 miles, as we fell outside the catchment area. Again, limiting the options of a doctor and having to register at ones supporting a local area where appointments are at capacity as are many surgeries. Again, get infrastructure in first!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Malcolm Riggs	Response-01680	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Malc Orbiston	Response-01673	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Mandy Rait	Response-01587	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available. It is already impossible to book a doctors/dentist appointment. To build 180 homes is utterly impracticable.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Mark Gough	Response-00888	Only one GP surgery in Sandiacre that you can't get appointments for, no chemist, no clinics for local mothers to take their babies to be weighed, and for help. Nothing for the elderly or clinics for diabetes, child healthcare, nothing for people suffering with mental health. Only one dental practice who can't take in any more NHS or even private. Absolutely ridiculous to think Sandiacre can cope with more people needing these services!!!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Mark Leek	Response-01740	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	mark skelton	Response-01341	No space already for appointments and no dentist's appointments for NHS patients.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Mark Warton	Response-00693	GP surgery's having to cope with even more patients. They currently cannot cope with the existing population of Sandiacre, this will put an even greater strain on a service which is already broken in Sandiacre. Dentists, NHS places are already at a premium
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Marta McManus	Response-00646	There's one GP surgery and no pharmacy in Sandiacre
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Martin Driver	Response-01387	No doctors or dentists available. Even if they say they can take them on, they won't be able to get an appointment. It's a mess!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Martin Ford	Response-01908	We currently struggle with Dr & dentist appointments.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Martin Hardy	Response-01413	There is limited healthcare in Sandiacre and the surrounding area. When we moved from Stapleford to Sandiacre we had to keep using the same doctors and dentists as there was no availability in Sandiacre. There are also no dentists taking NHS patients in the region. More houses means more people needing these services with no way to increase such healthcare provision.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Martyn Locker	Response-00903	This one isn't exclusive to Sandiacre, but it's already a fight to get a doctor's appointment. 180 new houses puts hundreds more people onto the single doctor's surgery's register. How much capacity does it have to expand - both physically in terms of space, and budget in terms of hiring new doctors - to meet the requirements of new residents? Specific to Sandiacre, the local pharmacy has been closed down, hundreds of elderly residents have to catch the bus to Stapleford just to collect a prescription. To me, that doesn't signify a town that's thriving and ready to welcome hundreds of new residents.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Matt Bancroft	Response-00916	Existing healthcare facilities are already oversubscribed with many residents already having to travel to neighbouring districts for health care.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Matt Hallam	Response-00476	Try ringing up sandiacre and stapleford doctors at 8am and try and get a appointment as it is. Good luck with atleast 180 more people
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Matthew Buckland	Response-00615	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8a.m. Often no appointments are available. Local hospitals are currently at full capacity and are pleading with the general public not to attend, so adding to this is ill advised, and I wouldn't want to ring an ambulance from the proposed site as the chances of getting an ambulance through the estate is slim to none - especially at peak times.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Maurice Mason	Response-01617	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	M Dougle	Response-01749	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	M Eastwood	Response-01757	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Melanie	Response-00586	There is currently only one GP surgery in Sandiacre, which is already operating near capacity. The addition of 180 households will place further strain on local healthcare services. No evidence has been presented to show that the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) has been consulted or that plans exist to expand capacity in line with the projected population increase. Our only pharmacy in Sandiacre was closed down too.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Melanie Caumont	Response-01272	Healthcare services in the area are severely stretched. Securing GP appointments is already challenging, and local dental practices are not taking on new patients. The proposed development makes no mention of investment in health infrastructure. This would significantly burden the system and reduce access for current residents.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Melanie Howarth	Response-01621	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Michael Anderson	Response-00461	We already have a severe problem in trying to get an appointment with our doctors. This additional number of people on this proposed site will cause even more problems.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Michael Darnell	Response-00648	The golf course is a healthcare facility for a lot of local people and this will be affected. The course has been there since 1905 and provides a lot of recreation for locals. The increased footfall across the course and the incursion on to the area will be a health and safety issue, and put off people joining and using the facility.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Michael Oscroft	Response-01926	We see no spare capacity in the health care facilities, nor schools to accommodate increased demand generated from the addition of high density housing residents.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Michell Birkin	Response-01657	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Michelle Alsop	Response-01645	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Michelle Cox	Response-01724	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Michelle Ledger	Response-00815	we have 1 GP surgery, Adam House - it is almost impossible some days to get a same day appointment , i have been on the phone at 8am on hold till say 820am and they have no appointments left! how can it support these additional residents the surgery clearly cannot cope as it is
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Michelle Wenham	Response-01650	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Mick Hughes	Response-01701	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Mike Darnell	Response-00698	No pharmacy not enough drs appointments no nhs dentist woh places
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Miss Garratt	Response-00905	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Miss R Cordon	Response-01648	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Mollie Snow	Response-01729	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Mr & Mrs Turton	Response-01660	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Mr and Mrs R Skelton	Response-01274	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Mr and Mrs Wright	Response-01275	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Mr Colin Key	Response-01841	Existing limited amenities that are already stretched to capacity and fully subscribed ie Doctor, Dentist

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Mr David Ainsworth	Response-00621	Access to a local GP is already difficult. Derby Road are not accepting new patients. Stapleford is full. Waiting times for community services are already running at several months. I have a son waiting for carpal tunnel treatment for six months and can't access due to high demand. My parents have been kicked off an NHS dental service because they are only taking private patients. Ambulance response times are some of the worst in the UK in the Midlands. You are going to make access to healthcare worse; waiting times longer; ambulance delays leading to worsening health outcomes and poorer experience of the NHS.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Mr John Hickingbotham	Response-01431	Attempting to access general healthcare facilities in Sandiacre, or in the adjacent town of Stapleford, is already very difficult - unless in an emergency situation. Adding several hundred more potential residents to the demand will simply make this situation worse, to the detriment of everyone.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Mr K Gubb	Response-01838	Existing limited amenities that are already stretched to capacity and fully subscribed ie Doctor, Dentist
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Mr K Turton	Response-01706	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Mr Luke	Response-01703	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Mr P J Tanner	Response-01728	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Mr R M Draper	Response-01856	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Mr R Widdowson	Response-01734	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Mr S. Haywood	Response-01585	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Mrs Christina Pope	Response-00732	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Mrs Donna C. Ball	Response-01594	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Mrs Froggatt	Response-00449	Only one doctors surgery which at the moment is not taking new patients. No pharmacy in the area. Nearest pharmacy over a mile away. Only one dentist that is not taking new NHS patients. Where will the new residents get health care from
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Mrs Griffin	Response-01698	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Mrs J. Cooper	Response-01596	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Mrs Joanne Thompson	Response-01690	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Mrs J Reeder	Response-01909	We currently struggle with appointments at our local Dr's so additional people will make things worse.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Mrs Lee Farabella	Response-01899	180+ houses will put pressure on local services, & healthcare.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Mrs Linda Cox	Response-01753	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Mrs Luke	Response-01704	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Mrs M. Rose	Response-01583	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Mrs Marie Draper	Response-01755	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available. I now have to either walk or catch the bus to get what I need from the chemist after it closed - this will put further pressure on the already little services we have.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Mrs M Burke	Response-01887	More houses will add more pressure on health care.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Mrs N Taylor	Response-01896	More pressure on local services, schools & only one small GP surgery, no pharmacy.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Mrs Rachel Coats	Response-01623	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Mrs R Cordon	Response-01647	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Mrs Rigby	Response-00641	Just one Doctor practice, one dentist and no pharmacy left in Sandiacre. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am leading to no appointments available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Mrs Shani Wainwright	Response-00754	We have just one Dr's surgery in Sandiacre and one dentist...and no chemist at all!!! It is already extremely difficult to get an appointment at either, with there often being no appointments available even for emergencies.....an additional 180 + homes will further exasperbate this issue sadly, making Sandiacres residents health care slip even further into a negative direction.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Mrs Sheila Hickingbotham	Response-01338	The addition of 180 houses will place unsustainable pressure on local doctors and dentists.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Mrs Shirley Victoria Riggs	Response-01685	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Mrs Susan Bantle	Response-01612	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Mrs Turton	Response-01707	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Natalie Bentley	Response-01646	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Nicole Cooper	Response-01597	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Nikki Vincent	Response-00688	We have only one doctor?s surgery in Sandiacre and currently no chemist. The increase in new patients will put more strain on our healthcare services, particularly the doctor?s and dentist.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Normn McCrea	Response-01754	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Oliver Marriott	Response-00679	Healthcare Facilities Healthcare - We only have one doctor?s surgery in sandiacre and from personal experience it?s impossible to get an appointment there. You either have to queue up for an hour outside or you have to continually phone up at 8am in order to get an appointment. Having an extra 250 people (minimum) will put too much extra pressure on an already strained service. Similarly with the dentist - they are at capacity currently so where are these extra people going to go? How will they access vital services? We currently don?t have a pharmacy in sandiacre which would make it very difficult for those residents who don?t drive to access these facilities, the nearest being the next town of Stapleford.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Paige Walker	Response-01669	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Pamela Bassett	Response-00608	More people will be register at Doctors vets and dentist dentist and I?m worried about not being able to get an appointment for myself as a pensioner
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Pam shepherd	Response-00453	The GP surgeries are impossible to get into already, local hospital always at capacity with the A&E function being a standard 4-6 hour wait adding this amount of homes in the area will make this <del>20</del> worse
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Pat Hardy	Response-01739	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Paula Darnell	Response-00665	Well where do I start <del>12</del> My daughter has been on thr waiting list for a nhs dentist in the area for 4 years already without no sign of a place. The doctors cannot cope with any more patients and you cannot get an appointment for ages Also we have no local chemist or pharmacist
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Paula Luck	Response-01710	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Paula Sims	Response-01687	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Paul Randall	Response-00131	How much headroom does the single GP surgery in Sandiacre have on its books? Can they accommodate an extra 400 people? Have they been consulted? If not, then these extra people are likely to head to Stapleford and an adjacent Council. Have they been consulted? Noting that Sandiacre does not have a chemist, the nearest being 40min walk ? have you assessed the impact on local roads since these 180 new homes will not have direct walking access to any shops, health centres, leisure centres etc other than the local ?Post Office / convenience store?, and whilst accessible by cycle, no one does since the site is at the top of a hill. Local doctors and dentists are either full, or unable to cope with the volume of existing patients. The nearest doctor is a 25 minute walk from this area and is a very small practice ? this would drive people to Stapleford and the surgeries there that are unable to cope with the number of patients. The chemist on Derby Road Sandiacre has recently closed, and the private dentist is regularly shut to new patients, and is certainly not taking NHS patients. It is unlikely that a 180 house development would include new school and medical provision, yet it would need it.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Paul Vleeton	Response-01770	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
		Healthcare Facilities	paul wheeldon	Response-00582	There are currently NO Dr's medical facilities in Sandiacre the nearest is at the far end of Stapleford
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Paul Wilkes	Response-00599	We do not have the doctors or dentist to take in the extra people from these homes. We are suffering ourselves getting appointments.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Peter Anthony	Response-01866	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Peter brown	Response-00671	Already struggle to get appointments in the healthcare sector.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Peter Nicholls	Response-01622	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Pete West	Response-01700	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Phil Creasey	Response-01342	Consideration needs to be made for health care facilities such as GP sugeries and dental practices. Currently there is only one of each which are both ocurrently over subscribed.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	P Sandes	Response-01682	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Rachel Crossley	Response-01661	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Rachel Skelton	Response-01241	Where will the extra provision for GP services come from?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	R Barratt	Response-01664	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Rcahel Sharp	Response-00652	Increased population will mean more people accessing healthcare locally. Already people complain about the length of time it takes to get a routine appointment. I am also concerned about NHS dental provision in the area as my dentist is retiring this week.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Rebecca Longmuir	Response-00253	Absolutely NO thought has gone into this properly! Let?s throw some houses up and fix the houses problem! Without first thinking about the serious consequences for the local residents! There IS NO ROOM at doctors for locals!! Currently and people struggling to be seen in general by a GP. Now you want to add fuel to the fire by building a huge housing estate?! This will only ADD to the PROBLEM! Not help. I am shocked and disgusted this is being forced onto us local residents. What about the serious ramifications on the already struggling nhs services. This will have a terrible impact on the locals health and wellbeing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Rhiannon Lowater	Response-01592	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	R Hibbitt	Response-01862	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Richard Broughton	Response-01352	Potentially around a 1000 people could live on this proposed development, with possibly 300 children, can the local practices and clinics absorb these numbers
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Richard Deeprise	Response-00816	More people will stretch health services
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Richard Haines	Response-01674	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Richard Jenkins	Response-00264	It is difficult to get a local GP appointment; the local chemist on Derby Road has closed; there is a paucity of NHS dentists in the area. This development will severely strain a struggling system. The only GP practice in Sandiacre is Adam House. It is difficult enough to get a GP appointment BEFORE the addition of 180 new households in the area and this development is a major concern to us with regard to our health and NHS support. Out of the 10 GP practices in Erewash, Adam House is rated 10th and has a ratio of patient to full-time GP much more than twice that of the second most ?full? practice. BEFORE the addition of 180 new households in the area. A copy of the report showing this is available at: <a href="https://www.healthsay.co.uk/articles/674-best-and-worst-nhs-gps-in-erewash">https://www.healthsay.co.uk/articles/674-best-and-worst-nhs-gps-in-erewash</a> I haven?t been able to get a same-day GP appointment at Adam House since January 2024 ? every time I need GP support, I have to see the practice nurse, the alternative being to wait for days to see a doctor. The last time I saw a GP (12th February 2025), I had to travel to Sawley Medical Centre ? a 15-minute walk plus 25-minute bus ride each way as this was the only option available. Bad enough for a fit person but I have documented mobility issues so quite a difficult situation and a much longer walk! NHS dentists are like hens? teeth ? We both have to travel to Long Eaton to get NHS dental treatment. There are no NHS slots available at the only dentist in the area. There is no way I can afford private dental care. 180 additional households will exacerbate the problem. Where will that leave us? NHS services (1 GP in Sandiacre, rated 10th out of 10 in Erewash; 1 dentist in Sandiacre, not taking NHS patients). No chemist in Sandiacre. What studies has EBC carried out with regard to NHS services capacity in the area?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Richard Marriott	Response-00675	Healthcare Facilities Healthcare - We only have one doctor?s surgery in sandiacre and from personal experience it?s impossible to get an appointment there. You either have to queue up for an hour outside or you have to continually phone up at 8am in order to get an appointment. Having an extra 250 people (minimum) will put too much extra pressure on an already strained service. Similarly with the dentist - they are at capacity currently so where are these extra people going to go? How will they access vital services? We currently don?t have a pharmacy in sandiacre which would make it very difficult for those residents who don?t drive to access these facilities, the nearest being the next town of Stapleford.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Richard Naylor	Response-00066	Adam House is the nearest GP, with limited GP appointments. Also there is no pharmacy.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Richard Shrimpton	Response-01301	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8a.m. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Rob Lowe	Response-01768	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Roger Day	Response-00023	The medical facilities in Sandiacre are already rated as needing improvement and adding yet more patients will only mean fewer appointments for existing residents. Adam House has a very large turnover of doctors and inadequate number of them, how are they going to cope with the potential increase?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Roger Farnsworth	Response-01910	The residents of Sandiacre already can't get into the doctors/dentist, more residents will make this worse & detriment peoples health due to long wait time.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Rosemarie Gough	Response-00997	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Roy Drew	Response-01614	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Ruby Sharp	Response-00886	Increased population will mean more people accessing healthcare locally. I have to go to Saxon Cross Surgery, which is in Stapleford. In Sandiacre, there is only one small medical centre which is just off a main road with not much parking. Increased patients here will mean dangerous parking and traffic. Already people complain about the length of time it takes to get a routine appointment. I am also concerned about NHS dental provision in the area as my dentist is retiring this week. Increased NHS patients at mydentist in Sandiacre will make appointments difficult to get. This dental practise is also small and on a main road with limited parking so also would not be able to handle extra patients.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Ryan Selby	Response-00479	Extra homes is extra stress on the local health care system, it?s already hard to get an appointment currently. Without the extra houses
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	S. Brailsford	Response-00598	You already can't get an appointment in the Doctors and they're already not taking any more patients on. No Dentist able to take on any patients in this area already too
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	S. Jones	Response-01615	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Sally Davies	Response-01294	Healthcare facilities are already stretched. People often use the facilities in Stapleford and Sawley. Loss of our chemist is very poor for an area as large as Sandiacre.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Samantha Anne Whitney	Response-00757	Where will the families access healthcare? If every house has 4 people living in it, that's an extra 720 people that need doctors and dentists? Are there that many spare places? It takes 2 weeks to get a doctors appointment and most people don't even have a nhs dentist anymore. You can't build all these extra houses without the infrastructure such as schools, doctors, dentists etc in place. Everything is already over subscribed.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Samantha Whildes	Response-01270	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Sam Buckland	Response-00600	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8a.m. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Sam Fleck	Response-00821	The current healthcare providers locally are already under huge pressure and can not cope with the amount of residents on the books. Current residents can not get a same day drs appt unless we queue from before 8am outside the surgery. There are no nhs dentists locally that are taking on new patients. Another 180 houses relying on an already struggling system will mean people will go untreated and the health of the community will suffer. I strongly object to the proposal due to reasons stated above.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Sam Greatorex	Response-01695	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Sandra Cooke	Response-01613	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Sarah Favell	Response-00038	The doctors cannot cater for the amount of residents now! We have no chemist to hand either
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Sarah Harrison	Response-01658	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	S Bryne	Response-01677	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Sebastian Roberts	Response-01675	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Shanead Ligton	Response-01689	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Shannon moss	Response-00454	Again the only dentist within the area is 'my dentist' again which has 0 NHS patients at the moment, our health care settings are over populated as it is
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Shannon Robinson	Response-01635	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Sharon Grant	Response-00219	I have to pay private for my dentist as you struggle to get appointments.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	sharon thornhill	Response-00448	our local GP and dentist is already struggling to provide a good service to residents of sandiacre without adding to the numbers !
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Sharon weston	Response-00440	There isn't a health care centre specifically for Sandiacre we share Stapleford's Saxon cross surgery of which is already at breaking point, no nhs places for dentists so only private with limited availability already, too add an extra 400 people to an already stretched service, please...
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Shaun Green	Response-01773	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Sheila	Response-00587	There is currently only one GP surgery in Sandiacre, which is already operating near capacity. The addition of 180 households will place further strain on local healthcare services. No evidence has been presented to show that the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) has been consulted or that plans exist to expand capacity in line with the projected population increase. Our only pharmacy was also removed and the closest pharmacy now is situated in Stapleford, not ideal when ill or infirm. No provision has been mentioned regarding the proposed new housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Sheila Payne	Response-01782	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Sian Knox	Response-01679	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	S Leek	Response-01737	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Sonny Bestwick	Response-00901	ALL PUBLIC SERVICES IN THE AREA ARE ALREADY MASSIVELY OVER STRETCHED!!! No matter who you speak to in the community nobody can get a doctor's appointment it has got to the point that it is constantly commented on online were already at the point of being in a 10 caller hold list at 08.00 to finally have the phone answered at 08.45 to be told sorry no appointments, how is a society supposed to have sustainable public services when already overloaded services such as gp's are being stretched to breaking
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Sonya Birkin	Response-01656	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Sophie	Response-00472	I think it goes without saying that the nhs is on its knees with waiting times etc. the gp is often difficult to get in with also, this would effect peoples helath more and more
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Sophie Bennett	Response-01631	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Sophie Farnsworth	Response-01913	The residents of Sandiacre already can?t get into the doctors/dentist, more residents will make this worse & detriment peoples health due to long wait times.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Stephen Barlow	Response-01808	Also to be considered is the fact that when we moved we had to change GP and this was not easy. There was no availability in Sandiacre and we are now at a GP in Stapleford.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Stephen Davies	Response-00214	Extremely difficult to see doctor. No NHS dentist in area. Sandiacre currently has circa 8,000 residents served by 1 medical centre, 1 dentist and no pharmacies. Adding 180 homes would place further strain on a system already at breaking point. Paragraph 95 states that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments are supported by the necessary infrastructure including health facilities. It is also supported by paragraph 8 which highlights the importance of promoting healthy and safe communities as part of sustainable development
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Stephen Sacker	Response-01598	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Steve Bilbie	Response-00285	Health care in sandiacre is already at breaking point so couldn?t cope with the substantial increase of patients.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Steve Whittaker	Response-01781	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Stuart Pensom	Response-00049	Doctor is bad enough to get a appointment. No pharmacy. And no NHS dentist anywhere
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Sue Harrison	Response-01629	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Susan Hales	Response-00212	There are already many difficulties in securing doctor appointments. Dentists providing NHS service are almost non existent. There are no pharmacies in this area of sandiacre.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Susan Heinke	Response-00468	There are no doctors or dental surgeries taking patients on and those that are already registered struggle to get appointments
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Susanne Beaven	Response-01618	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Sylvia Plampin	Response-00624	You can't get appointments readily as it is, more families will just add to this chaos. Dentists are the same, noone taking on NHS patients locally.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Tamara Partridge	Response-01780	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Tarnya Hinman	Response-01786	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Thomas Ilett	Response-01088	There are currently no dentists within Sandiacre accepting NHS registered patients. The Sandiacre Neighbourhood Plan highlights new housing requirement as being prevalent for the elderly and young working families (Chapter 17, paragraphs 144, 145 and 148). These demographics are likely to require NHS dentistry, opposed to private. Therefore, the proposed housing allocation is inappropriate considering dentist services in the village. Doctor surgeries are also strained; Adam House Surgery on Derby Road rarely have appointments on the same day and regularly outsource to Long Eaton and Sawley Health Centres for same day appointments, as well as having the attached pharmacy closed recently. This too, is inappropriate, particularly for the elderly, as many do not have direct access to travel options.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Tim Derbyshire	Response-01681	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Tim Gough	Response-00996	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Toby Moran	Response-01769	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Tom Ball	Response-01672	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Tony Weston	Response-00990	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Tracey Howe	Response-01860	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Tracey Hughes	Response-01699	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Tracy Jones	Response-00436	There is no capacity at either the stapleford or sandiacre GP practices
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Trevor Rowston	Response-01678	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Try church	Response-00033	Sandiacre has ONE doctors surgery, they cannot cope with the number of patients they currently have. Trying to get an appointment is impossible, the best you get is a telephone consultation. More sandiacre residents will stretch the service even more.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Tyler Hobbs	Response-00879	Sandiacre currently has only one GP surgery?Adam House Medical Centre?which serves a growing population and may struggle to absorb the additional demand that hundreds of new residents would bring. Appointments are already difficult to secure in a timely manner, and an increase in patients could lead to longer waiting times, reduced access to care, and added pressure on medical staff. Furthermore, the recent closure of the local pharmacy has forced residents to travel to Stapleford for prescriptions and over-the-counter medication, creating accessibility issues, particularly for the elderly, disabled, and those without transport. Without significant investment in expanding local health services, this development could seriously undermine the health and well-being of both existing and future residents.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Vanessa Asbach	Response-00700	We only have one gp in Sandiacre. You are lucky to see anyone there in 3 weeks. More people will negatively impact our surgery even further. We don't even have a pharmacy here anymore same with the dentist. Impossible to get an NHS dentist anywhere local and even going private you are on long wait lists. We don't need to extend that further
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Verity Lamb	Response-01298	You do realise the people who already live here cannot get in to see a doctor or dentist and you want even more people to pile into this broken system? You need to invest in the infrastructure for residents let alone adding more people
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Vickie Wright	Response-01552	Current healthcare facilities are over subscribed and cannot cope with current resident nos. So there is no capacity to support another 180 new homes.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Vicky	Response-00485	Why destroy more green belt when there are houses empty!! We already have the local hotels filled with immigrants where does it end
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Victoria Abraham	Response-01652	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Victoria Galpin-shrimpton	Response-01009	Healthcare. Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing In all weathers at 8a.m. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Victoria Greateorex	Response-01730	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Victoria Marriott	Response-00674	Healthcare - We only have one doctor?s surgery in sandiacre and from personal experience it?s impossible to get an appointment there. You either have to queue up for an hour outside or you have to continually phone up at 8am in order to get an appointment. Having an extra 250 people (minimum) will put too much extra pressure on an already strained service. Similarly with the dentist - they are at capacity currently so where are these extra people going to go? How will they access vital services? We currently don?t have a pharmacy in sandiacre which would make it very difficult for those residents who don?t drive to access these facilities, the nearest being the next town of Stapleford.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Vivien Davis	Response-01582	Just one doctors practice and one dentist. It is difficult to obtain an appointment at either and to do so requires standing in all weathers at 8am. Often no appointments are available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Wayne Major	Response-00408	I wish to object to the proposed development due to the lack of sufficient healthcare provision in the local area. As someone who uses Adam House Medical Centre, I am very aware of the challenges already facing our local GP services. It is extremely difficult to get an appointment, and patients are often required to call at exactly 8am to stand any chance of being seen. If you call even 30 minutes later, all available appointments for the day are typically gone. This has become the norm, not the exception, and it reflects the level of pressure the practice is already under. Adding another 180 homes to the area will place further strain on a system that is already at breaking point. Without additional investment in local healthcare infrastructure, this development risks worsening access for both existing and new residents. This concern aligns with Paragraph 95 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which states that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments are supported by the necessary infrastructure, including health facilities. It is also supported by Paragraph 8, which highlights the importance of promoting healthy and safe communities as part of sustainable development. Until there is a clear and funded plan to expand healthcare capacity locally whether through additional GP provision, clinic space, or staffing I believe this development is premature and would place an unacceptable burden on already overstretched services. For these reasons, I strongly object to the application and urge the planning authority to ensure that adequate health infrastructure is in place before any further large-scale housing developments are approved.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	William Marriott	Response-00676	Healthcare Facilities Healthcare - We only have one doctor's surgery in sandiacre and from personal experience it's impossible to get an appointment there. You either have to queue up for an hour outside or you have to continually phone up at 8am in order to get an appointment. Having an extra 250 people (minimum) will put too much extra pressure on an already strained service. Similarly with the dentist - they are at capacity currently so where are these extra people going to go? How will they access vital services? We currently don't have a pharmacy in sandiacre which would make it very difficult for those residents who don't drive to access these facilities, the nearest being the next town of Stapleford.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Healthcare Facilities	Zoe Hughes	Response-01919	Healthcare in Sandiacre is already oversubscribed & barely accessible, with residents having to access Stapleford & Sawley GP surgeries because of poor services.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Aaron Locksley	Response-00711	Obviously this will affect the landscape and thus property values, is there any remediation for current residents affected?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Adam Shooter	Response-01925	This green area is an attraction for dog walkers and visitors. The horizons in Stoney Clouds are fantastic. Personally I find it to be a great anxiety reliever and will be so disappointed to lose it.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	A Harby	Response-01684	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Aimee	Response-00952	The green belt land around sandiacre offers residents a place to escape the urban sprawl of concrete, tarmac and pollution. Our countryside is beautiful and should be protected. Local residents need green spaces to relax, walk and use for leisure and sporting activities. As the space available for these sort of activities is reduced it will impact people's mental health and wellbeing. The area has in recent years suffered from severe flooding, building further homes and concrete will reduce the area rain can soak into. Especially with current trends of paving over entire gardens or having artificial grass. The flooding will continue to get worse.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Alexander Love	Response-00626	Ruining scenery of sandiacre
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Alex Lord	Response-00946	This Green Belt and Reserve are the only thing that separates us from the M1, and filters a lot of noise from it and stops us from seeing the industrial complex on the other side of the M1, it allows us to feel at peace in nature, taking that away would ruin the good feeling of staring at the trees. I bet it would also affect how much our houses cost on the market too.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Alice Cooper	Response-01721	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Alice Ilett	Response-00571	This area is beautiful landscape filled with greenery and nature. It's used and loved- please don't take this away from us and our future generations.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Amanda Leech	Response-01625	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Amy Cray	Response-01223	It will ruin the lovely landscape, walls and view as well as destroy habitats
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Anastasia Anthony	Response-01865	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out. According to Forestry Commission (2022) Natural England wants a 15m buffer between development + woodland. National Planning Policy Framework: section 16 paragraph 202 mandates authorities to record an advanced knowledge of heritage assets.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Andrew Davies	Response-01295	The development could very easily, unless very carefully designed, have an effect upon the village and it's identity
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Andrew Marvin	Response-00255	The impact on the Landscape will be devastating The construction traffic alone is going to be horrendous So Wrong !!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Andrew Meadwell	Response-01654	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Andria Nyilasi	Response-00672	The landscape isn't suitable for a project of this size and scale. The land regularly floods in wet weather and slopes down to a point in the far corner. It backs up to the motorway where there's extreme noise and the possibility of subsidence. Residents whose property is adjacent to the field often experience flooding, particularly during extremely wet weather conditions and the added infrastructure will definitely exacerbate that.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Andy Martin	Response-01761	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Angela Whitehead	Response-00544	The historic site of Stoney Clouds is essential for Sandiacre residents it's reminiscent of our childhoods and what's left after the the M1 has cut through our countryside. It's our history it's what resonates with the locals. Such a shame to destroy and take that away
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Anne Castledine	Response-00499	The landscape will be lost forever if this goes through, a small area being packed with housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Anne Jenkins	Response-00350	The landscape would be changed forever and how can we be sure the building wouldn't extend further
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Annette Jones	Response-00961	This would change the landscape considerably and replaced with buildings and more traffic. The horses in the fields, wildlife, woodland will be gone and before we have time to voice our concern the next field will be built on and gradually that landscape will be eroded away.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Ann Harrison	Response-01602	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Anthony Pearson	Response-01760	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Antony M Ingram	Response-01626	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
			A R Gregory	Response-01918	

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Awson Wheldon	Response-01649	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Barbara Michell	Response-01787	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Barry Partridge	Response-01778	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Ben Hollins	Response-01651	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Beverley Gardner	Response-01692	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Beverley Green	Response-01686	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Bill Hartley	Response-01696	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	B T Keen	Response-01735	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	c/o The Equalised Club	Response-01603	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
			Callum binnall	Response-00460	The place your going to destroy is a beautiful bit of land that we don't want destroyed
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Caroline Driver	Response-00618	This proposal would change the existing beautiful landscape forever turning into a huge housing estate. The views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Carol Marshall	Response-00736	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Catherine Richardson	Response-00531	This landscape is the last bit of greenery between Sandiacre and the M1. It must be preserved
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Charlotte Fry	Response-00583	Building more ugly new builds will ruin the beautiful countryside and be none left. All the wildlife will be gone too
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Charlotte Hunter	Response-01376	There is a lot of wildlife including the endangered hedgehog which will be impacted by the building works.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	C Holmes	Response-01620	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Chris Hume	Response-01373	This is the worst place to build, it holds water, it's next to the M1, who would buy a house there, it's green belt and used for grazing land, it's best propose
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Chris Jones	Response-01718	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Chris O Connor	Response-01641	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Christian Rearson	Response-01763	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Christine Anderson	Response-00484	This area is used by so many members of the public to get out and relax - a very precious commodity in today's hectic rushing life. This is Green belt and should be conserved for future generations - we need to keep this.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Christine Gough	Response-00578	We know that the area around and on Stoney Cloud is beautiful, the landscape is well known. It's an area where people can walk without having to think about the roads and danger. The building of these houses will lose the beauty of this area. Wildlife will be gone forever and all we will see is a concrete jungle on the landscape.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Claire binnall	Response-00459	This will ruin the local environment
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Clare Green	Response-01751	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Cole Hawkins	Response-01714	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Colin Cox	Response-01716	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Colin Marriott	Response-00686	Builders do not care about the landscape only how many houses they can cram on a piece of land, how much profit they will make and planting a few shrubs and trees would not replace what we have.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Courtney Bennett	Response-00593	Stop destroying beautiful landscapes and green areas! Sandiacre is so very lucky to have so many pockets of green open spaces with a variety of wildlife, trees and plants that people of all ages can enjoy. Where is the wildlife going to go when we destroy their home? Where are dog walkers going to go when we destroy the fields? Where are children going to play, learn and enjoy the outdoor natural spaces when it's all gone and there is nothing left.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Craig Richards	Response-01638	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Craig Thims	Response-01765	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Cristina Jenkins	Response-01588	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	C Thompson	Response-01634	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Daniel	Response-00545	The development will significantly alter the semi-rural character of the area. What is currently a quiet, low-density neighbourhood will become crowded and urbanised. Views across green space and the sense of openness will be permanently lost, diminishing the aesthetic and recreational value of the area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Daniel Downes	Response-01630	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Danielle Harrison	Response-00568	This landscape is boggy in the winter and the water table being free from buildings allows the natural habitat to act as a permeable surface. If you build on this area, the landscape will have increased surface runoff which the local drainage system cannot sustain. Green belt should be a protected landscape.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Daniel Naylor	Response-00680	The geography of this area makes accessing this area of sandiacre really difficult in the winter months. Residents will inform you that driving up the proposed access route can be impossible when roads are icy.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Darran and Emma Rea	Response-00597	Stoney Clouds is a nature reserve, the landscape is going to change, it is going to ruin the views especially those right next to this proposed development
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	David Casey	Response-01608	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	David Cater	Response-01756	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	David Ruddock	Response-01776	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	David Thompson	Response-01324	Will look ugly
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	David Tindsley	Response-00515	The proposed development of 180 houses must be considered high-density (and very much in line with other sites developed by Peveril Homes in the area. This is totally out of character compared to the surrounding area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	David Yeo	Response-01705	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Dawn Glennis Smith	Response-00510	This is STONEY CLOUDS an historic part of the local landscape - PLEASE DO NOT DESTROY this precious part of Sandiacre by building on it. Build the houses on a Brown Field site.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Dean Bosworth	Response-01665	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Dean Lavelle	Response-01774	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Debra Scully	Response-00288	New build will destroy haven for local wildlife and areas of enjoyment from families who currently use the well trodden right of way
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Debs Washer	Response-00487	Noone needs to see yet another blot on the landscape.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Denise Creasey	Response-00786	This proposal would permanently change this landscape, spoiling the wonderful views and destroying the lovely walks.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Denise Lingard	Response-01759	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Dennis Watts	Response-01726	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Derek Morton	Response-01607	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Derrick Hunt	Response-00437	These are open fields looking out across the motorway towards Ilkeston These fields hold water well to certain point but when flooded you get a good run off down the footpath onto cloudside road
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Destiny Jade-Blake	Response-01636	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Diane Jones	Response-00852	The view from Stoney Clouds is amazing and the rocks are reputedly the end of the Pennines. This is a precious area and must be retained for future generations.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Diane Mcmorrow	Response-00433	Having nature on the doorstep is a wonderful thing we are so lucky in Sandiacre having this beautiful Nature Reserve within walking distance for many. The walks can educating relaxing and picturesque to unique to be destroyed
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Diane Turner	Response-01744	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	D Pallett	Response-01627	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	D Simpson	Response-01712	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	E Cooper	Response-01923	Nature reserve next door, additional noise/light/traffic etc. All with proximity will ruin this reserve! Why build here? More suitable spaces in built up areas with less impact & an eyesore that could be used instead.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Eleanor Moseley	Response-00799	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Eleanor Newman	Response-00718	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Emma Ryan	Response-00503	For me personally, I moved to Sandiacre in 2012 and Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve was one of my biggest appeals and has been somewhere myself and my family have frequented many times. It would be a shame to place a housing estate right by it like that and would actually put me off living here.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Emma Wall	Response-00319	Building on this site will totally ruin the landscape
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Esmé Moss	Response-00592	Will be an eyesore. Decrease the aesthetic value of the area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Esther Cook	Response-01861	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out. Although I do not live in the area, moving away a few years ago but still visit regularly to Sandiacre and enjoy the open landscape and wonderful greenbelt of Stoney Clouds.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Fay Cresswell	Response-00701	As above it's a landscape overlooking the Erewash golf course its tree lined and used for horses
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Gail Berry	Response-01644	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Geoff Tindsley	Response-00755	The proposed development of 180 houses must be considered high-density (and very much in line with other sites developed by Peveril Homes in the area. This is totally out of character compared to the surrounding area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Georgia C	Response-01296	United Kingdom is supposed to be our green and pleasant land, not grey concrete and red brick. So much of our established woodland has already been destroyed and now it seems they want fields to go the same way.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Georgia Marvin	Response-00261	The deconstruction of such a beautiful area will be so heart wrenching and breaking. The quiet area will be no more - the traffic and disruption will ruin the area. What once had such scenic views will be overrun with the horrid door to door ratio. Sandiacre will never be peaceful and beautiful again
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Gill West	Response-01725	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Glyn Holner	Response-01697	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Gordon Daris	Response-01639	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Greg Cox	Response-01702	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Gregg Bartrum	Response-01591	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Greg Watts	Response-00733	The area west of Sandiacre, particularly near Stoney Clouds, is valued for its natural beauty, tranquillity, and accessibility to the public. It is used regularly for recreation, walking, and nature appreciation. A high-density housing estate in this location would irreversibly change the character of the landscape and diminish its environmental and amenity value.
		landscape	Helen Gillain	Response-00964	The landscape houses a wide variety of wildlife and biodiversity ... building here would affect this and also affect global warming
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Helen Thompson	Response-01356	This plan will replace attractive green fields with housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Helen whiteman	Response-00447	The landscape of the area is not suitable for building more house right next to the m1 motorway with all the pollution
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Ian	Response-00493	Impacting the views on and around stoney clouds nature reserve
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Ian herbert	Response-00939	the present land borders and adds to the green space comprising the stoney clouds nature reserve. an important recreational area for wildlife and people.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	IAN TAYLOR	Response-00972	The site adjoins the Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve and is essentially part of the same ecosystem. Together with surrounding farmland they form part of the green belt around Sandiacre. The proposed development will inevitably damage the landscape.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Ian Ward	Response-01628	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Irina Anthony	Response-01867	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Isabelle Love	Response-00529	The changes to landscape due to constant development in Erewash has been vast and detrimental. The entire area is becoming gridlocked and hideous. In the last 40 years Erewash has seen enough development and it is time mindless politicians turned their attention elsewhere.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Isobel Ball	Response-01092	The green areas of west sandiacre, stoney clouds, the old and new golf courses are special places to many sandiacre residents. For me personally, as an owner of a golden retriever. The land in wish is projected to be built on is an area very special to me and my pup. It is a beautiful and safe area away from heavy population and busy areas and many of us treasure that. It's a place I grew up walking through, especially with my dad who passed away when I was 11. So for me and my family the area holds great weight and importance. We should be allocating houses to brown belt areas where there is no use for the land. Not green belts. Everyone deserves housing, but not here.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	J. E. Lord	Response-01601	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Jack Greateorex	Response-01731	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Jacob Whitt	Response-01748	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Jacqueline Marshall	Response-01436	Stones Clouds provides beautiful views over Erewash and is a well loved and well used site. Green spaces are necessary to our mental wellbeing and are part of social prescribing and you are planning to reduce and completely change the landscape
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Jade Smith	Response-01783	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	James Meadwell	Response-01653	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	James Roberts	Response-01708	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	James Seward	Response-01683	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Jane Dennett	Response-00965	Will ruin the outlook of the area. Especially for homes attached to land .
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Jane Elizabeth Tindsley	Response-00669	The proposed development of 180 houses must be considered high-density (and very much in line with other sites developed by Peveril Homes in the area. This is totally out of character compared to the surrounding area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Janet Whildes	Response-01869	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Janice Taylor	Response-01743	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Janice West	Response-00989	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Janine Holmes	Response-01595	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Jason Harwood	Response-01667	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Jason Webb	Response-01637	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Jayne Rowley	Response-01279	Stoney clouds is a valued nature reserve, this proposal would drastically change the area and its views across the parishes and the walks across this. The high density would just make it a mass of concrete with very little foliage and very little natural heat defence in the hotter months.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	J Cates	Response-01750	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Jeanette O Connor	Response-01640	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Jennifer Bailey	Response-01857	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Jennifer Tindsley	Response-00751	The proposed development of 180 houses must be considered high-density (and very much in line with other sites developed by Peveril Homes in the area. This is totally out of character compared to the surrounding area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Jenny Stephens	Response-01723	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Joanne Guyatt	Response-01784	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Joanne Johnson	Response-00765	This would be a crying shame to ruin this area further.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Joanne Lambert	Response-00494	Building so close to the nature reserve will spoil the natural feeling around there. Currently the houses close by are obscured by trees/woodland.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Jodie Owen	Response-01688	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Jodie Shrive	Response-00601	This area is a natural sanctuary for the existing residents of Sandiacre, it promotes well-being and serves as a safe haven for many struggling with their mental health. The landscape of the area is beautiful, and is a big part of the reason why people moved to this specific area, and you're willing to destroy that.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Jo Gerhardt	Response-01286	It would alter the landscape massively, as it would impact on the nature reserve that has been there for decades.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	John Gardner	Response-01694	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	John G Brown	Response-01752	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	John Hibbitt	Response-01855	Priceless. This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	John Ledger	Response-01605	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	John Payne	Response-01785	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	John whiteman	Response-00450	The landscape is much better as it is now and has been for years. Leave well alone
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Jon Burn	Response-01722	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Josh Williams	Response-01632	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	J Pearson	Response-01772	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	J Telfer	Response-01876	Sandiacre is already very dense. Kids need somewhere to play & walk.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Judith A Pultfer	Response-01863	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Judith Blackburn	Response-01928	It would again be a great pity if a large amount of walking area was to disappear.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Julie Hill	Response-01643	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Karen Alldread	Response-01868	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Karen Blain	Response-01732	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Karen Harwood	Response-01668	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Karen Pitts	Response-00643	This wonderful green space will be lost for ever. I have walked my dogs here for the past 30 plus years often taking the track over to the golf course and on to Stanton by Dale. People who live on the adjacent estate will lose their current outlook onto fields and trees. That change in the landscape will have a huge effect on the ecosystem with loss of habitat throughout the food chain leading ultimately to loss of resident species.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Kathryn Martin	Response-00527	Stunning land frequently used by all who live in the area
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Katie Morrice	Response-00664	This proposal would permanently change this landscape, spoiling the wonderful views and destroying the lovely walks.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Katrina	Response-00628	I brought my house on cloudside with the knowledge that it had a greenbelt beside it and the fact that it wasn't overlooked was a major selling point for the house, it will also lower my house price to have more houses behind, will there be compensation?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Kelsey Green	Response-01666	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Kenneth Cooper	Response-01720	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Kern-Paul Lewis	Response-01715	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Kerry Meadwell	Response-01655	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Kerry Smith	Response-01271	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Kerry stokes	Response-00769	We go walking across the fields where the build is to be proposed & enjoy walking in nature, seeing the views of the field & legendary sycamore tree. We enjoy taking our children to see the horses on the land & will be very upset at the thought of not being able to do this anymore. The area has a lot of memories/ sentiment attached to it & for many years has been a space that nourishes our mental well being as well as keeping our bodies moving. It would be a great loss to my family to have the landscape ruined.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	KH Taylor	Response-01663	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Kim Helm	Response-00632	An housing estate will not be in keeping with the rest of land and buildings around them
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Kirk Moss	Response-00439	The fields are regularly used by runners, walkers, families, and local clubs. They serve as an important recreational and wellbeing space for the community. Development would destroy this valued open space and negatively affect the area's visual character.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Kirsty Handa	Response-00445	This development will look unsightly and destroy the green belt landscape that so many people visit this area to look at
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Kirsty Meredith	Response-01462	This would have a massive impact on the landscape of the area, especially Stony Clouds, a protected local green space. This development risks harming biodiversity and is a risk to the local habitat.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Kristie Rugers	Response-01864	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Kyle Jones	Response-01764	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	L A Keen	Response-01659	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Laura Hallam	Response-01711	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Laura Thompson	Response-00702	Homes will mean fewer green spaces. Green spaces are known to have a positive impact on mental health and wellbeing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Laurence Luck	Response-01727	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Lauren Rose	Response-01446	The widening of the M1 took a number of trees and amounts of foliage out, replacing it with ugly, soul-less sound fencing. Please do not do the same here. People also do not want to look out of their windows to see straight into a neighbour's house or directly out on to the Motorway. Keep our unspoiled landscape as it is. We stopped HS2 because it would have ruined the local, ancient landscape. We will stop this development.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Lee Wilcock	Response-01670	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Lesley Bruce	Response-01397	This vital zone buffering the M1 from housing is much needed, scarce in the area and should not be considered for any housing, let alone high density as proposed.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Lia Thims	Response-01766	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Linda Castledine-Davies	Response-00850	The proposed site is primarily pasture land, shrub and woodland that undulates in a pleasing way providing stunning views across Sandiacre and Stanton village. It is currently used as pasture for a herd of retirement horses. A footpath cuts across the middle of the field and is used by so many. Housing on this site will dramatically impact the landscape.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Lindsey Rawlinson	Response-01624	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	LISA ANNE GILLIGAN-LEE	Response-00710	The proposed development on Stoney Cloud poses a significant threat to the existing landscape, which currently comprises of unspoiled green land that contributes to the area's natural beauty, ecological value, and rural character. This green space provides an essential buffer between built-up areas, supports local biodiversity, and offers recreational and visual benefits to residents and visitors alike. The introduction of urban infrastructure would irreversibly alter the open, scenic views and degrade the tranquil rural atmosphere, undermining the environmental and aesthetic qualities that define the local landscape. Protecting this land from development is crucial to preserving the unique character and long-term environmental integrity of the area for current and future generations. When did saving green spaces become so radical?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Lisa Heppell	Response-00878	It is a very beautiful area and I have had the pleasure of living in Sandiacre for over 50years
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Lisa J Pearson	Response-01762	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Liz Woodhouse	Response-01584	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	L Mee	Response-01777	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Logan Fox	Response-00746	not sure what to add
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Lorraine Hands	Response-00534	Building on the land could impact on residents at time of heavy rainfall, I have witnessed people on Maple being affected as rainfall was so heavy it was flooding through garages that backed onto Stoney Clouds, the landscape is important as more and more gardens are swapped for driveways,
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Louise Felfoldt	Response-01733	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Louise Harper	Response-01571	I look out of my windows and all I see is green , and trees, this is why I moved here in the first place from a ground floor flat with our young children, taking the dog on walks on stoney, not overlooked by anyone, , my piece of paradise, there are some things worth more than money, what will we do when they are all gone ? , it will be too late by then, it's not too late yet to save our green spaces
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Louise Harrison	Response-01719	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Louise Jacks	Response-01767	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Louise Libberton	Response-01693	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Lucy johnson	Response-01369	The landscape adds to the charm of our town! Don?t destroy it
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Luke Chein	Response-01779	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Lynda Morton	Response-01606	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
			Lynsey Blackburn	Response-01227	This is such a beautiful part of town which will be ruined by a housing development
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Macie Brothwell	Response-01633	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Malcolm Dillon	Response-00722	The duffer zone between developed land and townships must be enhanced were ever possible. This proposed development would have a detrimental effect of the identity of Sandiacre and would lead to urban sprawl. We are already to close to Stapleford township. The loss to Sandiacre citizens would also be the loss for Stapleford citizens. Social cohesion is the bedrock of good community life. This proposed development puts these concepts in danger.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Malcolm Fox	Response-00215	Simply put, green belts such as this site should not be considered. During winter months, the roads leading up to the area freeze due to the incline, resulting in vehicle access being impeded. Buses also stop accessing the immediate area. So although my comments on the actual landscape may not be applicable in your view, we must consume landscape leading up to the area as well.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Malcolm Riggs	Response-01680	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Malc Orbiston	Response-01673	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Mandy Rait	Response-01587	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out. The proposed development would certainly lead to our natural landscape lost for ever. There are many brownfield sites to be considered first.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Mark Gough	Response-00888	The landscape around the proposed area of Stoney clouds is the most scenic in the area . It has views of local wildlife , trees , green grass , fields . This landscape is crucial to the health and well being of the residents and visitors around . If taken away , people will become depressed , won't be able to walk their dogs, children won't have the freedom to play and walk in a safe environment away from traffic , life will be upturned . The landscape will be ruined and turned into a concrete jungle .
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Mark Leek	Response-01740	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	mark skelton	Response-01341	Beautiful site for walkers to stoney clouds and golf course. Would be so sad to loose it.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Mark Warton	Response-00693	Losing our Heritage and Countryside
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Martin Hardy	Response-01413	Without full site plans I cannot comment. These have not been provided.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Martyn Locker	Response-00903	Imagine the serene landscape of a vibrant green field, where horses frolic, wild plants sway in the wind, dog walkers stroll through to embark on an adventure into the gorgeous Erewash countryside. And now imagine a row of terraced houses, a Vauxhall Corsa with an enlarged exhaust pipe and tinted windows bounces over the speed bumps, while children play football in the road. It's no surprise that Sandiacre's had the largest opposition to these proposals.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	M A Simpkin	Response-01882	When our family was young we spent hours up the clouds, and the lads and their pals loved going down cardboard hill. My husband passed away last June. If he was here today I don't think he would be happy with building houses up there. Where will you be building next the playing fields? What barmpot come up with the idea of building up the clouds anyway. Nowhere for ramblers or dog walkers to go. Don't suppose you will take a blind bit of notice anyway, even if everyone in Sandiacre voted against it. You will just go ahead and build.
			M A Smith	Response-01889	Walking for health.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Matthew Buckland	Response-00615	It's beautiful up there - why put a load of houses on there when there are more than enough empty properties.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Maurice Mason	Response-01617	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	M Dougle	Response-01749	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	M Eastwood	Response-01757	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Melanie	Response-00586	This proposal conflicts directly with the Neighbourhood Plan and planning principles aimed at protecting the Green Belt. The site serves a clear role in maintaining the character and openness of the landscape and should not be compromised when alternative sites are available. Development here would result in irreversible loss of valuable green space.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Melanie Caumont	Response-01272	The development would be intrusive, altering the landscape character and impacting views from both the conservation area and residential homes. The proximity to the M1 also raises noise and pollution issues for any new homes, which compromises the desirability and sustainability of the site.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Melanie Howarth	Response-01621	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Michael Anderson	Response-00461	To build services for this area, such as water gas electricity sewers are bound to breakdown the landscape to this Green Belt site.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Michell Birkin	Response-01657	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Michelle Alsop	Response-01645	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Michelle Cox	Response-01724	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Michelle Ledger	Response-00815	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Michelle Wenham	Response-01650	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Mick Hughes	Response-01701	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Mike Darnell	Response-00698	Totally wrong area for an estate, out of character and damaging to the biodiversity of the nature reserve. Obstructing the beautiful views. We need more green spaces for our physical and mental wellbeing. I use this area daily and know this is not the place for housing. It is up a steep windy hill with narrow roads. It is totally the wrong place
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Miss Garratt	Response-00905	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Miss R Cordon	Response-01648	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Misty McGrath	Response-01556	Why do we insist on placing cheap housing for people so close to the M1. The health impacts themselves are not good, plus the negative mental aspects on the existing residents.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Mollie Snow	Response-01729	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Molly Newbold	Response-00486	Houses vs our greenery. Of course it will ruin the landscape
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Mr & Mrs Turton	Response-01660	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Mr A Monk	Response-01905	
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Mr and Mrs R Skelton	Response-01274	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Mr and Mrs Wright	Response-01275	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Mr K Turton	Response-01706	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Mr Luke	Response-01703	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Mr P J Tanner	Response-01728	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Mr R M Draper	Response-01856	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Mr R Widdowson	Response-01734	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Mr S. Haywood	Response-01585	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Mrs Christina Pope	Response-00732	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Mrs Donna C. Ball	Response-01594	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Mrs Griffin	Response-01698	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Mrs J. Cooper	Response-01596	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Mrs Joanne Thompson	Response-01690	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Mrs Linda Cox	Response-01753	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Mrs Luke	Response-01704	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Mrs M. Rose	Response-01583	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Mrs Marie Draper	Response-01755	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Mrs M Jones	Response-01884	We have had generations of this small towns people use that land for walks, the nature there and it is a great source of relaxation to our community. I am 60 now and have grown up and met my husband on that land and kept horses for many years there. My children and many other people have had happy memories on that land. And its been part of Sandiacres heritage for many years. It is a very sad state of affairs when something so precious to us all in Sandiacre is going to be bulldozed over and ruined forever.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Mrs Rachel Coats	Response-01623	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Mrs R Cordon	Response-01647	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Mrs Rigby	Response-00641	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscapes forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walks used daily by the local people will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Mrs Shani Wainwright	Response-00754	This proposal will sadly negatively impact our beautiful landscape forever and turn a once beautiful green belt area into a sterile concrete jungle.....the loss of this area could well increase flood risk in Sandiacre as tjis natural drainage area will be lost.The fantastic views across the parish and its beautiful walk will be destroyed with the skyline being blotted out too.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Mrs Sheila Hickingbotham	Response-01338	The site is situated next to the Cloudside Conservation Area and Local Nature Reserve and the proposed development will have an adverse effect on the character of the area, including views into and out of the Conservation Area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Mrs Shirley Victoria Riggs	Response-01685	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Mrs Susan Bantle	Response-01612	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Mrs Turton	Response-01707	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Nasim Rashid	Response-01103	Area of beauty that benefits the physical and mental well being of local people.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Natalie Bentley	Response-01646	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Nicole Cooper	Response-01597	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Nikki Vincent	Response-00688	It would be a huge shame to lose such a wonderful landscape. My children love going to stoney clouds and exploring our local green areas.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Normn McCrea	Response-01754	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Oliver Marriott	Response-00679	Landscape Landscape & Green belt I?m confused as to why this site was selected, it only is it very limiting in terms of the access but also the fact it?s on a nature reserve. Surely, this is going to affect a whole area for people, animals and nature. We are so lucky to have such a special place on our doorstep the views are incredible snd it?s so widely used I?m sure there must be more suitable alternatives available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Paige Walker	Response-01669	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Pam shepherd	Response-00453	This goes side by side with the damage of the protect species in the area, damage the environment their animals habitats the natural walk people use the area for it?s a disgrace that you want to try and turn a beautiful town into a city environment
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Pat Hardy	Response-01739	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Paula Darnell	Response-00665	To build here on this site at the top of sandiacre up small windy narrow congedted roads with hairpin bends on our greenbelt precious nature reserve is not acceptable
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Paula Luck	Response-01710	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Paula Sims	Response-01687	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Paul Randall	Response-00131	You are proposing to build on green belt, so?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Paul Vleeton	Response-01770	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	paul wheeldon	Response-00582	This field has drop of straight down to the motorway along one edge this could cause serious issues if the banking were to give way
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Peter Anthony	Response-01866	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Peter Nicholls	Response-01622	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Pete West	Response-01700	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Phil Creasey	Response-01342	This proposal would perminantly change this landscape, spoiling the wonderful views and destroying the lovely walks.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	P Sandes	Response-01682	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Rachel Crossley	Response-01661	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Rachel Skelton	Response-01241	Changing of the landscape - destroying the open green spaces
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	R Barratt	Response-01664	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Rebecca Longmuir	Response-00253	The landscape will be destroyed by the awful housing estate you wish to enforce on us. There is brown belt land in Sandiacre you could use behind Lidl was one area!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Rhiannon Lowater	Response-01592	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	R Hibbitt	Response-01862	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Richard Chambers	Response-00745	The houses will impinge on the views from Stoney Clouds
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Richard Haines	Response-01674	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Richard Marriott	Response-00675	Landscape Landscape & Green belt I?m confused as to why this site was selected, it only is it very limiting in terms of the access but also the fact it?s on a nature reserve. Surely, this is going to affect a whole area for people, animals and nature. We are so lucky to have such a special place on our doorstep the views are incredible snd it?s so widely used I?m sure there must be more suitable alternatives available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Richard Naylor	Response-00066	Your plans affect the landscape around Sandiacre.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Richard Shrimpton	Response-01301	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Rob Lowe	Response-01768	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Rosemarie Gough	Response-00997	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Roy Drew	Response-01614	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Ruby Sharp	Response-00886	The land in question has historical significance, and developing it could risk damaging archaeological sites or landscapes that carry cultural value for the community.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Ryan Selby	Response-00479	The landscape will not be the same, less greenery. More traffic, more noise, more pollution in a quiet village.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	S. Jones	Response-01615	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Sally Davies	Response-01294	This development will ruin the nature of the area and will be in detrimental to the houses already in the area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Samantha Anne Whitney	Response-00757	The landscape should stay untouched, Stoney Clouds has had enough development on it already.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Samantha Whildes	Response-01270	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Sam Greateorex	Response-01695	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Sandra Cooke	Response-01613	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Sarah Harrison	Response-01658	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	S Bryne	Response-01677	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Sebastian Roberts	Response-01675	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Shanead Ligton	Response-01689	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Shannon moss	Response-00454	The landscape is a huge selling point for all houses that back onto the open fields with the beautiful views of horses, this development will not only destroy the views, the landscape, it will decrease the value of properties that back onto here
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Shannon Robinson	Response-01635	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Sharon weston	Response-00440	The landscape out of my rear windows behind my garden is the reason I brought my house in the first place, so I'll have to endure staring at a house instead of a tree line and watching the wildlife.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Shaun Green	Response-01773	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Sheila	Response-00587	The proposed development would cause a significant and lasting detriment to the character and visual quality of the local landscape. Situated within the Green Belt, this site currently serves as a vital buffer between urban settlements and contributes meaningfully to the rural identity of Sandiacre. Its open and undeveloped nature offers visual continuity with the surrounding countryside, supports local tranquillity, and provides important long-range views for residents and visitors alike. The construction of high-density housing in this location would result in the urbanisation of a valued green space, permanently eroding the sense of openness and undermining the area's distinct landscape character. You are destroying a nature reserve.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Sheila Payne	Response-01782	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Sian Knox	Response-01679	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	S Leek	Response-01737	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Sonya Birkin	Response-01656	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Sophie	Response-00472	Stones clouds is a local beauty spot which has been very much loved and appreciated by the local community and visitors for many years, this would be a real eyesore to this and the wildlife
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Sophie Bennett	Response-01631	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Stephen Barlow	Response-01808	We see lots of people walk up our road with thier dogs to walk on Stoney Cloud and obviously this would not happen if houses were built.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Stephen Davies	Response-00214	The existing houses on Larch Drive bordering proposed development are all bungalows. Any other type of properties would have detrimental effect on view. Proximity to existing nature reserve is likely to result in significant disruption to wildlife and tree / vegetation This is the only green space between the existing properties and the M1, thus providing a break in air and noise pollution
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Stephen Sacker	Response-01598	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Steve Bilbie	Response-00285	This would be a scar on the most beautiful part of Sandiacre enjoyed by the residents and visitors. A total disaster for the landscape of this beautiful area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Steve Whittaker	Response-01781	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Sue Harrison	Response-01629	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Susan Heinke	Response-00468	Enough destruction of our landscapes. Our new generation are not going to have anywhere that isn't built up to go
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Susanne Beaven	Response-01618	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Tamara Partridge	Response-01780	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Tara Marshall	Response-01890	I walk up there everyday it helps with my mentel health and refresh my brain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Tarnya Hinman	Response-01786	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Thomas Ilett	Response-01088	Due to the proposed site's prominence at the top of an incline, the proposed development will result in a significantly detrimental impact on the landscape. Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve is adjacent to the proposed development. The landscape and aesthetics of this beautiful nature reserve, integral to the Sandiacre community will be ruined by a housing estate looming over it from the West. This will also potentially limit sunlight in the afternoon and evening to Stoney Clouds limiting its landscape and beauty further. As mentioned under flooding, Stoney Clouds is also a flood plain for Sandiacre. With increased hardstanding and at the top of an incline, increased flooding could result in damage to the landscape, including the medieval furrows - a key historical landmark.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Tim Derbyshire	Response-01681	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Tim Gough	Response-00996	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Toby Moran	Response-01769	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Tom Ball	Response-01672	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Tony Weston	Response-00990	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out. The land in question has historical significance, and developing it could risk damaging archaeological sites or landscapes that carry cultural value for the community.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	landscape	Tracey Howe	Response-01860	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Tracey Hughes	Response-01699	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Trevor Rowston	Response-01678	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Try church	Response-00033	The current landscape is pleasant both for residents and visitors walking over the land. Many houses have a boundary onto the land and enjoy the open view. Many of the houses being purchased for that reason. It is not acceptable to be using this land for building when they're are many more suitable brown sites
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Tyler Hobbs	Response-00879	Building on the greenbelt land in Sandiacre would dramatically alter the landscape in a negative way, eroding the rural character of the area and replacing open, natural spaces with urban sprawl. The greenbelt provides vital green spaces that contribute to the scenic beauty of the area, offering expansive views of the countryside and maintaining a peaceful, tranquil environment for residents. Development of 180 houses would not only diminish these visual aesthetics but also create a permanent disruption to the landscape's natural contours. Trees, hedgerows, and open fields that currently support local wildlife would be replaced by concrete, roads, and housing estates, resulting in habitat loss and fragmented ecosystems. This change would not only affect the natural beauty of the area but also reduce the overall quality of life for residents, as the green, open spaces that once provided a buffer from urban life would be lost. The development would essentially transform a vibrant, rural landscape into a crowded, suburban sprawl, permanently altering the area's character and environmental health.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Verity Lamb	Response-01298	Is a full archaeological survey to get carried out on the site which covers the origins of Sandiacre.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Victoria Abraham	Response-01652	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Victoria Galpin-shrimpton	Response-01009	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Victoria Greateorex	Response-01730	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Victoria Marriott	Response-00674	Landscape & Green belt I?m confused as to why this site was selected, it only is it very limiting in terms of the access but also the fact it?s on a nature reserve. Surely, this is going to affect a whole area for people, animals and nature. We are so lucky to have such a special place on our doorstep the views are incredible and it?s so widely used I?m sure there must be more suitable alternatives available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	Vivien Davis	Response-01582	This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Landscape	William Marriott	Response-00676	Landscape Landscape & Green belt I?m confused as to why this site was selected, it only is it very limiting in terms of the access but also the fact it?s on a nature reserve. Surely, this is going to affect a whole area for people, animals and nature. We are so lucky to have such a special place on our doorstep the views are incredible and it?s so widely used I?m sure there must be more suitable alternatives available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Aaron Locksley	Response-00711	We live on Cloudside Road in a house that directly butts onto the proposed land, it's currently a lovely view of horses and green open space. I can see that perhaps the land is a good use for houses but 180 is excessive. We are increasingly becoming aware of the need for green spaces in our lives, inevitably with that many houses their private gardens will be tiny and due to the overcrowding they won't feel private, has anyone thought about the long term impacts on mental health this will have for the new build residents? Plonking them right next to the motorway with basically no garden is a recipe for ill health. I would think if the number was lowered to ~100, you would meet much lower opposition, especially if you provision for current residents (i.e. afford a nice gap between current houses and the new builds with a nice long garden), you might not reach the numbers sought after, but they might actually get built this decade.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Adrian Randall	Response-00463	The number of houses proposed is ridiculous, and not in keeping with the existing property in the area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	A Harby	Response-01684	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Alex Corns	Response-01151	Of course 180 houses is going to bring in potentially 700 odd people to Sandiacre. There are few facilities in the area, no major supermarket, small drs, small dentist, NO CHEMIST, hardly any public parking and very very little room for further development to expand, the schools are full to capacity. Many people already have to travel outside the area for schools.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Alice Cooper	Response-01721	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Alice Ilett	Response-00571	180 houses on our greenbelt in such a small area is ludicrous. It's massively out of keeping with the rest of the area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	A Malinski	Response-00620	This number of homes in such a small area will impact on the local character and infrastructure. Schools, doctors, dentists to name but a few resources are already stretched and as I don't see any allowance for additional services I can only assume that the planner is placing the additional numbers on the existing services.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Amanda Leech	Response-01625	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Amy Skinner	Response-01447	The proposal of 180 houses for this space is ridiculous - the infrastructure simply isn't there and there is not enough space for vehicular access. There is not enough room to house that many people especially when the only access into the site is at the end of a very small drive.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Anastasia Anthony	Response-01865	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future. NPPF Para. 60-62 warrants a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). Will the houses meet the needs of our community? What impact will they have on crime + cultural identity?

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Andrew Marvin	Response-00255	180 houses = approx 250 Cars The amount of houses in that plot is disgusting
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Andrew Meadwell	Response-01654	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Andrew Solloway	Response-00958	Small area, large number of houses, poor concept
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Andria Nylasi	Response-00672	The volume of housing on the site is ridiculous and will mean that the houses are extremely close together. If every house had two cars to each property, there would be close to an extra 400 cars in the area and at least that many extra people, although I suspect we'd be probably looking at closer to an extra 1000, with a minimum of 4 per family.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Andy Martin	Response-01761	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Annabel Marriott	Response-00760	The amount of houses is just unimaginable in the proposed area. It ruins the suburban town we are this side of Sandiacre. It feels like these houses are being squeezed into the most ridiculous space.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Anne Castledine	Response-00499	Far too many for the infrastructure that there is. Heavy rain causes flooding from the main sewer on Derby Road, it's struggling now.
			Anne Jenkins	Response-00350	No houses should be built there
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Annette Jones	Response-00961	Too many to start with as more than the street I live on which backs directly onto the proposed site! How high are these houses supposed to be and will they accommodate two cars per household or will they end up parking on the pavement. Bungalows are not suitable due to the steep hills and therefore older or people with limited mobility will be dependent on a car or other transport. Will they be just a house with a drive with no garden so further impact on the environment.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Ann Harrison	Response-01602	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Anthony Pearson	Response-01760	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Anthony Smedlewick	Response-01877	No houses should be on this little site.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Antony M Ingram	Response-01626	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
			A R Gregory	Response-01918	
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Awson Wheldon	Response-01649	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
			Barbara Michell	Response-01787	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Barbara Warton	Response-01886	NONE on green belt land.
			Barry Partridge	Response-01778	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Ben Hollins	Response-01651	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Beverley Gardner	Response-01692	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Beverley Green	Response-01686	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
			Bill Hartley	Response-01696	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	B T Duke	Response-01900	Don't want them. Build on grey/brown belt.
			B T Keen	Response-01735	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	c/o The Equalised Club	Response-01603	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Callum binnall	Response-00460	We don't want anymore houses being built!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Caroline Blackmore	Response-00451	Refer back to all the above area's how are they meant to cope with the increase. Councils are already at breaking point with the services they provide
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Caroline Driver	Response-00618	It is the highest density of all the proposals and not in keeping with current housing
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Carol Marshall	Response-00736	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Carolyn Hallam	Response-00489	Far too many houses on a narrow strip of greenbelt, right next to the motorway. It really isn't a good place to build
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Catherine Greenaway	Response-00429	Will there be 180 in sandiacre or is this number split over several areas? If so how many are planned for sandiacre?
			Catherine Richardson	Response-00531	Far too many houses being proposed for this site
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Charlotte Fry	Response-00583	Too many houses are being built in that area and to get access to them you have to go up such a narrow little road that can't handle that much traffic
			Charlotte Hunter	Response-01376	This is going to cause noise pollution to the surrounding houses.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	C Holmes	Response-01620	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Chris Hume	Response-01373	The number of proposed houses is frankly ridiculous, for all the reasons mentioned, make use of all the empty properties before building more. There are viable sites within Erewash, this site is not viable for access alone
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Chris Jones	Response-01718	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
			Chris O Connor	Response-01641	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Christian Rearson	Response-01763	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Christine Gough	Response-00578	180 homes too many for this space . We don't have the infrastructure to cope with them and the people who are going to potentially live there .
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Claire binnall	Response-00459	0 we need 0 new houses
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Clare Green	Response-01751	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Cole Hawkins	Response-01714	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
			Colin Billington	Response-00227	Far too many houses on green belt
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Colin Cox	Response-01716	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Colin Marriott	Response-00686	The density far outnumber those in adjacent areas. The current population of Sandiacre is approximately 8000 but you are trying to increase it by over 5%. Where are these people coming from.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Courtney Bennett	Response-00593	The number of house needs to be reduced by a minimum of half if not more! It would be even better if no houses were built at all.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Craig Freeman	Response-01561	180 dwellings in such a narrow space so close to the motorway is not very desirable for the residents, and will potentially create a future problem if not attracting a healthy diversity of income families.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Craig Richards	Response-01638	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Craig Thims	Response-01765	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Cristina Jenkins	Response-01588	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	C Thompson	Response-01634	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Daniel	Response-00545	180 is an obscene amount for the type of land were talking about for such a small amount of land which such massive disadvantages.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Daniel Downes	Response-01630	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Daniel Hands	Response-00057	To add another 180 residencies to this area seems unrealistic and not in keeping with the wants, needs or opinions of the current residents. 30 - 50 would be more realistic and could be built to be more inkeeping with the area
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Danielle Harrison	Response-00568	180 houses are disproportionate the the houses already built along the surrounding roads. The scale of this planning application far exceeds the housing surrounding it.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Daniel Naylor	Response-00680	Sandiacre and neighbouring towns and villages seem to be taking the brunt in Erewash's allocation o required new developments where other areas of the borough seems largely untouched.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Darran and Emma Rea	Response-00597	It is double the density of what is currently in the area which will not be in keeping, even if it was half the housing they want to build, it would still not be in keeping with the area
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	David Casey	Response-01608	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	David Cater	Response-01756	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	David Ruddock	Response-01776	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	David Thompson	Response-01324	Too many
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	David Thompson	Response-00826	I would like to object to the proposed house building on green belt land at Stoney clouds, Sandiacre, why build here when 1800 houses are empty in the Borough
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	David Tindsley	Response-00515	It is my strongly held view, and mirrored by neighbours and residents in the affected areas, that NO houses should be built on this land whatsoever. It is completely inappropriate given the significant access and traffic issues, and I therefore strongly object to the suggested development.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	David Yeo	Response-01705	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Dean Bosworth	Response-01665	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Dean Lavelle	Response-01774	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Dean Michell	Response-01343	To many house of any type.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Debra Michell	Response-01346	There are a lot of empty houses in sandiacre, 180 new homes on that lands is far to many houses, for the area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Debra Scully	Response-00288	Too many for the site suggested
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Debs Washer	Response-00487	None is the correct answer.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Denise Creasey	Response-00786	It is the highest density of all the proposals and if this is allowed, will give raise to concerns for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Denise Lingard	Response-01759	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Dennis Watts	Response-01726	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Derek Morton	Response-01607	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Derrick Hunt	Response-00437	The site doesn't seem to be large enough for 180 houses unless they are going to be shoe horned in. There has to be room for roads and infrastructure and each house will need 2 car parking spaces minimum
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Destiny Jade-Blake	Response-01636	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Diane Jones	Response-00852	No houses nshould be built on this land.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Diane Mcmorrow	Response-00433	I've lived in Sandiacre all my life and 42 of them at my present address I personally don't want to see any houses built
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Diane Turner	Response-01744	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Dorothy Deeprise	Response-00817	Please dont build new houses. I would ask you to fix the buildings we already have or knock them down and build on them. We should future proof what we have. Insulate, add solar panneling, EV chargers and heat pumps if we are going to future proof Britain.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	D Pallett	Response-01627	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	D Simpson	Response-01712	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	E Cooper	Response-01923	Too many for current infrastructure of area without additional services also being added.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Eleanor Moseley	Response-00799	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Eleanor Newman	Response-00718	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Emily	Response-01880	Too many houses for that area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Emma Ryan	Response-00503	Too many home for an already full area. I understand the 'need' for housing, but 10% being 'affordable' ...18 out of 180 just feels shocking. It isn't supporting people needing homes. It's unnecessary greed.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Emma Wall	Response-00319	180 houses on that space of land is utterly ridiculous. It's not big enough for that and certainly the infrastructure will not cope with it in terms of drainage, water, electricity supply communication supply et cetera et cetera
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Esme Moss	Response-00592	Not a sustainable number of houses for the small area of land.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Esther Cook	Response-01861	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Ewan Snowdon	Response-00766	With so many houses, there worry that there won't be enough parking provision. So the newly built roads will be clogged with cars parked on the roads, making access for emergency services even more difficult and endangering pedestrians.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Fay Cresswell	Response-00701	There is not area for 180 houses to meet government standards.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Gail and Tony Orme	Response-00805	I feel it is unnecessary for Sandiacre we already have lots of new builds. Plus I'm told there are 1800 empty houses!!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Gail Berry	Response-01644	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Geoff Tindsley	Response-00755	It is my strongly held view, and mirrored by neighbours and residents in the affected areas, that NO houses should be built on this land whatsoever. It is completely inappropriate given the significant access and traffic issues, and I therefore strongly object to the suggested development.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Georgia C	Response-01296	We have an aging population, so how is there a housing crisis now when for decades the number of houses has more than sufficed? The death rate is higher than the birth, so why do we require so many new builds?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Georgia Marvin	Response-00261	180 houses is ridiculous. Triple the residents, triple the cars, triple the strain it will put onto our town. Triple the wildlife threat. Triple the accidents this will cause.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Gill West	Response-01725	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Glyn Holner	Response-01697	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Gordon Daris	Response-01639	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Greg Cox	Response-01702	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Gregg Bartrum	Response-01591	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Harriet Farnsworth	Response-01914	Way too many.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Harry Fleck	Response-01084	The proposed 180 houses is highly dense and is not in keeping with the surrounding estate.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Helen Gillain	Response-00964	The number of houses proposed is unservicable in this area
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Helen Richardson	Response-00432	It is unclear how the proposal for 108 new homes on Green Belt aligns with a strategy that prioritizes the efficient use of existing housing stock, particularly in light of the significant number of existing vacant homes in the Erewash area. It appears that a more sustainable and resource-efficient solution would be to focus on incentivizing and facilitating the re-occupation of the over 700 empty properties currently standing within the borough. This approach would address housing needs without the detrimental impact of developing valuable Green Belt land.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Helen Thompson	Response-01356	The council has recently adopted the Sandiacre neighbourhood plan which was prepared in consultation with residents and voted for. This identifies other sites for housing development and advocates for protection of our green spaces.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Helen whiteman	Response-00447	The whole scheme should be stopped and no houses built at all
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Ian herbert	Response-00939	180 houses is excessive and only 50 to 70 would be appropriate
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	IAN TAYLOR	Response-00972	A recent study indicates that the density of the proposed housing will be twice the density of existing developments. This is neither desirable nor acceptable.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Ian telfer	Response-00991	180!! Way too many in my opinion
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Ian Ward	Response-01628	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Irina Anthony	Response-01867	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Isabelle Love	Response-00529	Too many houses for such a small area - obviously. One house is too much given where it is proposed, but 180 is utterly ridiculous
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Isobel Ball	Response-01092	Everything I have already said in every comment, except quadrupled. Because this is not a few houses it is housing to live hundreds of residents.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	J. E. Lord	Response-01601	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Jack Greatorex	Response-01731	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Jacob Whitt	Response-01748	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Jacqueline Marshall	Response-01436	The number of houses is too large and SHOULD NOT be allowed on THE GREEN BELT it will have a detrimental impact on people living close to the proposed development and will spoil a beautiful place loved by many residents of both Sandiacre and Stapleford.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Jade Smith	Response-01783	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	James Meadwell	Response-01653	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	James Roberts	Response-01708	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	James Seward	Response-01683	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Jane Dennett	Response-00965	Zero from me
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Jane Elizabeth Tindsley	Response-00669	It is my strongly held view, and mirrored by neighbours and residents in the affected areas, that NO houses should be built on this land whatsoever. It is completely inappropriate given the significant access and traffic issues, and I therefore strongly object to the suggested development.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Janet Edwards	Response-01906	There should be no building allowed on this part of Sandiacre.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Janet Whildes	Response-01869	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Janice Taylor	Response-01743	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Janice West	Response-00989	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Janine Holmes	Response-01595	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Jason Deeprise	Response-00818	Dont need more houses. Get rid of the people then the houses we have will do
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Jason Harwood	Response-01667	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Jason Webb	Response-01637	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Jayne Rowley	Response-01279	This development is one of the highest density of the proposals and is not in keeping with the existing area
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	J Cates	Response-01750	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Jeanette O Connor	Response-01640	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Jeffrey Whittaker	Response-00594	Enough hoses on that area as it us
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Jennifer Bailey	Response-01857	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Jennifer Tindstley	Response-00751	It is my strongly held view, and mirrored by neighbours and residents in the affected areas, that NO houses should be built on this land whatsoever. It is completely inappropriate given the significant access and traffic issues, and I therefore strongly object to the suggested development.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Jenny Stephens	Response-01723	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Joanna hardy	Response-01304	This site is proposing 180 new homes. I simply don't see how so many properties could be comfortably built in the proposed area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Joanne Guyatt	Response-01784	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Joanne Johnson	Response-00765	Way too many for the area, they will be too close to each other with hardly any garden space.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Joanne Lambert	Response-00494	180 is too much of an increase for our small community
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Jodie Owen	Response-01688	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Jodie Shrive	Response-00601	We should not have to be objecting and trying to reason with the utter lunacy that this council has become and attempting to negotiate how many houses should be built, because the answer has and always will be ZERO. 180 houses is NOT sustainable. 180 houses is LUNACY. Where are the plans for road improvements to help facilitate this development? 180 houses will be a complete eye sore, a complete 180 turn around for what this country is claiming it's trying to achieve in regards to climate change and saving our planet. Where is the demand coming from for an extra 180 houses? Why do we need it?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Jo Gerhardt	Response-01286	It would lead to an increase in the all ready populated area, causing all sorts of problems as already mentioned in the other sections. Why build on green belt when there is a vast space on the old ironworks at Stanton. They could make the so called contaminated land, ready for use and build as many houses as they wish. A whole community could be built including a school, GP surgery etc. Building houses require the right infrastructure and the West of Sandiacre on the Green Belt is not the answer. Land behind Lidl could also be used without ruining the Green Belt.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	John Gardner	Response-01694	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	John G Brown	Response-01752	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	John Hibbitt	Response-01855	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	John Ledger	Response-01605	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	John Payne	Response-01785	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	John whiteman	Response-00450	No comment as they should not be built
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Jon Burn	Response-01722	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Josh Williams	Response-01632	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	J Pearson	Response-01772	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	J Telfer	Response-01876	Who dreamt up that number. Way too many.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Judith A Pulfer	Response-01863	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Judith Blackburn	Response-01928	Question drainage, roadwidths, access to estates, need details on proposed builds and gardens, recreation areas.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Julie Hill	Response-01643	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Karen Alldread	Response-01868	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Karen Blain	Response-01732	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Karen Harwood	Response-01668	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Karen Pitts	Response-00643	The current housing estate is roughly twice the size of the proposed area, yet it contains 180 houses. How can a further 180 houses be built in an area of half the size? The sewage produced from this extra number of houses will affect the already overstretched systems. Look at the flooding that has occurred over the last few year in both Sandiacre and Risley. The capacity to cope just isn't there. Extra street lighting will also have an environmental effect.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Kathryn Martin	Response-00527	Area the same size or smaller in surrounding area have 50 houses maximum
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Katrina	Response-00628	The proposed density isn't in keeping with the surrounding area, 180 houses is too dense, it would be better if it was around 100 with some open areas to preserve some of the green areas
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Kelsey Green	Response-01666	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Kenneth Cooper	Response-01720	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Kern-Paul Lewis	Response-01715	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Kerry Meadwell	Response-01655	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Kerry Smith	Response-01271	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Kerry stokes	Response-00769	1 house on the land proposed is too many nether mind 180 houses. The land is too small for this many houses.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	KH Taylor	Response-01663	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Kim Helm	Response-00632	180 on that site is ridiculous. They will all be on top of each with very little or no garden. Some will probably be 3 storey , affecting the landscape

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Kirsty Handa	Response-00445	180 houses is a very big development for such a small area. The houses in this area are a mixture of semi detached and detached properties with large gardens. This amount of houses is not keeping with the area, this development will look out of place, cramped and unsightly
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	K Reynolds	Response-01916	There is the old with the new, & plenty for the area. And there is already a complex of uninhabited flats ect. going derelict.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Kristie Rugers	Response-01864	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Kyle Jones	Response-01764	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	L A Keen	Response-01659	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Laura Hallam	Response-01711	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Laurence Luck	Response-01727	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Lauren Freeman	Response-01562	I am familiar with the proposed area and I cannot visualise 180 houses with useable gardens and parking. Also the only entry point is in no way wide enough for vehicles to pass each other going in and out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Lauren Rose	Response-01446	180 houses in such a small area is a ridiculous idea. People we have spoken to have said the maximum they would recommend would be 50. Gardens will be limited and tiny, so residents will have little to no green space.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Lee Wilcock	Response-01670	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Lesley Bruce	Response-01397	This land should not be touched as it is a valuable local facility for a very built-up area. Development is detrimental to people and environment in so many ways.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Lesley Morral	Response-01920	180 houses does not align with the surrounding estate.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Lia Thims	Response-01766	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	lilly stokes	Response-00767	The mass number of houses that they are building are going to be immensely cramped in and the pressure on local services is going to be huge. This will make it extremely stressful for me to even come out of my house,
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Linda Castledine-Davies	Response-00850	Quite simply a ridiculous number of houses is proposed. The proposal for this site is a much higher density than any of the other green belt sites and no reason has been given. By their own admission Erewash know of 1800 houses that lie empty and have done so for as long as 2 years. There are a considerable number of houses for sale and the market is flat with most being reduced in price. There is no data to substantiate why this many houses need to be built it appears to just be towing the party line. Number of houses Local Government Association state Empty Homes Week 2025, UK Currently, nearly 700,000 homes sit empty and unfurnished, with over 265,000 classed as long-term vacant. 1800 in Erewash alone. This proposal is not in keeping with the area. Such a rapid population growth in high-density areas will strain limited existing services like transportation, healthcare, and education, add to congestion, longer wait times, and inadequate service provision. The total fertility rate (TFR), which measures the average number of children a woman is expected to have over her lifetime, has been in overall decline since 2010. In 2023, the TFR in England and Wales fell to 1.44, the lowest on record (ONS) and Life expectancy is down. The need for such an aggressive housing policy is not understandable,
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Linda Oscroft	Response-01927	The description high density housing indicates an alternative way of saying - cram on as many as can be put & build them to accommodate as many as possible. This does nothing to promote social cohesion.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Lindsey Rawlinson	Response-01624	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	LISA ANNE GILLIGAN-LEE	Response-00710	Such a development will put immense pressure on local infrastructure i.e. schools; GP surgeries; public transport and emergency services. Without sustainable planning, these additional homes will lead to long-term community issues.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Lisa J Pearson	Response-01762	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Liz Woodhouse	Response-01584	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	L Mee	Response-01777	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Logan Fox	Response-00746	I have heard almost 200 house. That would increase the amount of houses using a single road 4 times over! Any amount of houses would simply add more problems to our area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Lorraine Hands	Response-00534	If I say the amount proposed is to many this sounds like a lower number would be acceptable!! I am sorry but I don't feel houses on that piece of land are a good idea! Again I can't imagine how this will affect residents on Cloudside and Larch! I do have family who live on Cloudside!!!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Louise Felfoldt	Response-01733	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Louise Harper	Response-01571	I would prefer no houses at all on the site, I am not choosing any number of houses, 0 would be the number for me
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Louise Harrison	Response-01719	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Louise Jacks	Response-01767	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Louise Libberton	Response-01693	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Louise Robinson	Response-00647	180 houses is a large number for such a small site. Maximising profit over living standards.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Lucy johnson	Response-01369	Like I've said before adding 180 houses to that small area of land is just plain stupid! I walk up stoney every morning with my dogs and I just have no words other than it's stupid! They will be packed in like a tin of sardines! That's no life, with a next to nothing garden and neighbours overlooking. It's just asking for trouble!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	lucy victoria garner	Response-00949	currently 77 houses for sale in sandiacre ranging from £80-700K to suit a range of options. Also 397 within a 1 mile radius as per Rightmove website. No indication there is no options for housing in the local area and no indication that another 180 houses are required
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Luke Chein	Response-01779	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Lynda Morton	Response-01606	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Macie Brothwell	Response-01633	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Malcolm Dillon	Response-00722	There are no guarantees that 180 houses will be the only number of properties ultimately built on this greenbelt piece of land. The benefits of greenbelt land both as an amenity and an irreplaceable resource for plants, people and all forms of life should be enough to halt this proposal. The value of open space was starkly highlighted during the dark days of the recent Covid pandemic. There will be another pandemic, we just do not know when. The retention of this area of greenbelt is vitally important and should be acknowledged and should prevent any building on this land.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Malcolm Fox	Response-00215	180 homes will equate to a an additional 200+ vehicles, 400+ residents, of which more than half will be children. This is not a small inclusion into the area but a drastic change that will negatively impact all currently living here. So the number of house proposed is grossly overinflated and unsuitable.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Malcolm Riggs	Response-01680	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Malc Orbiston	Response-01673	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
			Mandy Rait	Response-01587	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Mark Gough	Response-00888	180 houses too many for the reasons mentioned . Even half that will be too many , that space is not big enough . The roads and access to it not suitable .
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Mark Leek	Response-01740	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	mark skelton	Response-01341	Far too many in a small space. Estate will suffer from such a larger development
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Martin Driver	Response-01387	180. Ridiculous. Build somewhere else!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Martin Ford	Response-01908	150+ Houses!!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Martin Hardy	Response-01413	180 houses in the proposed area is excessive. Homes need proper access, off road parking to limit congestion, gardens for residents and space between houses. Seeing the site I can't see how 180 properties could fit.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Martyn Locker	Response-00903	I touched on this previously, but my initial reaction upon reading about the plans was surprise and bewilderment that it'd even be possible to fit 180 houses into that small plot of land. And that reaction doesn't seem to be unfounded. I have to question whether the medium-to-long-term impact on the livelihoods of thousands of existing residents have been considered at all, as the evidence points towards this being an urgent attempt to tick some boxes and turn some green space grey.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Matt Bancroft	Response-00916	The density of houses proposed is absurdly and unsustainably high. This site has the worst access yet the highest proposed density, why?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Matthew Buckland	Response-00615	It'll be very tight to build that amount of houses in that amount of space. Personally I can't see it, but then it won't matter as the developers will just move onto the next destructive project and leave the problem to yourselves.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Maurice Mason	Response-01617	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Maxine Sutton	Response-00471	There are already 1800 houses lying empty in Erewash. I appreciate the Council are attempting to contact the owners so surely building 180 new homes when ten times that amount already exist is foolhardy and a waste of public money.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	M Dougle	Response-01749	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	M Eastwood	Response-01757	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Melanie	Response-00586	The proposed density of 38 dwellings per hectare significantly exceeds existing residential densities in Sandiacre (typically 22 per hectare). This is not in keeping with the surrounding character of the area and will create an isolated, high-density enclave with limited access?raising concerns over community integration and long-term sustainability. It seems it's about hitting targets, it's unrealistic with its goals. It's all about hitting targets, not considering residents.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Melanie Caumont	Response-01272	180 homes crammed into 4.8 hectares equates to a density of nearly 38 homes per hectare?far higher than typical suburban developments in the area. This risks overdevelopment, with insufficient green space, privacy, or infrastructure to support such a concentrated population increase.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Melanie Howarth	Response-01621	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Michael Oscroft	Response-01926	The description high density housing indicates an alternative way of saying - cram on as many as can be put & build them to accommodate as many as possible. This does nothing to promote social cohesion.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Michell Birkin	Response-01657	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Michelle Alsop	Response-01645	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
			Michelle Cox	Response-01724	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Michelle Ledger	Response-00815	building 180 homes will have to be quite dense and this is just not in keeping with the local area whatsoever, Sandiacre will totally lose its village type of area that we all love
			Michelle Wenham	Response-01650	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Mick Hughes	Response-01701	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Miss Garratt	Response-00905	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Miss R Cordon	Response-01648	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Mollie Snow	Response-01729	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Molly Newbold	Response-00486	180 is too many and it will affect everything in the area from traffic to schools.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Mr & Mrs Turton	Response-01660	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Mr and Mrs R Skelton	Response-01274	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
			Mr and Mrs Wright	Response-01275	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Mr Colin Key	Response-01841	High density housing is not in keeping with the current housing. It will give rise to many problems and cause severe disruption to both residents and wildlife. The number proposed of 180 exceeds all other proposed sites and no reason or justification has been given for this.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Mr David Ainsworth	Response-00621	180 is the biggest scheme for the entire council plan with the poorest access and greatest impact upon existing residents. Its ticking the housing plan box and missing the voters point. You need to listen to what people are saying. Those who voted Labour in with trust. There should be no houses on green belt land. Angela Raynor promised not to touch green belt and this is why I voted Labour. Now you've gone against this manifesto and sadly losing me as a future voter.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Mr Ivan Stevenson	Response-01875	We would not need to build more houses, if the price of existing houses were made affordable.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Mr John Hickingbotham	Response-01431	The density of housing proposed for this development is considerably in excess of that in the surrounding neighbourhood and is therefore considered to be inappropriate in this location.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Mr K Gubb	Response-01838	High density housing is not in keeping with the current housing. It will give rise to many problems and cause severe disruption to both residents and wildlife. The number proposed of 180 exceeds all other proposed sites and no reason or justification has been given for this.
			Mr K Turton	Response-01706	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Mr Luke	Response-01703	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Mr P J Tanner	Response-01728	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Mr R M Draper	Response-01856	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Mr R Widdowson	Response-01734	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Mr S. Haywood	Response-01585	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
			Mrs Christina Pope	Response-00732	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Mrs Donna C. Ball	Response-01594	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
			Mrs Griffin	Response-01698	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Mrs J. Cooper	Response-01596	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Mrs Joanne Thompson	Response-01690	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Mrs Lee Farabella	Response-01899	A large estate - style development could fail to integrate with surrounding character in this area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Mrs Linda Cox	Response-01753	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Mrs Luke	Response-01704	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
			Mrs M. Rose	Response-01583	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Mrs Marie Draper	Response-01755	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future. Too many houses on this site!
			Mrs M Burke	Response-01887	180+ houses will not integrate with the surrounding area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Mrs M Jones	Response-01884	Everyone says no to the proposed building it will only destroy our community not only by the houses being erected there but it will affect our doctors and dentists. So we've got bob hope if this plan goes ahead.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Mrs N Taylor	Response-01896	A large estate style development could fail to integrate with the character of the area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Mrs Rachel Coats	Response-01623	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Mrs R Cordon	Response-01647	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Mrs Rigby	Response-00641	It is the high density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Mrs Shani Wainwright	Response-00754	The fact that it is the highest density of all of the erewash proposals is very concerning and disappointing.....there seems to be no regard for the residents of Sandiacre health and well being.....The loss of our public amenity, this wonderful nature reserve, needed for recreation, mental well being and community engagement is abhorrent.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Mrs Sheila Hickingbotham	Response-01338	The number of houses proposed is too many for a site of this size, resulting in high density housing with very little amenity space. When the original Coronation Avenue estate was laid out, there were only 153 houses built on a much larger area at a time of very low car ownership.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Mrs Shirley Victoria Riggs	Response-01685	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Mrs Susan Bantle	Response-01612	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
			Mrs Turton	Response-01707	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Mrs Whittaker	Response-00595	The current plan for 180 houses is far too many for the site.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Nasim Rashid	Response-01103	Disproportionate amount of houses for small site. Other brown sites should be considered with better access and size of plot
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Natalie Bentley	Response-01646	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Nicole Cooper	Response-01597	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Normn McCrea	Response-01754	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Oliver Marriott	Response-00679	Number of Houses Number of houses It is the highest density of housing of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for future phases. Have you not considered other more suitable sites for this housing? Ones that aren't on a nature reserve.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Paige Walker	Response-01669	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Pamela Bassett	Response-00608	180 houses seems too many for the size of the plot
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Pam shepherd	Response-00453	To many simple as not required
			Pat Hardy	Response-01739	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Paula Darnell	Response-00665	180 is totally ridiculous. To put any houses on this site is totally wrong. Wrong site, wrong place

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Paula Luck	Response-01710	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Paula Sims	Response-01687	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Paul Randall	Response-00131	The Sandiacre site is 4.8ha for 180 homes ? 38 houses per hectare. This density is some 20% greater than the next dense proposal. Indeed, it is significantly denser than any existing part of Sandiacre (c. 22 per ha) and therefore at odds with the surrounding area. This will create an isolated community especially with only single road access to high density housing. 180 houses on this area would make it more densely populated than the rest of the Sandiacre estate. This would change the local standard of living significantly.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Paul Vleeton	Response-01770	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	paul wheeldon	Response-00582	The number of proposed houses on the site would be highly excessive and over crowded
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Peter Anthony	Response-01866	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Peter Nicholls	Response-01622	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Pete West	Response-01700	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Phil Creasey	Response-01342	It is the highest density of all the proposals and if this is allowed, will give rise to concerns for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	P Sandes	Response-01682	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Rachel Crossley	Response-01661	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Rachel Skelton	Response-01241	180 houses on such a small site is too much
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	R Barratt	Response-01664	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Rchael Sharp	Response-00652	Please see my comment about the type of housing.
			Rebecca Longmuir	Response-00253	0 NO HOMES NO SOCIAL HOUSES/ COUNCIL HOUSES
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Rhiannon Lowater	Response-01592	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	R Hibbitt	Response-01862	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Richard Haines	Response-01674	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
			Richard Jenkins	Response-00264	The number of houses proposed is completely out of character with the surrounding area
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Richard Marriott	Response-00675	Number of Houses Number of houses It is the highest density of housing of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for future phases. Have you not considered other more suitable sites for this housing? Ones that aren't on a nature reserve.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Richard Naylor	Response-00066	There's too many houses proposed in this area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Richard Shrimpton	Response-01301	it is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
			Rob Lowe	Response-01768	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Roger Farnsworth	Response-01910	Way too many.
			Rosemarie Gough	Response-00997	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Roy Drew	Response-01614	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Ruby Sharp	Response-00886	180 houses is far too many to build on the small area of land. Everybody should be entitled to a place where they feel safe and able to be themselves without any body watching, however this will not be the case as you will be able to see in everyone's gardens. I am 25 and starting to look at houses. A reasonable sized driveway and garden would be ideal for me, along with good infrastructure and a well spaced estate. Unfortunately, the number of houses and the size of these houses due to the number would put me off the area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	S. Jones	Response-01615	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Sally Davies	Response-01294	As stated previously - these houses are not required. Many empty homes in the area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Samantha Anne Whitney	Response-00757	This land isn't suitable for any number of houses due to access and where it's situated. There are better places to build if you're adamant you're going to build extra housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Samantha Whildes	Response-01270	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Sam Greatorex	Response-01695	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Sandra Cooke	Response-01613	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Sarah Harrison	Response-01658	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	S Bryne	Response-01677	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Sebastian Roberts	Response-01675	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
			Shanead Ligton	Response-01689	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Shannon moss	Response-00454	If your plans where to get approved it is not going to be a 180 plot, once all factors have been considered and borders put in place you'd be lucky to get half the houses on there, you'd have to leave a clear buffer to both the residents, the motorway and the nature reserve 180 houses will mean small gardens, practically on top of each other meaning our house will be massively overlooked
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Shannon Robinson	Response-01635	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Sharon Grant	Response-00219	Far too many houses for such small roads. If the proposed access is Larch drive, how will you get two vehicles through, what is now, the gate to the horse field ???
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Sharon weston	Response-00440	Far too many and this isn't going to happen overnight so we will have to endure this for at least 5 years, there are alternative sites.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Shaun Green	Response-01773	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Sheila	Response-00587	The proposed density of 38 dwellings per hectare significantly exceeds existing residential densities in Sandiacre (typically 22 per hectare). This is not in-keeping with the surrounding character of the area and will create an isolated, high-density enclave with limited access?raising concerns over community integration and long-term sustainability.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Sheila Payne	Response-01782	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Sian Knox	Response-01679	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	S Leek	Response-01737	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Sonya Birkin	Response-01656	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Sophie	Response-00472	180 is a very high number of houses, as soon as they are built and sold their will Be no thought into the schools, gps, traffic issues etc
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Sophie Bennett	Response-01631	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Sophie Farnsworth	Response-01913	Way too many.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Stephen Davies	Response-00214	180 houses beyond belief. Suggests some 180 to 360 additional vehicles? 180 houses is very high density and not in keeping with existing housing stock Note that the boundary to Larch Drive consists only of bungalows which we believe was a requirement of previous planning applications to take into account the impact on the skyline
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Stephen Sacker	Response-01598	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Steve Bilbie	Response-00285	Numbers are immaterial for the reasons given to previous questions. 75% too many for a site of this size. Far too many leading to flooding and sewerage issues.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Steve Whittaker	Response-01781	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Sue Harrison	Response-01629	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Susanne Beaven	Response-01618	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Sylvia Plampin	Response-00624	There is no way 180 houses could be safely placed on this site.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Tamara Partridge	Response-01780	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Tanya Hinman	Response-01786	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Thomas Ilett	Response-01088	The housing allocation is currently proposing a maximum of 180 houses on the site. The maximum allocation of social housing is proposed at 30%. As such a maximum allocation of social housing will be 54 of a proposed target of 5000 for the Borough of Erewash. Destroying the Green Belt to build approximately 1% of EBC's target of 5000 in the Borough is disproportionate and inappropriate.
	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Tim Derbyshire	Response-01681	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Tim Gough	Response-00996	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Toby Moran	Response-01769	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Tom Ball	Response-01672	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Toni hopkins	Response-00539	Too many too crowded insufficiency amenities nearby
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Tony Weston	Response-00990	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future. Assert that the development would change the character of the local community and disrupt the aesthetic appeal of the area, which is often valued for its natural beauty.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Tracey Howe	Response-01860	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future. The area is elsewhere peaceful, I can't believe this build is even been considered, 180 houses will surely not be in keeping with the type/quality of houses currently around.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Tracey Hughes	Response-01699	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Tracy Kerry-Cliff	Response-00801	The whole community (and it is a community) will be lost with the building of 180 high density houses - this is unacceptable, we need to protect our children's future's. Green spaces are essential! It's unnecessary, when there are so may more suitable (brown) land areas that can be built on - let alone all the "empty" houses and factories in both Derby and Nottingham, that could and should be repurposed into suitable accommodation.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Trevor Rowston	Response-01678	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Try church	Response-00033	With the number of houses proposed, they will be too close together making a rabbit Warren like area. This will encourage crime and anti social behaviour where offenders can make a quick exit over the m1 to the golf course and if course can also enter from that way too
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Tyler Hobbs	Response-00879	The sheer number of houses proposed?180?is simply not appropriate for a village the size of Sandiacre, particularly when considering the strain it would place on local infrastructure, services, and the environment. This scale of development is disproportionate and would represent a significant and abrupt expansion of the village, altering its character and overwhelming the community. Local roads, schools, healthcare facilities, and public transport are already under pressure, and such a large influx of new residents would push these services beyond their limits without substantial and unlikely investment. Smaller, more carefully planned developments that take into account the existing capacity of the area might be manageable, but a proposal of this size risks causing long-term harm to the sustainability and livability of Sandiacre. The number is not just excessive?it?s incompatible with the village?s current infrastructure and its ability to grow responsibly.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Vicky	Response-00485	Why destroy more green belt when there are houses empty!! We already have the local hotels filled with immigrants where does it end Houses are empty, fill them first
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Victoria Abraham	Response-01652	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Victoria Galpin-shrimpton	Response-01009	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Victoria Greatorex	Response-01730	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Victoria Marriott	Response-00674	Number of houses It is the highest density of housing of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for future phases. Have you not considered other more suitable sites for this housing? Ones that aren?t on a nature reserve.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Vivien Davis	Response-01582	It is the highest density of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Wayne Major	Response-00408	See housing type: I wish to object to the proposed development on the grounds that it does not appear to be in accordance with the local Neighbourhood Plan, particularly in terms of housing scale, type, and density. The area currently benefits from a Neighbourhood Plan, developed in consultation with the local community to guide appropriate and sustainable development. This plan sets clear expectations that new development should reflect the character of the area, including the type and density of housing, and should be proportionate to the existing built environment. A proposal for 180 dwellings on this site would represent a significant increase in density compared to the surrounding area. It would result in a development that appears out of scale and out of keeping with the established residential character. Such a large number of homes in a single location also risks undermining the carefully considered planning policies agreed through the Neighbourhood Plan process. This conflicts with Paragraph 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which recognises the legal status of Neighbourhood Plans and supports giving local communities the power to shape development in their area. It also contradicts Paragraph 127, which states that developments should be sympathetic to local character and align with the expectations set out in local design guides or codes. In light of the above, I believe the proposal in its current form fails to comply with the Neighbourhood Plan and should be reconsidered. A reduced number of homes, designed in a way that respects the established form and layout of the community, would be far more appropriate for this site.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	William Marriott	Response-00676	Number of Houses Number of houses It is the highest density of housing of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for future phases. Have you not considered other more suitable sites for this housing? Ones that aren't on a nature reserve.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Number of Houses	Zack Snowdon	Response-00764	180 houses into that small of an area will create unhappy living conditions similar to a ghetto. This is absolutely unacceptable
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Aaron Locksley	Response-00711	Personally, I would consider dropping my opposition if: - the number of houses was more in keeping with the neighbouring area (and allowing the new builds to have decent sized gardens) - new build houses that would be directly adjacent to current residents are required to have a long garden - financial restitution for those whose property values will be affected by the new builds
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Alice Ilett	Response-00571	Please reconsider this area, it's loved and used by locals and has been for generations. There's far more suitable options for social housing and many empty houses.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Andrew Davies	Response-01295	As outlined above with the pressure on the facilities in the village would not be a forward step. Many of our facilities are in Borrowash , Long Eaton and Ilkeston (or travelling into Derby) and extra housing will put extra stress on these facilities, also as outlined above for a number of these journeys it could lead to additional car journeys
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Andrew Marvin	Response-00255	I seriously don't think you understand how bad the traffic around this area is now I suggest you take some time to monitor traffic at school Time at all 3 schools it's horrendous Also the entry point into coronation avenue and Cloudside Road is horrendous the corner turning into Cloudside Road is also very dangerous now 2. Cars CANNOT PASS EACH OTHER ITS A BLIND CORNER !!!!!!!!! Very dangerous
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Andrew Solloway	Response-00958	Infrastructure is poor now, will be even worse with these houses
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Andria Nylasi	Response-00672	It's just a ridiculous proposal in a very hard to reach backwater. None of it has been thought through enough and the councillors proposing it are trying to tick a box to make the Labour Party look good in their target to build more houses. None of the councillors proposing the development live near the site and have no idea how detrimental it would be to those already living there.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Anne Castledine	Response-00499	The small access road on Larch Drive and Cloudside are not large enough to take heavy lorries carrying building materials, let alone the probable extra 400 cars that would come with 180 new hoses.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Anne Jenkins	Response-00350	This is a ridiculous scheme and I am appalled that the council have tried to push this through with no proper investigation or consultation
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Annette Jones	Response-00961	The road conditions are already strained and will only be added with to the additional heavy vehicles if this goes ahead as it will not be able to cope with the stress. No funds are allocated to improve road conditions on the surrounding roads so developers should be made to contribute to this. We should not be made to accept these proposals if not done fairly and proper consultation has not been made with the people it impacts on.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	A R Gregory	Response-01918	Very concerned about the amount of traffic using Derby Road, way to like M1, also getting to see the doctor.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Barbara and John Morrell	Response-00509	I feel it is totally wrong to build houses on this greenbelt land. The implications of it will cause numerous complications to this area and local residents for various reasons, not least of which is the SAFETY ASPECT of extra traffic, which is of paramount importance.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Barbara Warton	Response-01886	Lived in Sandiacre all my life (was a lovely VILLAGE not now). The council should think again and look after the residents who are already living in Sandiacre they have already allowed to much country side be gone forever.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Bill Meadwell	Response-00864	I understand that housing is required in the borough, but it cannot be on a 'find a piece of land and build on it' basis. Without suitable access, medical facilities, schools and public transport, a site cannot be deemed to be in any way appropriate
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Callum binnall	Response-00460	Stop this ridiculous project You clearly aren't a sandiacre resident. You clearly don't have our best interests at heart. Stop
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Caroline Blackmore	Response-00451	We don't want or need these house's, 2 development's is enough in Sandiacre. People can find else where to live don't ruin Sandiacre. Bad enough all the migrants we have to tolerate in the hotels as well. Consider the wildlife as well what are we teaching our children???
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Caroline Driver	Response-00618	Totally inappropriate proposal. I have listed objection under every heading and all hugely relevant. What's worse is we, the tax payers, are expected to foot the bill yet again for things we don't want. I suggest saving any further waste of our money and scrap the plan altogether. Concentrate instead in relieving the further congestion that is going to be coming from Stanton park before trying to inflict further travesties on the local people.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Catherine Richardson	Response-00531	I feel that not enough thought has gone into this. Someone from government needs to visit and witness all the problems this site would cause

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Chris Hume	Response-01373	There are reasons why planning has never been granted on this land, nothing has changed, go back and look why it's never been granted. This is green belt, once it's gone it's gone, use the empty property in Erewash, then brown field land first.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Christine Anderson	Response-00484	The roads that would give access to this proposed new site were built nearly 100 years ago and are too narrow to accommodate any extra traffic. We have an ageing population now in this area and walking and crossing the roads is quite difficult. I use a stick and it is sometimes treacherous to get across the roads - I can't imagine how dangerous and stressful this would be with the proposed 180 new homes (400+ cars) and associated transport using these small old roads. Please think about the current residents.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Christine Gough	Response-00578	Even the people moving into the proposed new homes will suffer from pollution from the Motorway , as well as the residents suffering with more pollution from their cars . Trees and hedges will be torn down so no protection from carbon . There will be health problems as I mentioned before , and more strain on the NHS. Depression and mental health will increase due to anxiety with the constant juggling of parking , the noise of added vehicles and heavy construction. It will also make children ill with the pollution , and no green space to play and enjoy the outdoors . There is a park at St Giles but again to get there , there is busy roads with no crossings .
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Claire binnall	Response-00459	Stop thos development immediately
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Colin Billington	Response-00227	Thhre are surely other areas of land to build houses on and not on green belt causing congestion
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Colin Marriott	Response-00686	Official figures state that over 1800 properties lie empty in Erewash, why aren't they being utilised. 5000 on the housing list but only 10% social housing. There are alternative brownfield sites in the area that would be more suitable and cause less disruption. And as a Labour supporter all my life I am disgusted that you are taking the easy option.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Connor Murfin	Response-00926	These houses will most are most probably being built for migrants who are illegally in this country, so your housing people that are not even contributing to society, never will and draining the countries money.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Courtney Bennett	Response-00593	Stop killing wildlife, stop killing trees, stop killing plants. Please be mindful, sustainable and responsible for keeping our environment clean, environmentally friendly and pleasurable to the eye, soul and mind.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Daniel	Response-00545	Let me be absolutely clear: this proposed development is not just inappropriate, it is an insult to the local community. Every single point raised in this objection, traffic chaos, lack of infrastructure, strained schools and GP services, environmental destruction, flooding risk, and irreversible harm to our local landscape, has been echoed by countless residents who live here and care about this area. If this application is approved despite the overwhelming and reasoned objections from those who actually live, work, and raise families here, it will serve as undeniable proof that public consultation is nothing more than a checkbox exercise. If community voice holds no weight in the planning process, then what we have is not democracy, it is dictatorship under the guise of due process. Let's talk plainly. This land was sold approximately four years ago. It is glaringly obvious that the current owner, likely a developer or an entity working with one, purchased this land with the intent of pushing through a housing scheme, regardless of the suitability or local needs. This isn't a community-driven initiative. This isn't local regeneration. This is opportunism, pure and simple, and trying to pass it off as beneficial or necessary is not only disingenuous, it is outright dishonest. You do not need a degree in planning to see what is going on here: a green buffer next to a motorway is being targeted for high-density housing, with zero meaningful investment in infrastructure to support it. And you expect residents to accept this under the illusion of progress? We are watching. And should this be approved, it will be remembered as a blatant example of a council putting profit and policy ahead of people. If you push forward with this plan, despite the logic, the reasoning, and the overwhelming public outcry, then let history show that you didn't just ignore us, you damaged the democratic system.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Daniel Hands	Response-00057	This entire process has seemed underhand by Erewash borough Council and it seems they have done their utmost to minimise the consultations and engagement from residences. It is clear that those supporting these developments either have alteria motives and incentives , or are completely out of touch with their constituents and deny that their views are worth considering. I have yet to meet another local resident that supports this development. I feel betrayed by this council and the government that supports it. It is not the first time this Council has faced scrutiny over its planning decisions and the effects its incompetence has had on the local communities. I for one would welcome a full public enquiry into Erwash Council and it's operations, as they seem more interested in profitability than community.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Danielle Harrison	Response-00568	Councillors should fight for green belt and its protection at all costs. It is deplorable to think we would sacrifice such a huge site of green belt in this way, when there is absolutely no demand for it
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Daniel Naylor	Response-00680	Existing traffic needs to be monitored at an appropriate time (ie, peak times) to understand how awful the traffic already is, without the added traffic from 180 new homes and the 2300 homes approved for development in the 2022 Erewash core strategy in neighbouring kirk hallam and Stanton, and the currently developing industrial units in Stanton .
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Darran and Emma Rea	Response-00597	This new development will increase traffic, congestion, strain on the local services and schools which are already at full capacity, as pet owners we use the nature reserve daily, this will have a huge impact on the area especially the work that has to be carried out for the development, the quiet streets will have an increase of traffic, pollution and noise, this development could also have an impact on the house prices of the area not to mention the detrimental effect on the wildlife and the environment, Sandiacre is a close knit community, we object to the development as we love the area as it is, we do not need more houses in the area

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	David Tindsley	Response-00515	1. I understand that in the appendix to the local Neighbourhood Plan, an alternative housing site has already been proposed. This site, on derelict land behind Lidl, has undergone public consultation, been reviewed by a planning inspector, and was approved through a referendum, with broad community support. This alternative site would deliver a similar number of homes to the Sandiacre area but is far better suited to the community's needs and local infrastructure. Given the extensive process already undertaken, which included public input and scrutiny, I believe this site represents a much more appropriate and sustainable option for development than the currently proposed site. In light of this, I strongly urge the planning authority to prioritise this alternative site and reject the current proposal, which does not align with the outcomes of the Neighbourhood Plan process. 2. I find it difficult to accept that any councillor that has voted to support the scheme has actually visited the site, and taken time to assess properly the significant problems and issues it would cause. Common sense would show that the proposed single site access is both too narrow, and only approached from a series of narrow, congested residential streets that have many blind right-angle bends which are totally unsuitable for HGV construction traffic. 3. As this portal does not seem to support the attachment of files, I will be submitting a series of photographs by email to supplement this objection, to demonstrate some of the key areas that I have outlined. 4. Overall, I regard it as absolutely disgraceful that the council is even considering this site for possible development, when perfectly acceptable brownfield sites are available. It has no redeeming features, and I object to the proposal in the strongest terms.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Debra Michell	Response-01346	I am very concerned about more traffic coming through sandiacre especially with all the work happening at Stanton. There are far too many lorries using our roads. We need a new junctions on the motor way to take this traffic out of Sandicre. How about sorting out this problem first,
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Debs Washer	Response-00487	A ridiculous idea which has not been thought through correctly at all. Just don't. For once, consider the landscape, wildlife and don't go grabbing the money. You cannot create more green space so don't lose the ones you have
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Denise Creasey	Response-00786	Access for emergency vehicles needs to be addressed especially when construction traffic is blocking already difficult to navigate roads.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Derrick Hunt	Response-00437	I would like to say this just seems a very poorly thought out scheme of housing. Which just seems to be purely about political box ticking rather than being in any body's interest apart from maybe a developer Access and traffic to this part of sandiacre is already very heavy and restricted.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Diane Mcmorrow	Response-00433	The infrastructure of Sandiacre isn't there to sustain the building of the houses roads schools health care and the emergency service would not cope
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Emily Milnes	Response-00470	Currently no access to the site and would likely result in changing road layout and infrastructure that is already struggling.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Emma Ryan	Response-00503	I honestly don't know how the schools or the healthcare can survive another 180 families accessing them in the area. It's difficult to get a dentist appointment, you have to travel to Stapleford to access a pharmacy. There is one small doctors surgery. We have two small schools that already are full to capacity as are most other schools within the locals towns. I currently really love living in Sandiacre, have been living here since 2012. If more houses get built I really would be considering moving because I just don't feel my family will be able to get the services they need (education and healthcare) from the local area that we should be able to access.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Emma Wall	Response-00319	I'm very much objecting to any kind of building on that piece of land for structural reasons around infrastructure healthcare transport, air quality protecting wildlife drainage water supply communications and everything else. It's a very bad place to build on from that perspective. And we will lose a lot of wildlife and it will spoil stony clouds.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Ewan Snowdon	Response-00766	Access to the site is really tight at the moment, busses get stuck and emergency services struggle at the moment to get up there. When you add even more traffic and even more streets off the network of existing streets, how will a fire engine get to the houses in the back of the estate in time to save lives, or an ambulance.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Geoff Tindsley	Response-00755	1. I understand that in the appendix to the local Neighbourhood Plan, an alternative housing site has already been proposed. This site, on derelict land behind the Lidl superstore, has undergone public consultation, been reviewed by a planning inspector, and was approved through a referendum, with broad community support. This alternative site would deliver a similar number of homes to the Sandiacre area but is far better suited to the community's needs and local infrastructure. Given the extensive process already undertaken, which included public input and scrutiny, I believe this site represents a much more appropriate and sustainable option for development than the currently proposed site. In light of this, I strongly urge the planning authority to prioritise this alternative site and reject the current proposal, which does not align with the outcomes of the Neighbourhood Plan process. 2. I find it difficult to accept that any councillor that has voted to support the scheme has actually visited the site, and taken time to assess properly the significant problems and issues it would cause. Common sense would show that the proposed single site access is both too narrow, and only approached from a series of narrow, congested residential streets that have many blind right-angle bends which are totally unsuitable for HGV construction traffic. 3. Overall, given the serious traffic congestion and safety issues, together with significant access issues, (plus the fact that the land is currently green belt and borders a nature reserve I regard it as absolutely disgraceful that the council is even considering this site for possible development. It has no redeeming features, and I strongly object to the proposal.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Georgia Marvin	Response-00261	I used to reside on cloudside road, I was born there. I spent 24 years there and was always rewarded by such beautiful views. I now reside on Taft Avenue, which is round the corner to cloudside school - the parking there is horrendous as it is during school pick up times/drop off. I don't see how adding 180 houses will make this any better.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Gordon Bruce	Response-01455	This goes entirely against the Sandiacre Plan which is a shameful way of ignoring the local people.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Harry Fleck	Response-01084	There are 1970 houses currently unoccupied in the area so why is there a need to build another 180 houses on green belt land while these other properties are standing vacant?

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Helen Gillain	Response-00964	EMERGENCY SERVICES .... With roads that are already barely passable this number of increased population would create an even bigger strain on the emergency services .. if Ambulances and Fire Engines cannot pass through and could lead to fatalities!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Helen Thompson	Response-01356	I think you fail to understand the importance of the Stoney Clouds area to local people - there is a very strong attachment to this just like the importance of Sycamore Gap to people in that area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Helen whiteman	Response-00447	We are being bulldozed into this scheme by the labour government and their house building ideas with no thought for the local residents Once again they are being thoughtless about any one but themselves We do not need these houses Angela raynor wants them so the council jumps
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	IAN TAYLOR	Response-00972	I object to the proposed development which will damage the environment, increase pollution and add pressure to existing services such as schools and medical facilities. It will also cause significant traffic disruption to the area both during construction and if the houses are built. Notwithstanding the proposed Section 106 obligations to be imposed, there is simply insufficient space to alter the existing road system to accommodate this.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Isabelle Love	Response-00529	I am incredibly confused and concerned that this area has even been put forward for development. Sandiacre has recently just had a new build site off Longmoore lane, into an area that already has stretch or nonexistent facilities. The lack of awareness or compassion for residents is evident and feels like nothing more than a shameless attempt at yet more money for Erewash council. I'm frankly disgusted and sincerely hope that common sense prevails and is rejected by planning as much as it is rejected by the residents.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Jack McQueenie	Response-01823	Title? Wrong. Land earmarked is Due North of Sandiacre town centre.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Jacqueline Marshall	Response-01436	On a personal level I am at a loss with the reasoning behind this development. We need our green spaces for our mental wellbeing. We need trees to offset carbon footprints and to help keep towns and cities cool and act as a buffer to air pollution. It's no good ticking a box just to fulfill Government figures without looking at the bigger picture and the detrimental impact on landscape, loss of green spaces, and an increase in air pollution, This development should not be allowed under any circumstances.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Jane Elizabeth Tindsley	Response-00669	1. I understand that in the appendix to the local Neighbourhood Plan, an alternative housing site has already been proposed. This site, on derelict land behind Lidl, has undergone public consultation, been reviewed by a planning inspector, and was approved through a referendum, with broad community support. This alternative site would deliver a similar number of homes to the Sandiacre area but is far better suited to the community's needs and local infrastructure. Given the extensive process already undertaken, which included public input and scrutiny, I believe this site represents a much more appropriate and sustainable option for development than the currently proposed site. In light of this, I strongly urge the planning authority to prioritise this alternative site and reject the current proposal, which does not align with the outcomes of the Neighbourhood Plan process. 2. I find it difficult to accept that any councillor that has voted to support the scheme has actually visited the site, and taken time to assess properly the significant problems and issues it would cause. I have been made aware that there is a councillor who currently lives in the area and is supporting the Revised Strategic Plan. I find this, as a long-standing resident of Larch Drive, astonishing given the very obvious existing daily problems residents have to encounter and navigate. 3. Common sense would show that the proposed single site access is both too narrow, and only approached from a series of narrow, congested residential streets that have many blind right-angle bends which are totally unsuitable for HGV construction traffic. 4. As this portal does not seem to support the attachment of files, I will be submitting a series of photographs by email to supplement this objection, to demonstrate some of the key areas that I have outlined. 5. Overall, I regard it as absolutely disgraceful that the council is even considering this site for possible development, when perfectly acceptable brownfield sites are available. It has no redeeming features, and I object to the proposal in the strongest terms.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Janet Edwards	Response-01906	If building went ahead it would spoil a beautiful part of Sandiacre which is enjoyed by many.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Jennifer Tindsley	Response-00751	1. I understand that in the appendix to the local Neighbourhood Plan, an alternative housing site has already been proposed. This site, on derelict land behind the Lidl superstore, has undergone public consultation, been reviewed by a planning inspector, and was approved through a referendum, with broad community support. This alternative site would deliver a similar number of homes to the Sandiacre area but is far better suited to the community's needs and local infrastructure. Given the extensive process already undertaken, which included public input and scrutiny, I believe this site represents a much more appropriate and sustainable option for development than the currently proposed site. In light of this, I strongly urge the planning authority to prioritise this alternative site and reject the current proposal, which does not align with the outcomes of the Neighbourhood Plan process. 2. I find it difficult to accept that any councillor that has voted to support the scheme has actually visited the site, and taken time to assess properly the significant problems and issues it would cause. Common sense would show that the proposed single site access is both too narrow, and only approached from a series of narrow, congested residential streets that have many blind right-angle bends which are totally unsuitable for HGV construction traffic. 3. Overall, given the serious traffic congestion and safety issues, together with significant access issues, (plus the fact that the land is currently green belt and borders a nature reserve I regard it as absolutely disgraceful that the council is even considering this site for possible development. It has no redeeming features, and I strongly object to the proposal.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Joanna hardy	Response-01304	The state of the roads in sandiacre is already a major problem. Poor maintenance and heavy traffic have damaged the roads and little work is being done to rectify the problem. Construction traffic and increased traffic from new residents would increase this issue. Leading to more cost for the local council and more road work traffic and increasing road dangers for drivers.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Joanne Johnson	Response-00765	The extra housing would increase the crime rate - for example in Sandiacre Jan 2025 - 63 crimes Feb 2025 - 51 crimes <a href="https://www.erewash.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2025-02/ca_sandiacre_conservation_areas_character_appraisal.pdf">https://www.erewash.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2025-02/ca_sandiacre_conservation_areas_character_appraisal.pdf</a> The neighbourhood would go even further downhill, we would need more policing, they struggle atm. Everyone I've spoken to, alot if people are against this development.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Jodie Shrive	Response-00601	The existing residents of the local area DO NOT want this to go ahead, we are fighting with absolutely everything that we have to put a stop to what has become a very corrupt, sly local government and shame on ALL OF YOU. Many of the residents in this area moved here for it's access to green spaces and it's peaceful environment and we can not believe that any government would want to destroy that. Forcing this development on us is making us angry, you are alienating the community and ruining our trust in local planning processes, local government and it's representatives. Everyone can see what you are trying to do here, you have tried to push through an entire development and worked hard to prevent us from knowing that you are actively trying to destroy our community. I'm not sure when Labour became more about a quick payday than it did anything else, but it's a great shame.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Joe Sells	Response-01924	I strongly object to the proposed development of 180 homes in this area. The scale of construction will significantly increase traffic congestion, strain local infrastructure & public services, & negatively impact the character & environment of our community. The planning should prioritise sustainable growth that aligns with the areas capacity & residents well being.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Jo Gerhardt	Response-01286	Quite simply' there are other options to build all these proposed houses and by just sticking some houses in an already densely populated area, next to a nature reserve, and on green belt land is definately not the answer. I fully support the anguish of many many people that live within the area opposing the development.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	John whiteman	Response-00450	It is the labour government that wants these houses. Once again I am sure the council will be the labour governments poodles and roll over shame on you
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Kathryn Martin	Response-00527	This is such a shame and very upsetting anyone would want to do this to sandiacre
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Katrina	Response-00628	Water pressure on cloudside is already rather low, new systems would be needed to ensure the new houses aren't using the same pressure system.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Kelly Randall	Response-00591	According to the Sustainability Assessment, this site scores negatively overall and ranks ninth. Full disclosure of the assessment methodology and justification for proceeding with this site is requested.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Kim Helm	Response-00632	I have lived in Sandiacre 20+ yrs. we have renovated our house over the years. We had every stumbling block possible and projects turned down. We wanted a triple garage and we told there were certain places we couldn't have it because we would be parallel to a high way, one being the motorway although there was two fields in between, this now the proposed site of 180 houses!!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Kirk Moss	Response-00439	Access to the site does not meet legal requirements due to narrow entry points. Improving access would require the demolition of existing buildings, further impacting the community. Similar proposals have previously been rejected due to environmental and social concerns. Approving this application would contradict previous decisions and national planning policies such as the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which only allows changes to greenbelt boundaries in exceptional circumstances ? which this development does not meet.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Lauren Freeman	Response-01562	We love where we live. I grew up in Sandiacre and feel honoured that my children are doing the same. I do not want to fear for their safety on the roads more than I already do and they should be able to get to and from school safely. My oldest daughter is 11 and will soon be at the age where she is going out with her friends unsupervised. I do not want to live in fear of her being involved in a traffic accident. We are so blessed to have such a Beautiful, unspoilt nature reserve on our doorstep which generations have enjoyed and hopefully still will for many more.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Lauren Young	Response-00522	Object
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Lesley Bruce	Response-01397	I strongly object to this proposal. The Sandiacre Neighbourhood Plan agrees community objectives "To protect and improve the parks and other green spaces that are highly valued assets for local people". This proposal blatantly ignores this Plan and it's objectives. I am shocked that the Council is even remotely considering inflicting this on residents as the disruption on these older narrow roads which would need to be dug up to lay pipes, cables and facilities would be horrendous short term, and the stress on the current inadequate infrastructure would be detrimental to all long term when the full impact of the hundreds of extra residents is felt on schools, medical facilities, services, roads and infrastructure, plus the huge loss of a precious local asset and amenity. It is now well known that open green space is good for mental health and physical wellbeing. It is already a scarce commodity in this highly populated area,
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Lesley Morral	Response-01920	I reject this proposal.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Linda Castledine-Davies	Response-00850	This proposal is already having a detrimental affect on my health. I have a condition that is exacerbated by stress and I am already feeling the strain with symptoms returning. I have had two nightmares recently of heavy goods vehicles plowing through my bedroom wall which is situated right next to this proposed access route. This site is used by myself and many others for their wellbeing and to alleviate day to day stress the loss of this valuable pressure valve will impact us dramatically. We need green spaces and recreational areas. These developers show little or no innovation to the housing they erect cramming as many rectangular boxes together as they can and leave a sterile uninhabitable environment behind for animals, insects, birds etc. They have no interest in the environment and pay lip service to the ineffectual laws that have been laid down . This is their mission statement no mention of bio diversity they are more interested in interior design to snag buyers . "Our approach to selecting the right locations is always focused on upholding our continued commitment to the needs and requirements of local landowners, authorities, key stakeholders and local communities" No mention of existing residents either because they dont care about residents or wildlife or green belt its just easy money for them. As per your own commissioned report from Derbyshire Wildlife Trust "The local community The local nature reserve is close to residential neighbourhoods in Sandiacre with a population of several thousand in the locality. The site is the main area of public open space for recreation in the immediate locality and as such is used regularly by sections of the public" This applies to the proposed site too. I dont believe we were consulted or notified sufficiently putting a notice 3.5 miles away on a town hall that few have every visited is not sufficient notification are we expected to go to the town hall every single day just in case?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Linda Oscroft	Response-01927	Surprised the use of green belt land is even being considered when there is derelict dis-used land available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	LISA ANNE GILLIGAN-LEE	Response-00710	I ask that the Council focus instead on sustainable planning that protects Stoney Ground's green spaces and prioritises the wellbeing of its residents?present and future. I urge you to reconsider allowing any further urban development on this land. Our community values its green spaces?not just for what they are, but for what they mean to our quality of life, our environment, and our future. The land targeted for development is one of the few remaining green spaces in our community and I believe that this decision will have significant, long-lasting negative impacts on the environment, local infrastructure, and the quality of life for current and future generations. There are several underutilised brownfield sites that could support housing development without damaging green belt land. The Council should prioritise the use of these existing urban sites to meet housing needs while protecting natural landscapes.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Lisa Heppell	Response-00878	If houses are built on the area ,I believe fly tipping will be come a problem and the whole area will never be the same quiet place I grew up in .It is only a matter of time til other fields are built on ,I urge you for the sake of future generations not to build on it
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Logan Fox	Response-00746	We love our area and the peaceful surroundings, don't take this away from us living here, it is simply unfair. This is causing stress for a lot of people living here and we should realise this. protect the area by keeping the open spaces and avoid increasing traffic with m ore cars which WILL result in accidents.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Lorraine Hands	Response-00534	To have the added volume of houses and traffic could also seriously affect emergency vehicles that could be called! Or refuge collection! On Moores Avenue we often have to wait for a small lorry to empty our bins as the regular lorry cannot turn into the road due to cars parked on Starch Lane!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Louise Harper	Response-01571	This green belt piece of land has been empty for a very long time, it should stay empty , there needs to be balance between housing and fields , use and improve all the empty housing across the borough , use the brown field sites instead of ruining something you cannot replace
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Luke Hinchley	Response-00699	Many people see this greenbelt site as part of the surrounding areas beauty and it is as though it is a part of the nature reserve. The protections outlined in the proposal do not secure confidence that the green belt land of the nature reserve will also be converted to grey field in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Malcolm Dillon	Response-00722	The recent 10 year development programme, for Sandiacre, made no mention of the proposed development. The 10 year plan was presented to every Sandiacre citizen as a consultation document. Provision was made for the provision of additional housing in Sandiacre on a brownfield site. I voted to accept the proposals made in the 10 year consultation document for Sandiacre. I did not, and do not, accept the proposal for 180 houses to be built on Sandiacre Greenbelt Land !
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Malcolm Fox	Response-00215	The manner in which this entire process has been handled by the council has been nothing but disappointing and border line appalling. Having seen the one meeting at the council, it was made clear that this council simply wish to tick a box and ensure they are the council body that meets a housing target. The impression given by the council, in particular those that are pro development, use social housing and children living in poverty as plausible reasons to move forward. With all due respect, this development will not solve that! The local infrastructure and supporting services cannot support this suggested development. We are not against housing and understand the importance, but why this area when others are available? Why the lack of clarity, why the stealth meetings and lack of communication with residents. We have email, post, door knocks, text messages all available, yet the council have deliberately chosen to move forward, almost in secret, and this proves that this development is one they wish to move forward with in order to fulfil their professional desires. The people put faith in the those elected, and all they have proven is their lack of respect for the people. On the other hand, the local councillors who understand the negative impact, speak with true detail and relevant stats on how this will affect all. Why is it that when it is time to vote, we get door knocks and emails and letter asking for support? Why then, do we hear from those wanting our support? But in this instance we get no communication? The entire population living in this area is against the development due to the negative impact this will have on all! We can name all the issues this will result in - traffic, further service pressures, removal of the green belt and wildlife impact.. yet the excuse used will be 'we have to meet our target'. Can the council look at the impact on those already living here, those that pay their taxes every month, those that should be heard and are clearly being ignored.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Mark Gough	Response-00888	We have heard , as well as others that sewage is pumped down at night from the top Larch drive area . Because it backs up . If this is true then surely building cannot go ahead due to the lack of drainage already . This would be an health issue . I would propose that environmental health to check this out before building .
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	mark skelton	Response-01341	The homes and roads leading into the proposed site really can't cope with the traffic in and out. Already very busy and dangerous some times of the day. Speeding up the narrow road of Beech ave. Lots of parked cars during peak times. Young families with children crossing the road and walkers heading towards the nature reserve . Please reconsider this site for lots of reasons. We want to stay living in the area as we've lived here all my lives. Both our families live on the street and if this becomes busier will be looking to leave the area for somewhere quieter but really would like to stay here. Beech ave really can't cope with another possibility 200+ vehicles in and out the estate, especially during school time and home time. Noise and pollution would increase and also risk to life. Not the right site for this kind of development.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Marta McManus	Response-00646	We need to stop turning green spaces into housing developments. There are plenty derelict buildings or old factories which are in my opinion better option for development than green space which is used and loved by people and wildlife.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Martin Driver	Response-01387	DONT DO IT. DO THE RIGHT THING FOR LOCAL PEOPLE! NOT WHAT THE PUPPETS AT WESTMINSTER ORDER YOU TO DO!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Martin Hardy	Response-01413	I would question the viability of the logistics of getting construction materials to the proposed site. To access the site you must drive around several 90° bends which already have access issues for large delivery vehicles. Also maneuvering large HGVs would put excessive strain of the roads, turning a large vehicle around a sharp bend put extra load on the edges of the road and would cause damage to the road and possibly structural damage to houses already built.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	M A Simpkin	Response-01882	Where have all the shops gone? The factories? Nothing Now. Just finished building all those houses on Longmoor Lane.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Matt Hallam	Response-00476	My house is 1 affected by the new build application on the current horse field and my house backs on it. I have been living here for 33 years which both my parents, myself and my children have lived here so this is deeply distressing especially as the view is second to none and my auntie next door has lived there for 55 years and has had the horses there since then. If we ever moved, we wouldn't be able to get the views like this for anywhere near our house prices Firstly I was understanding that around 25-30 years ago, Westermans owned the field. They tried to build on there but had an application rejected. 1 of those reasons was that they tried to buy houses 31 and 33 chestnut grove (I live at 33) because they wanted to build a road there as larch would be to much traffic. planning was accepted for 180 houses to be built behind lidl but then was changed to behind me. This is greenbelt land and shouldn't be anything else. This is the first time I have wanted to move and it's Deeping stressing and upsetting to us all
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Maxine Sutton	Response-00471	Every time I drive through the old Stanton and Staveley site I wonder why so many huge warehouses have been allowed to be built there. As previously mentioned Sandiacre really can't cope with much more traffic, especially heavy lorries. Why wasn't this land used for a solar panel farm? There are only two houses which might overlook the large site, it is conveniently flat, and there are already mature trees that form a screen from the road. This was a very sadly missed opportunity to help with green power generation and protect the environment. Please try to make a better decision this time.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Melanie	Response-00586	There is no clear evidence that local infrastructure?including roads, schools, healthcare, drainage, and public services?can accommodate the additional demand generated by this development. Without concrete commitments and a detailed delivery plan, the proposal is unsustainable. The proposal appears to conflict with multiple aspects of the Sustainability Assessment Criteria. Many critical factors?including environmental impact, infrastructure capacity, and community needs?have not been satisfactorily addressed. It is unclear how the site has been assessed as sustainable or how it aligns with the Council?s stated objectives. This will be the death of Sandiacre as we once knew it. This is not progress. It?s a box ticking exercise that will destroy Sandiacre especially once the lorry park is in full swing. You should be ashamed.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Melanie Caumont	Response-01272	Subject: Formal Objection to Strategic Policy 1.7 ? West of Sandiacre (Land West of Cloudside) Dear Sir/Madam, I am writing to strongly object to the proposed residential development of 180 homes on greenbelt land west of Sandiacre (Strategic Policy 1.7), directly behind my property. This land is the last remaining portion of greenbelt in our area and provides critical environmental, infrastructural, and community value. The Council should explore more suitable brownfield or under-utilised land before considering greenbelt development. The industrial estate behind Lidl in Sandiacre represents a far more appropriate site for new housing and infrastructure, without the extensive ecological and community costs associated with building on greenbelt. In summary, this proposal is poorly conceived, environmentally damaging, and infrastructurally unsustainable. It fails to meet the needs of existing residents while compromising the character, safety, and wellbeing of the community. I urge the Council to reject Strategic Policy 1.7 and protect this vital greenbelt land for future generations.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Michael Anderson	Response-00461	We are living in a more ageing community and more consideration should be given to this. More traffic on narrow roads surely is not the answer in a heavily populated town that was planned nearly a century ago.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Michael Darnell	Response-00648	This would be a major planning mistake to allow to development on such a much loved area of Sandiacre. Over the years development has been nibbling away on this area and enough is enough. Use brown field sites and get homes that are unutilised back in use before thinking of using green fields.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Michael Ocroft	Response-01926	Surprised the use of green belt land is even being considered when there is derelict dis-used land available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Misty McGrath	Response-01556	There are other pieces of land that would better serve for housing. The piece of land adjacent to Lidl for example. There are also numerous empty properties/buildings that would provide the good quality housing that is so desperately needed. Smaller non-profit developments would provide a better balance for existing residents and new residents. Even smaller numbers of properties on the land identified, with an emphasis on sustainable development would be beneficial.
	West of Sandiacre	Other	Molly Hall	Response-01873	I object to losing green belt.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Molly Newbold	Response-00486	Wouldn't have moved here last year if we had none this development would happen. Completely ruins this little village. And not telling the residents it's happening, what a poor council Sandiacre has
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Mr John Hickingbotham	Response-01431	1. Preference should be given to existing brownfield sites rather than causing the irreplaceable loss of Green Belt land which currently soaks up storm water and helps to prevent flooding. 2. With alternative brownfield land already earmarked for almost 2,000 homes at the former Stanton Ironworks redevelopment area, which is less than one mile away on the opposite side of the M1 motorway, why is such an ill-conceived plan for building 180 homes on such an inaccessible plot land off Larch Drive even being considered?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Mrs Froggatt	Response-00449	I have been a resident of Sandiacre for over 70 years and was always a lovely safe, peaceful and friendly village. However these last few years the council appear to be hell bent into making it an area of discontent from its residents.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Mrs M Jones	Response-01884	There are so many other reasons also where are the kids going to play. More fly tipping its disgusting rubbish being dumped around the lanes and never cleaned up unless the locals do it themselves.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Mrs Shani Wainwright	Response-00754	Approving such a project goes against national and local commitments to fight climate change, protect green spaces and promote sustainable developments. Ref Sandiacre Neighbourhood plan policy 1. Sustainable development... It is not on brownfield land, risks harming biodiversity near Stoney Clouds LNR, and affects the rural edge of the green belt. Ref policy 2. Protecting and enhancing heritage assets.... The site borders the Cloudside conservation area, and it's scale & setting could well damage protected views and heritage character. This plan disregards the views of current residents completely, many of whom moved to the area for its access to green space and peaceful environment. So ref Policy 5. Local green spaces... Stoney Clouds is protected as a local green space. Development next to it could harm its tranquility, wildlife and public value. Ref policy 7a. Protecting biodiversity... The site is right by a local wildlife site. Proposals must show 10% biodiversity net gain, but this one risks habitat loss and fragmentation. Ref policy 12. Pedestrian & cycle movement... Poor access, weak connectivity and car dependence go against the aim for active, sustainable travel. Forcing this development through risks alienating the community and eroding trust in the local planning procedures. Sandiacre is already suffering enough with the Stanton Park New development..... do not make our residents suffer further.... our quality of lives should matter.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Mrs Sheila Hickingbotham	Response-01338	The site has a single point of access through Larch Drive which is a narrow residential street. This could lead to a conflict between motorists and pedestrians as well as commercial and emergency vehicles. It is hard to see how this development will not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety and neighbouring properties. Sandiacre Parish Council has produced a Neighbourhood Plan which appears to have been overlooked in this instance.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Nasim Rashid	Response-01103	Too small a site for so many houses. Potential danger at school at just times. Other brown belt sites in area should be considered that will have less impact on the quality of life if the residents and with better access via road and local services that potentially will benefit local economy. Fumes from cars will be an added negative to an area of local natural beauty with a connection to the past and local people
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Oliver Marriott	Response-00679	I've lived here all my life. I've been part of both sandiacre football club, sandiacre cricket club, plus cubs and scouts held in the rooms on Stanton road. What I love is the fact there are two parks within walking distance, plus the nature reserve. We use it a lot as I go walking with my grandparents and parents. We use it in the winter for sledging. It's always been part of my life. I think the extra traffic and the Lorry's would be quite a worry as it would be more dangerous to cross the roads, plus it would make it a lot busier making it hard to get anywhere or for people to visit, I think I would feel quite cut off and I would feel very anxious about how this would affect me and my mental health. I really don't want this project to go ahead plus the extra stress and noise while I'm doing my exams is something I'm extremely worried about.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Pamela Bassett	Response-00608	I find it hard to believe people would choose to live right next to the motorway.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Paul Randall	Response-00131	On the Sustainability Assessment Criteria, exactly how many of the questions need to be answered ?negatively? before you actually consider the proposal as being unsuitable? I find it difficult to score any of the criteria positively, so am curious as to how you've reached a positive decision. The scoring appears to total -5 and the proposal is ranked 9th. Please can you share the rationale as to how each of the criteria have been scored specifically for Sandiacre and how this results in a positive decision? The Local Neighbourhood Plan was recently voted through. This contains a specific requirement to protect green spaces. This proposal is therefore in direct contravention of the Neighbourhood Plan. Have the council done a full environmental and infrastructure assessment? This would immediately show why this development cannot go ahead, and that stopping further work at this stage would save the council a significant amount of money.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	paul wheeldon	Response-00582	A very ill thought idea which seems to be politically motivated
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Phil Creasey	Response-01342	Access for emergency vehicles needs to be considered, its already difficult to navigate the roads due to the bends and narrow areas as well as the multitude of cars parked on street.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Philip Reed	Response-01449	I'm all for building houses. I build infrastructure for a living but to build on the suggested greenbelt land in Sandiacre makes no sense. The access to Cloudside is rubbish. I can only presume that those proposing this work haven't made the commute through Sandiacre to what would be the site entrance
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Rachel Skelton	Response-01241	This development would be disastrous for the local area and I am shocked that this location has been chosen over much more suitable brown belt land with better transport links in the local area.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Rebecca Longmuir	Response-00253	After the shamelessly poor ?meeting? in march where residents were invited to have an opinion/voice. On massive changes proposed in their area affecting them. This was a lie!! No council members allowed the public into a public meeting. Our voices, concerns, worries, went unheard, unanswered. Our voices silenced by the very council we pay for, the council that is meant to listen, help and support its residents. All the member who voted in favour of this proposal. If you're so concerned with housing. Maybe you should open up your homes to people in need?! Build in your back gardens?..
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Richard Jenkins	Response-00264	This development would lead to a potentially unacceptable strain on local infrastructure, such as schools, roads, and emergency services, which are not equipped to handle an influx of new residents. What studies has EBC carried out with regard to local infrastructure capacity and the potential impact of this proposal?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Richard Marriott	Response-00675	Personal - Myself and my wife have lived in Sandiacre on Stanton road for 22 years. We have raised our two children here (now 20 and 15). We both grew up in a village (Hemington and Breaston respectively) and this is what first attracted us to Sandiacre. We love Stoney clouds, we can recall coming as children and now we take our own children. It's part of our community, it's part of our life. I'm not sure you realise what impact this will have on our village and how it will impact us all personally. Mental health - The extra traffic, noise and people are going to increase the pressure on an already overloaded area. This in turn is going to have a massive impact on our mental health and create a lot of extra stress. Logistics is going to become impossible making it hard for us to not only go anywhere but for people to visit us. This can become very isolating and not the best environment to raise a teenage son. I strongly object to this proposal for ourselves, our family, our future. Please, please reconsider this proposal, I cannot express to you the negative impact it will have on our community. Particularly in this time of financial uncertainty community is the one resource we have to pull together and make life better. If you do this you will be destroying the heart of this special place.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Richard Naylor	Response-00066	You don't care about removing green belt land from Sandiacre. This is typical of Labour councillors and government. You do realise that when it's gone then it's gone.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Roger Day	Response-00023	I have not seen any proof that new homes are required. We keep hearing that there are 5000 people on the waiting list for houses but this does not mean the housing stock does not exist. They aren't exactly living on the street are they, so where are they? We hear about temporary accommodation but why can't that be made permanent? Do a better job of getting empty property into use again. Send the illegal boat people currently in the hotel on Bostocks Lane back so they can apply for asylum in the correct manner.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Ruby Sharp	Response-00886	I only heard about this development from the community, not the council. It was rushed and many residents do not know about this. The cost of upkeep for this development from the council will prevent money going to more important causes elsewhere such as Sandiacre Scout Group and our green spaces.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Sally Davies	Response-01294	Building on this area will be detrimental to our mental health, with lack of countryside to enjoy. Sandiacre has very poor facilities - too many barbers, hairdressers and nail bars. A community centre is desperately needed.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Sam Fleck	Response-00821	under other: I understand that in the appendix to the local Neighbourhood Plan, an alternative housing site has already been proposed. This site has undergone public consultation, been reviewed by a planning inspector, and was approved through a referendum, with broad community support. This alternative site would deliver a similar number of homes to the Sandiacre area but is far better suited to the community's needs and local infrastructure. Given the extensive process already undertaken, which included public input and scrutiny, I believe this site represents a much more appropriate and sustainable option for development than the currently proposed site. In light of this, I strongly urge the planning authority to prioritise this alternative site and reject the current proposal, which does not align with the outcomes of the Neighbourhood Plan process.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Shannon moss	Response-00454	The current entry point to the site does not meet legal requirements for development access due to its narrow constraints. Expanding access would require demolishing existing buildings, further disrupting the community and violating planning policies. Previous Planning Rejections: Similar proposals have been rejected before on the grounds of environmental and community impact. Approving this development would contradict previous rulings and demonstrate an inconsistency in planning policy. Precedent and Policy Violations The UK government has consistently reaffirmed its commitment to protecting greenbelt land. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that greenbelt boundaries should not be altered unless in exceptional circumstances, which this development clearly does not constitute. Allowing this project to proceed would set a dangerous precedent for further greenbelt erosion across the country. The footpaths that connects clousaide road to the fields will become a human footpath, creating more antisocial behaviour similar to that of which we are seeing a rise of at the bottom park next door to the library
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Sharon Grant	Response-00219	When it snows up here, most cars can't get down and if they can, they then can't get back up. Many people have to abandon their vehicles. or people park on the road further down; with 180 houses built that would be utter chaos. Also with the housing development on Rushy Lane, it's going to be utter bedlam on the lane. It's often back up right past Friesland Farm at rush hour.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Sheila	Response-00587	This development represents an unjustified incursion into Green Belt land and would place undue pressure on already strained local infrastructure. There are more appropriate brownfield sites available, and until these are fully explored, development on this site should not proceed. I respectfully urge the Council to reject this proposal and uphold its commitment to sustainable development and the protection of our valued Green Belt. Once gone, it's gone for good. We should be preserving Sandiacre not adding to its destruction for future generations.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Sophie	Response-00472	It would be a real shame to try and extend sandiacre in this way with such a large amount of extra housing. The local services are all very much at capacity at is. Let alone the devastating effects this will have on the wildlife. There has also been a recent rise in flooding throughout Sandiacre, and this would surely cause more issues with that. There is a lot of history to the area that should be left kept as it is. I hope you reconsider this.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Stephen Davies	Response-00214	I believe Erewash as a whole has extensive brownfield sites as indeed does Sandiacre itself which are surely more appropriate, sustainable and in line with national policy? I believe that in the appendix to the Neighbourhood Plan an alternative site has already been proposed which would deliver a similar number of homes but is far better suited to the community's needs and local infrastructure. The site in question is to the side of Lidl Sandiacre and has broad community support and has been reviewed by a planning inspector
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Steve Bilbie	Response-00285	I'm am very sad to see this site suggested and hope the council will do the right thing and remove it from the list. I speak as a representative of Sandiacre, and a retired Builder and know this is an unsuitable plot for development. Steve Bilbie. Ward Councillor for Sandiacre.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Thomas Ilett	Response-01088	Paragraph 98 of the NPPF states 'access to a network of high-quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and physical activity is important for the health and well being for communities?'. Stoney Clouds Local Nature Reserve, part of the Sandiacre Cloud Conservation area, is a key open space for the Sandiacre community. Exposing it to increased risk of surface water flooding limits access to it as an open space for the Sandiacre community, reducing their health and well being and contravenes the NPPF.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Tony Weston	Response-00990	Mental and physical health benefits provided by access to green spaces, which will diminish if such areas are developed. Studies show that access to green spaces is crucial for mental health, and this development will reduce the recreational areas available for families and individuals to enjoy both within and visitors alike. The role green spaces play in combating climate change by absorbing carbon dioxide and reducing heat islands in urban areas. Conversion to housing could reduce these benefits. Many affected residents are not adequately informed about the potential impacts of the development this proposal was rushed through without thought for the town. New developments often lead to additional upkeep costs for local councils or residents, which can strain public resources that might otherwise go toward community services. Often, the necessary infrastructure such as roads, sewage, and public transport needs to be developed first, which can be financially burdensome and delay the project indefinitely
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Try church	Response-00033	To lose this last piece of green belt would be detrimental to the people of sandiacre and I would urge the council to think twice before allowing such destruction especially as it goes against the very pledge that the Labour Party gave in the election manifesto.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Victoria Marriott	Response-00674	Personal - Myself and my husband have lived in Sandiacre on Stanton road for 22 years. We have raised our two children here (now 20 and 15). We both grew up in a village (Hemington and Breaston respectively) and this is what first attracted us to Sandiacre. We love Stoney clouds, we can recall coming as children and now we take our own children. It's part of our community, it's part of our life. I'm not sure you realise what impact this will have on our village and how it will impact us all personally. Mental health - The extra traffic, noise and people are going to increase the pressure on an already overloaded area. This in turn is going to have a massive impact on our mental health and create a lot of extra stress. Logistics is going to become impossible making it hard for us to not only go anywhere but for people to visit us. This can become very isolating and not the best environment to raise a teenage son. I strongly object to this proposal for ourselves, our family, our future. Please, please reconsider this proposal. I cannot express to you the negative impact it will have on our community. Particularly in this time of financial uncertainty community is the one resource we have to pull together and make life better. If you do this you will be destroying the heart of this special place.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	Wayne Major	Response-00408	I understand that in the appendix to the local Neighbourhood Plan, an alternative housing site has already been proposed. This site has undergone public consultation, been reviewed by a planning inspector, and was approved through a referendum, with broad community support. This alternative site would deliver a similar number of homes to the Sandiacre area but is far better suited to the community's needs and local infrastructure. Given the extensive process already undertaken, which included public input and scrutiny, I believe this site represents a much more appropriate and sustainable option for development than the currently proposed site. In light of this, I strongly urge the planning authority to prioritise this alternative site and reject the current proposal, which does not align with the outcomes of the Neighbourhood Plan process.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Other	William Marriott	Response-00676	I've grown up here and lived here my whole life. I cannot imagine not having access/ restricted access to Stoney clouds. I am currently serving in the Royal Navy, I really value my time off and Stoney clouds is very much part of my down time. I have also been a member of both sandiacre football club and sandiacre cricket club. At a younger age I was in Scouts and later explorers before going on to my career. Really valued being part of these clubs and the community I've forged lifelong relationships that I owe to these clubs. These are such vital parts of our community your proposal threatens to affect these precious commodities. With the increased traffic and disruptions caused by the extra vehicles and lorry's there is a real risk people will stop using these facilities. This would be a huge loss to the village and community impacting many peoples lives. I urge you to reconsider this proposal, the access isn't viable, the roads aren't viable, the project isn't viable.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Aaron Locksley	Response-00711	I worry about my children playing on the street, which is a key reason we purchased a property in a quiet neighborhood, with all the extra traffic about.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Adam Shooter	Response-01925	The proposed access roads are steep and not wide enough for the construction proposal nor for the increased traffic when complete. I expect accidents when snowy/icy with this proposal.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	A Harby	Response-01684	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Alex Corns	Response-01151	Road safety will be compromised. How on earth will all the construction traffic get upto the proposed development with the amount of traffic/parked vehicles already on the road and when the children are coming out/going to school I believe it is an accident waiting to happen.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Alex Lord	Response-00946	Likewise: The roads around there already have parking issues and are tight to maneuver through [Stanton, Beech & Coronation] adding an entire housing estate that would have to pass through these roads, will increase the dangers of the road as people dart in and around parked cars, near a school, & school walking route.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Alice Cooper	Response-01721	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Alice Ilett	Response-00571	The roads are dangerous already especially around school times. More houses will lead to more chaos and I'm really concerned that it's only a matter of time before this leads to terrible accidents. I'm not sure how the lorries will get anywhere near the site with limits one side and a school the other. We already can't cope with the traffic we have in the area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Amanda Leech	Response-01625	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Amy Skinner	Response-01447	Increased traffic congestion both during and after the works would significantly increase the safety of the roads in the area especially for the many children and elderly who live here. Currently some of the streets such as Larch Drive are relatively quiet but this would change dramatically with heavy vehicles going in and out of the site. This would most certainly make the roads less safe.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Anastasia Anthony	Response-01865	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions. Highways Act 1980 Section 41: Imposes duty on local authorities to maintain safety. With the primary school + post office it is difficult and dangerous as it is, nevermind having to accommodate an additional 100+ vehicles.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Andrew Bishop	Response-01186	The volume of traffic, especially HGV's, at all times of day and night is excessive for a residential area and needs to be reduced, not increased with additional housing - the current road structure cannot cope.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Andrew Davies	Response-01295	See above the junctions between Stanton Rd and Rushy Lane also Stanton Rd and Town St could become more hazardous, the latter especially can already be problematic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Andrew Marvin	Response-00255	Massive concern regarding Road safety The roads are not wide enough So many parked cars already on the road and pavement, driving into coronation Road and Cloudside Road ?.. madness !!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Andrew Meadwell	Response-01654	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Andria Nyilasi	Response-00672	The volume of traffic this site would create would overwhelm the local area. There is only one proposed access route which would put an immense strain on the surrounding roads, particularly during term time and rush hour. The local schools are minutes away and are already experiencing extreme traffic congestion. This would exacerbate the problem and cause danger to the students and elderly residents.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Andy Martin	Response-01761	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Angela Whitehead	Response-00544	In a tight housing development where cars park wherever they can this inly increases traffic accidents. I'd also be concerned about access for emergency vehicles
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Anne Butler	Response-00385	The on road parking leading up to the site means there is poor visibility for a motorist negotiating the roads. Children on the pavements cannot be seen. Poor parking often means people have to walk in the road. Increased traffic will mean an increase in likelihood of accidents.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Anne Castledine	Response-00499	As a pedestrian difficult as cars are often parked on pavements, if they didn't roads would be at a standstill.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Anne Jenkins	Response-00350	There are many families living in the area and the possibility of more traffic particularly construction traffic is very dangerous
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Annette Jones	Response-00961	Road safety is getting worse and an accident waiting to happen on Stanton Road especially during school and football club events. Road safety awareness is not a priority in schools now and lollipop people are rare to see now. The knock on effect is that it causes drivers to speed up the neighbouring roads and not taking care posing even more risk to safety. Parking on the pavement is normal because not enough parking spaces and people don't want to risk their car being damaged so also a hazard to pedestrians and people with limited mobility. Emergency services have had difficulty accessing certain parts of the roads and parking close to the actual address. Cyclists have to take into account the current state of the roads which is getting harder and extra traffic. Don't see the cycling proficiency tests now near the school as it's not safe.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Ann Harrison	Response-01602	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Anthony Pearson	Response-01760	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Anthony Smedlewick	Response-01877	There are too many bends on these roads around here & are dangerous because of the school.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Antony M Ingram	Response-01626	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	April	Response-00469	The proposed development poses serious concerns regarding road safety. A significant population increase will lead to more vehicles on the road, amplifying the risk of traffic accidents, especially in areas not built to handle high volumes of traffic. Narrow roads, limited pedestrian crossings, and insufficient traffic control measures could become hazardous, particularly for children, the elderly, and cyclists. Without proper investment in safety infrastructure?such as sidewalks, street lighting, and speed regulation?the likelihood of collisions and injuries will rise, putting both new and existing residents at greater risk.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	A R Gregory	Response-01918	
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Arleen Corns	Response-01146	As mentioned previously, road safety is compromised because of the volume of traffic and where people park, especially at school opening/closing time. People are literally pulling out blind as vehicles park on the pavement. I once witnessed a vehicle try to reverse back up the hill on Beech Avenue because a large vehicle was struggling to get through and it hit another parked car on the street.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Awson Wheldon	Response-01649	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Barbara Michell	Response-01787	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Barbara Warton	Response-01886	Only a matter of time before a pupil from Freizlands School gets run over & killed.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Barry Partridge	Response-01778	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Ben Hollins	Response-01651	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Ben Snowdon	Response-00428	The roads are not wide enough for cars to pass and cars often drive on the pavements to get past nearly running me and my children over
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Bethany Oakes	Response-00960	During pick up time, Stanton Rd and Rushy Lane are already hazardous, they cannot support any more vehicles without compromising safety.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Beverley Gardner	Response-01692	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Beverley Green	Response-01686	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Bill Hartley	Response-01696	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Bill Meadwell	Response-00864	The roads leading from the proposed development are used as walking routes by children going to and from school. It is also a very popular dog walking route. Adding to the number of vehicles using them on a daily basis will inevitably lead to more danger from road traffic accidents. The junctions on these roads are narrow with visibility often hampered by parked vehicles. The construction vehicles would be cause extra danger when turning into these roads and will need to mount the pavement in order to manoeuvre round the junctions. They will also further destroy the surface of the roads creating even more potholes making a trip hazard for pedestrians and possible damage to cars.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	B T Duke	Response-01900	Roads not suitable for HGV's.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	B T Keen	Response-01735	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	c/o The Equalised Club	Response-01603	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Callum binnall	Response-00460	If this was to go ahead where would the new roads be built? What would happen to stoney clouds..
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Caroline Driver	Response-00618	During school start and finish there is dangerous parking, roads reduced to single file. It is already dangerous for motorists and pedestrians often having to edge out blindly before any extra vehicles. The bus gets stuck regularly with the driver honking their horn and knocking on doors. The additional congestion that Stanton park will already cause on the main roads to the motorway will already leave us gridlocked in the estate and the queues back up into the estate causing hazards to pedestrians crossing between cars. My cat got run over and killed last year. Volume of traffic important as roads are twisted, VERY narrow and blind corners (exacerbated by park cars from school and football club) creating little visibility, especially hazardous to the many children living on the estate.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Carol Marshall	Response-00736	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Carolyn Hallam	Response-00489	Large HGVs will not be able to get up to the site. People will be forced to park on pavements causing danger to our many elderly and children.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Catherine Greenaway	Response-00429	Beech Avenue is already treated like a race track, the extra traffic will make this worse and dangerous for the residents.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Catherine Richardson	Response-00531	The area is adjacent to a nature reserve frequently used by many dog walkers and pedestrian walkers. The access near Larch Avenue would become dangerous for these people. Also Cloudside road is already tricky to access and would become so much more dangerous. Chestnut Grove would become a rat run for traffic trying to avoid this so would also become dangerous for pedestrians
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Charlotte Fry	Response-00583	As said before, roads are already narrow from parked and there is bound to be more accidents of people getting hit from cars and buses trying to drive by.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Charlotte Hunter	Response-01376	This is also a route for young families that children use to get to school as well as access to nature reserve with higher risk of accidents happening due to the amount of people coming in and out of the road at the start and end of school day.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	C Holmes	Response-01620	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Chris Hume	Response-01373	Volume of traffic on the estate at busy times makes it difficult and dangerous with all the parked cars to pass.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Chris Jones	Response-01718	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Chris O Connor	Response-01641	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Christian Rearson	Response-01763	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Christine Anderson	Response-00484	This is already a problem area as we have the Cloudside school, Sandiacre town football club all vying for parking on a very small busy road. Extra children from the 180 new houses will make this even more dangerous and difficult.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Christine Gough	Response-00578	Road safety is a huge issue , people can't see the road with all cars parked on Stanton Road, there is a school on there and the amount of cars used each day is a problem and will only get worse with more houses built . There will be a serious accident one day . Beech Ave is a nightmare to get out off , when you drive down you cannot see when pulling out due to the amount of cars parked on Stanton Road , I have already had a car bump into me whilst pulling out . A child or infant anyone can get injured with the amount of traffic . There's no road crossing and you would not see them anyway if there was! There's cars parked all up Beech Avenue, blocking buses . Nightmare for emergency vehicles to get up , they would have a job and of course that would endanger lives more !
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Christine Ridgway	Response-00465	I worry in the road safety aspect, due to it already being a busy area and struggling to cross the roads. If proposed housing development goes ahead it will make it worse.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Claire binnall	Response-00459	The road is already too busy and narrow this is near to a local primary school which already served by a road that should be one way as its dangeroud
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Clare Green	Response-01751	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Cole Hawkins	Response-01714	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Colin Cox	Response-01716	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Colin Marriott	Response-00686	As in the previous comment an increase in traffic movement increases the risk of accidents especially past either Cloudside Academy or Friesland school
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Corrina loosemore	Response-00589	As before
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Courtney Bennett	Response-00593	The roads in the area are already dangerous with no or very little safe pavement / paths. There is already a danger to the public because of this and this is going to increase the footflow as well as increase the chance of potential accidents and deaths. Increased traffic volumes, improper footpaths, crossing spaces, overgrown & damaged footpaths meaning increased chance of accident.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Craig Freeman	Response-01561	It is already very congested to drive anywhere towards Larch Drive for the handful of cars that have to go this far back from Stanton Road. Increasing the volume of traffic these access roads would be dangerous and cause bottlenecks for all users. Often cars are already frequently driving onto pavements to avoid blockages and this will only increase causing singinifacnt danger to pedestrians and frustrations to drivers.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Craig Richards	Response-01638	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Craig Thims	Response-01765	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Cristina Jenkins	Response-01588	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	C Thompson	Response-01634	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Daniel	Response-00545	Further to my comments on traffic, the blind corner and kerb parked cars are a really problem when considering the volume of traffic you are insisting upon
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Daniel Downes	Response-01630	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Daniel Hands	Response-00057	At the bottom of the estate is Cloudside junior school, at the is Friesland comprehensive. These area and the surrounding roads are an accident waiting to happen, with cars parked on pavements, blind bends, turning spaces, double parked and/or blocking residents access and egress to their properties. The number of vehicles trying to access the area often creates gridlock and creates increased risks for both pedestrians and drivers alike as both are put under more pressure due the standoffs created. It is not unusual for drivers to mount and drive on the footpath simply to relieve the stalemate in traffic. To further increase the number of vehicles on and off this estate is not only dangerous, but also a further frustration for residents who battle these streets on a daily basis
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Danielle Harrison	Response-00568	Cloud side school congestion at drop-off and pick-up times makes Stanton Road impassible. If you extend the estate, with more families accessing this education provision, the local roads will become more hazardous.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Daniel Naylor	Response-00680	The planned access to this proposed site is an absolute non starter. working in the construction industry, I have vast experience what transport is required to complete this development. The tight corners and small roads would make delivering materials and plant to this site near impossible making everyday life for residents along this route a living nightmare. I have no confidence the integrity of the roads could be maintained due to the weight of daily industrial traffic whilst the long drawn out development would take place. The roadworks that would take place offsite to install required utilities ( electricity, water, gas, fibre) all the way to the proposed site to add to the traffic needs to be also addressed. Residents who live in this area did so as its a quiet area and the volume of traffic that would be required to build these houses would make roads unsafe, especially for families and the elderly. This area of sandiacre is a quiet area and as such, this has been a huge factor when families and elderly people choose to live here. The risk of harm from extra traffic would multiply, with this area taking heavy traffic not common in this area during development, then afterwards with 180 homes adding to the area permanently. The unnecessary nuisance and risks the residents would have to endure during the vast roadworks required to install required utilities (electricity,gas, water and fibre) to the new development needs to be taken into consideration as these works would be major works, that will go on for weeks, if not months. Emergency vehicles already struggle to access some parts of the proposed route in sandiacre, especially in the winter months when the roads are at high risk of icy conditions. Anybody living in the proposed new development would do so with the risk of emergency assistance reaching them in adequate timescales due to the steep incline to the proposed development.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Darran and Emma Rea	Response-00597	Current traffic is already dangerous, cars are parked on junctions which is restricting clear views, cars go way above the speed limit already (check Stanton Road and also Sycamore Crescent) there are a lot of elderly and disabled people in the area alongside those who have dogs, it is difficult enough already with the current traffic in the area, not to mention cars parked obstructing views
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	David Casey	Response-01608	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	David Cater	Response-01756	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	David Fry	Response-00596	The school operates additional facilities every evening and all weekend and the traffic for residents is overwhelming as it's difficult to get off the drive some days The football club also means lots of traffic. Additional housing will only compound the traffic problems
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	David Ruddock	Response-01776	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	David Tindsley	Response-00515	Stanton Road is the ?main? access road to the proposed site, with Beech Avenue and Coronation Avenue feeding off it. There are only two wider approaches to Stanton Road ? from the west from Rushey Lane, and from the east from Town Street/Ikkeston Road. Given that Rushey Lane has a weight restriction on it of 7.5 tonnes (unless for access) to prevent HGVs travelling on to Stanton via Stanton by Dale, so it would seem inevitable that any construction traffic will have to enter from Town Street/Ikkeston Road. This is already difficult, with tight, blind bends immediately you access Stanton Road, another when to turn right close to the Blue Bell pub, and particularly so when you turn left by Sandiacre Football Club/St Giles Park. Within 100m of the football club, on the opposite side of the road, is Cloudside Academy Primary School. Both are key facilities/amenities for the village, and extremely important. However, on practice nights, match days and on evenings when football matches are being screened on TV, Stanton Road is extremely congested. It must not be forgotten that the football club provides facilities for children as well, and this causes serious safety concerns for them, particularly as they are less aware of the safety hazards caused by the congestion. School drop-offs and pickups are even worse. Whilst there is a temporary restricted speed of 20mph during these times, the congestion is awful, with congestion on street corners creating further blind bends for people trying to turn left out of Beech Avenue, and with parking extending well up Beech Avenue as well. Whilst most drivers are considerate and careful, I have seen several instances where drivers have had to mount the school-side kerb to avoid vehicles coming in the opposite direction. With very young children in the vicinity, I think is already a major safety issue which can only be exacerbated by an increase in traffic numbers from the proposed development. This is particularly the case when large construction traffic is added to the situation. I consider the road safety issues involved with this proposal to be extremely serious, and I therefore strongly object to the proposal.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	David Yeo	Response-01705	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Dawn Glennis Smith	Response-00510	Road safety would increase as the infrastructure to this area will not be improved.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Dean Bosworth	Response-01665	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Dean Lavelle	Response-01774	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Dean Michell	Response-01343	When the bus has stop ,car use the pavement to get round. I have nearly been hit coming out my gate.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Dean Peake-Whitehurst	Response-00488	See comments on Traffic Congestion. The thought is the same, more vehicles will result in increased danger for a small, quiet village
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Debra Michell	Response-01346	When the bus is at the bus stop car mount the pavement to get round. Children use this Avenue to get to and from school. parent that bring there children in car park everywhere on pavement and corner and don?t consider anyone, it?s a nightmare driving at these times.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Debra Scully	Response-00288	Due to the amount of road parking there are severe concerns as to road safety .
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Debs Washer	Response-00487	More cars equals more risks to children getting knocked down
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Denise Creasey	Response-00786	The roads on and around Cloudside are steep, twisting and with blind narrow comers already difficult to navigate with poor visibility with parked cars. This area could not contend safely with additional traffic or indeed construction traffic. At peak times there is congestion of traffic making road safty for padestrians very difficult. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloudside Road is unsuitabe for this volume of traffic. The increase in the volume of traffic and construction vehicles would also be detrimental to the road safety of the children and parents at the peak times when children are arriving and leaving schools in the area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Denise Lingard	Response-01759	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Dennis Watts	Response-01726	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Derek Morton	Response-01607	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Derrick Hunt	Response-00437	The roads around the existing estate are pretty dangerous already for children With Cloudside infants on Stanton road And children for senior school having to walk to Friesland at Ripley or a drop off journey for parents causing more danger to the ones walking .
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Destiny Jade-Blake	Response-01636	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Diane Jones	Response-00852	The proposed development is very near to local schools and therefore construction traffic on Stanton Road, which is already very busy , is an added danger.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Diane Mcmorrow	Response-00433	The traffic at the moment is very busy cars parking on the pavement buses struggling to pass additional traffic would be dangerous to school children walking to school along with all other pedestrians I've struggled walking my dog trying to pass parked cars
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Diane Meadwell	Response-00807	The roads around the proposed development are narrow and there are always vehicles parked on them. They are used regularly by children on their way to and from school and as access to Stoney Clouds. They are also used frequently by dog walkers at all times of day. The additional traffic would not only be increased by the residents of the houses, but also by the numerous courier services which often use larger vehicles. These delivery companies are already very frequent users of our local roads, and that number will only increase as people use internet shopping more and more. Add to this an additional 180 addresses requiring access through these narrow roads, and the risk of road accidents of all kinds would undoubtedly increase. We should be encouraging people, children in particular, to walk and cycle, but this added danger will result in too many misgivings.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Diane Turner	Response-01744	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Donna Steele	Response-00781	Traffic congestion is already a nightmare around the proposed area, this will only add to this.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Dorothy Deeprise	Response-00817	The road will become a traffic jam and therefore make safety an issue for the people here.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	D Pallett	Response-01627	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	D Simpson	Response-01712	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	E Cooper	Response-01923	Difficulty already accessing homes. Parked cars already make road crossing difficult.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Eleanor Moseley	Response-00799	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Eleanor Newman	Response-00718	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Elisha Gunn	Response-00585	As the proposed plans are close to a school the road safety will be reduced as more cars cause further congestion getting out of the small town which can lead to dangerous driving and accidents to our young and venerable residents
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Emily	Response-01880	Small road for access for the amount of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Emma	Response-00492	The roads are extremely difficult to get up and down in winter and icy snowy conditions. Several times I've had to have days off work due to icy conditions where other colleagues who live locally aren't on top of the hill don't have any issues.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Emma Peterson	Response-00491	School nearby
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Emma Ryan	Response-00503	I don't think you can add somewhere between 180-360 cars to a small town and not expect the roads to be more congested and more dangerous, especially given the school located a short distance away. The area around the school struggles enough daily as it is, without putting extra people and their cars into the town.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Emma Wall	Response-00319	Cars already parked on either side of the roads around this area and prevents ambulances and buses is getting through it quite a number of places it's not suitable for an increase of traffic. It's dangerous for children people drive fairly fast through these roads already adding to that it will only cause more problems.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Esme Moss	Response-00592	Will increase the number of cars, road users in the local area contributing to increased traffic congestion, pollution and poses a greater risk to children and elderly people in the area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Esther Cook	Response-01861	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions. I would also point out access to the site would be difficult as steep hills and damage would be done to all roads leading to the site.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Ewan Snowden	Response-00766	Currently the traffic isn't light and on certain days it becomes very heavy with traffic and vehicles mounting pavement to get through the traffic. With the new flow of traffic that will come through means further drivers making unsafe decisions just for the sake of pushing through traffic rather than waiting. I shouldn't have to further add to my anxiety by worrying if vehicles are going to mount the curb and hit me, just to get around the additional parked cars.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Fay Cresswell	Response-00701	As above there are so many dangerous roads double parking, parking on pavements parking on corners where visibility is already poor. In winter Chestnut Grove Larch Drive Cloudside Road become very difficult to drive as the hill of Cloudside is steep and cars skid frequently in ice and snow. I myself got stuck and it took 3 men from local houses to push my car up to my property on Chestnut Grove. Buses run through the estate and frequently get stuck because of badly parked vehicles. This estate was Council and when built rules were work vans were not allowed to park on streets at home addresses but now 3 of my nearest neighbours have personal cars and work vans 2 houses sold across from mine without drives one family have 2 Estates and a Transit Van and the other a MPV and a works van there is not space for 2 vehicles outside the property yet alone 3 and this is common place on the Estate. The proposed path and that's what it is to the development is too small to take 180 houses worth of vehicles let alone construction traffic. There is a 7.5 tonne weight limit

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Gail Berry	Response-01644	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Geoff Tindsley	Response-00755	1. Stanton Road is the ?main? access road to the proposed site, with Beech Avenue and Coronation Avenue feeding off it. There are only two wider approaches to Stanton Road ? from the west from Rushey Lane, and from the east from Town Street/Ilkeston Road. I believe that Rushey Lane has a weight restriction on it of 7.5 tonnes (unless for access) to prevent HGVs travelling on to Stanton via Stanton by Dale, so it would seem inevitable that any construction traffic will have to enter from Town Street/Ilkeston Road. 2. When coming from the other side of Nottingham, via Moorbridge Lane, there is a difficult right-hand turn into Stanton Road, particularly when there are large HGVs coming in the opposite direction. There are tight, blind bends immediately you access Stanton Road, another when to turn right close to the Blue Bell pub, and particularly so when you turn left by Sandiacre Football Club/St Giles Park. Within 100m of the football club, on the opposite side of the road, is Cloudside Academy Primary School. 3. I am sure that both are important facilities/amenities for the village. However, when there are practice nights, match days and on evenings when football matches are being screened on TV, I have experienced Stanton Road being extremely congested. It must not be forgotten that the football club provides facilities for children as well, and this causes serious safety concerns for them, particularly as they are less aware of the safety hazards caused by the congestion. 4. I am aware that school drop-offs and pickups are even worse. Whilst there is a temporary restricted speed of 20mph during these times, the congestion is awful, with congestion on street corners creating further blind bends for people trying to turn left out of Beech Avenue, and with parking extending well up Beech Avenue as well. 5. Whilst most drivers are considerate and careful, I have seen instances where drivers have had to mount the school-side kerb to avoid vehicles coming in the opposite direction. With very young children in the vicinity, I think there already is a major safety issue which can only be worsened by an increase in traffic numbers from the proposed development. This is particularly the case when large construction traffic is added to the situation. I consider the road safety issues involved with this proposal to be extremely serious, and I therefore strongly object to the proposal.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Georgia C	Response-01296	The roads are already unsafe as is, poor quality of driving can be observed every journey you go on. We don't need more cars on the road.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Georgia Marvin	Response-00261	I do feel that there will 100% be more accidents if this goes ahead. Cloudside road has such a tight blind corner, and if two cars are met head to head I'm concerned for the safety of drivers, pedestrians and pets.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Gill West	Response-01725	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Glyn Holner	Response-01697	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Gordon Bruce	Response-01455	There are already huge problems with parking for schools and nurseries as the roads in that area were not built to accommodate the number of cars parked and cars delivering children to schools etc, so problems already occur. Busses and vans struggle to get through already. There would also be a major issue with Coronation AVE and Larch drive being dug up to allow services to be laid for new housing. Parking and access are already very difficult. The extra traffic for a project of this size on an unserviced green field site is huge, as would the disruption to locals be if this were to go ahead. Safety is inevitably compromised if people who already fight for parking near their homes are given even less access if their road is dug up. The proposed entrance from Lark Drive is woefully inadequate, far too small for the volume of construction traffic, and unsafe for existing residents.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Gordon Daris	Response-01639	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Greg Cox	Response-01702	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Gregg Bartrum	Response-01591	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Greg Watts	Response-00733	Access across or near the Stoney Clouds escarpment could be technically challenging.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Harriet Farnsworth	Response-01914	Roads are already too busy & will lead to the inevitable increase in accidents (& potholes).

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Harry Fleck	Response-01084	The roads up to the access site will make it unsafe for pedestrians as the road network is not wide enough to accomadate 2 passing cars and sufficient pathways. Large construction vehicles will be having to mount the pavements in order to navigate the narrow right hand bends which will cause a huge safety issue for anyone using pathways particularly with small children or the elderly
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Helen	Response-00883	Parking and traffic in this area is horrendous now with many blind spots for crossing roads. The school on Stanton Road is a nightmare at collection and drop off times. With increased traffic this is an issue with children and parents attempting to cross the road. I am already genuinely concerned a serious accident will happen without adding to this with increased traffic movements
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Helen Gillain	Response-00964	with vehicles parked either side of road and on pavement visibility is poor and poses a danger for for vehicles and pedestrian
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Helen Richardson	Response-00432	I object to the proposed development of 108 new homes due to the significant increase in traffic and the consequent detrimental impact on road safety. The existing road network in Sandiacre, already burdened and poorly maintained, will be further strained by a substantial increase in vehicular movements, leading to a heightened risk of accidents for pedestrians, cyclists, and other road users.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Helen Thompson	Response-01356	There are existing road safety concerns in this area which will be increased by more traffic and people. You should study the traffic safety issues around Cloudside school when the children come out at 3.15. Walking on the school side of Stanton Road can be hazardous as traffic comes very near or on the pavement - this includes the bus. Also people park on the pavement at the bottom of Beech Avenue. The junction of Church Street and Town street/Ikeston road is hazardous already due to the number of lorries coming to and from the Stanton site which have problems on the corner without crossing onto the wrong side of the road.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Helen whiteman	Response-00447	It would be impossible for it to be safe walking up coronation road with all the extra traffic it would cause so much inconvenience and it would not be safe
			Ian	Response-00493	High levels of traffic will in turn lead to more accidents, especially during school transit hours
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Ian herbert	Response-00939	the access road to this site is totally unsuited to heavy construction vehicle access and then high residential movements as the area is only suitable for car based commuting.
			Ian Steele	Response-00780	The roads are narrow and tight even for the amount of residents here already
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	IAN TAYLOR	Response-00972	For the reasons stated at 1, increased congestion means less safety on the roads and adjoining footpaths.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Ian telfer	Response-00991	Cars trying to get past school traffic is dangerous. More houses = more cars!!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Ian Ward	Response-01628	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Irina Anthony	Response-01867	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Isabelle Love	Response-00529	With further traffic obviously comes the greater risk to pedestrians (particularly children).
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Isobel Ball	Response-01092	Similar to the traffic congestion notes i entered. Small children and dogs live in this area as it is close to the local primary schools. An increase of lorry?s and equipment being carted up there everyday is in no way safe for the families/ habitats/farm animals that reside in this area. It is incredibly dangerous and someone will get hurt.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	J. E. Lord	Response-01601	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Jack Greatorex	Response-01731	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Jacob Whitt	Response-01748	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Jacqueline Marshall	Response-01436	Cloud side Academy is on Stanton Road in Sandiacre and is close to the proposed development. I walk this road regularly and witness first hand road safety issues on a daily basis Allowing approximately another 360 cars onto this road from the proposed development will increase the dangers for young children and older residents and must be taken into consideration. There is also an infant school on Victoria Road which will also be affected by increased traffic along with Albert Road, King Edward Street and Butt Street as drivers from the proposed development search for easy access to major roads there are no controlled crossings on the residential roads, cars already cause safety problems at drop off and pick up times. Allowing another 360 cars onto to these roads are putting young and old lives at risk.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Jade Smith	Response-01783	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	James Meadwell	Response-01653	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	James Roberts	Response-01708	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	James Seward	Response-01683	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	James White	Response-01883	Roads accessing proposed build land is not fit for purpose e.g. Beech Avenue, Larch Drive puts pedestrians at greater risk.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Jane Dennett	Response-00965	Too near Friesland more traffic more incidents. Derby Road Bostocks dangerous already.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Jane Elizabeth Tindsley	Response-00669	Stanton Road is the ?main? access road to the proposed site, with Beech Avenue and Coronation Avenue feeding off it. There are only two wider approaches to Stanton Road ? from the west from Rushey Lane, and from the east from Town Street/Ilkeston Road. Given that Rushey Lane has a weight restriction on it of 7.5 tonnes (unless for access) to prevent HGVs travelling on to Stanton via Stanton by Dale, so it would seem inevitable that any construction traffic will have to enter from Town Street/Ilkeston Road. This is already difficult, with tight, blind bends immediately you access Stanton Road, another when to turn right close to the Blue Bell pub, and particularly so when you turn left by Sandiacre Football Club/St Giles Park. Within 100m of the football club, on the opposite side of the road, is Cloudside Academy Primary School. Both are key facilities/amenities for the village, and extremely important. However, on practice nights, match days and on evenings when football matches are being screened on TV or there is a social event, Stanton Road is extremely congested. It must not be forgotten that the football club provides facilities for children as well, and this causes serious safety concerns for them, particularly as they are less aware of the safety hazards caused by the congestion. School drop-offs and pickups are even worse. Whilst there is a temporary restricted speed of 20mph during these times, the congestion is awful, with congestion on street corners creating further blind bends for people trying to turn left out of Beech Avenue, and with parking extending well up Beech Avenue as well. Whilst most drivers are considerate and careful, I have seen several instances where drivers have had to mount the school-side kerb to avoid vehicles coming in the opposite direction. With very young children in the vicinity, I think is already a major safety issue which can only be exacerbated by an increase in traffic numbers from the proposed development. This is particularly the case when large construction traffic is added to the situation. More traffic would create an increase in hazardous zones for children, cyclists, disabled and elderly residents. I consider the road safety issues involved with this proposal to be extremely serious, and I therefore strongly object to the proposal.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Janet Whildes	Response-01869	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Jane Warton	Response-00662	heavy construction traffic having to use roads that are already in a poor condition
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Janice Taylor	Response-01743	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Janice West	Response-00989	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Janine Holmes	Response-01595	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Jason Deeprise	Response-00818	I hope you will put in good crossings and cycle lanes.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Jason Harwood	Response-01667	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Jason Webb	Response-01637	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Jayne Rowley	Response-01279	The existing roads are narrow and there are several blind corners which often cause those vehicles using those roads near misses with other oncoming traffic, one of the main ones being at the top of Cloudside where access to the proposed site would need to pass through. There is limited visibility due to parked cars making it dangerous for other road users, pedestrians, pets and local wildlife. There is a local school which at peak times already means that it is difficult to pass through to exit the estate, a further rise in traffic would put children trying to get to school at a higher risk. The proposed access to the site is unsuitable for the increases in both cars and the building traffic, this risk would be even greater in the winter months as it is not on the main gritting routes and the sharp corners already make travel in snow and ice a high risk
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	J Cates	Response-01750	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Jeanette O Connor	Response-01640	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Jeffrey Whittaker	Response-00594	Very concerned at cloud side school & Friesland where the most traffic would be
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Jenna Mitchell	Response-01407	An excess of cars and no measures to curb speeding in the area would make additional f hundreds more cars dangerous
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Jennifer Bailey	Response-01857	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions. I do fear the roads will become so parked up that buses will not be able to get through. I do think the increase in traffic will lead to accidents. Its already difficult to get round this estate.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Jennifer Saville	Response-00516	Roads around Sandiacre are already crowded and anothe 200+ cars from the new development would only add to the dangers, especially predestrians including school children
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Jennifer Tindsley	Response-00751	1. Stanton Road is the ?main? access road to the proposed site, with Beech Avenue and Coronation Avenue feeding off it. There are only two wider approaches to Stanton Road ? from the west from Rushey Lane, and from the east from Town Street/Ilkeston Road. I believe that Rushey Lane has a weight restriction on it of 7.5 tonnes (unless for access) to prevent HGVs travelling on to Stanton via Stanton by Dale, so it would seem inevitable that any construction traffic will have to enter from Town Street/Ilkeston Road. 2. When coming from the other side of Nottingham, via Moorbridge Lane, there is a difficult right-hand turn into Stanton Road, particularly when there are large HGVs coming in the opposite direction. There are tight, blind bends immediately you access Stanton Road, another when to turn right close to the Blue Bell pub, and particularly so when you turn left by Sandiacre Football Club/St Giles Park. Within 100m of the football club, on the opposite side of the road, is Cloudside Academy Primary School. 3. I am sure that both are important facilities/amenities for the village. However, when there are practice nights, match days and on evenings when football matches are being screened on TV, I have experienced Stanton Road being extremely congested. It must not be forgotten that the football club provides facilities for children as well, and this causes serious safety concerns for them, particularly as they are less aware of the safety hazards caused by the congestion. 4. I am aware that school drop-offs and pickups are even worse. Whilst there is a temporary restricted speed of 20mph during these times, the congestion is awful, with congestion on street corners creating further blind bends for people trying to turn left out of Beech Avenue, and with parking extending well up Beech Avenue as well. 5. Whilst most drivers are considerate and careful, I have seen instances where drivers have had to mount the school-side kerb to avoid vehicles coming in the opposite direction. With very young children in the vicinity, I think there already is a major safety issue which can only be worsened by an increase in traffic numbers from the proposed development. This is particularly the case when large construction traffic is added to the situation. I consider the road safety issues involved with this proposal to be extremely serious, and I therefore strongly object to the proposal.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Jenny Stephens	Response-01723	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Joanna hardy	Response-01304	As a mother of young children I am concern about construction traffic rolling past cloudside junior school. The area is congested already at dropnoff and pick up times, but an increase in traffic would pose a greater risk to our children. I know 1st hand the dangers of lorries travelling past schools. When i was in primary school in asfordby in Leicestershire a girl a year or 2 older than me was killed by a lorry while crossing the road outside school. I remember the aftermath. Fortunately the local council finally took steps after this tragedy and a bypass was built. This is not possible in sandiacre so I fear increased traffic and more large vehicles on our roads will be a danger to local children. I live on Coronation avenue and have young children. I am concerned that increased traffic from construction and new residents would pose an increased danger to my young children.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Joanne Guyatt	Response-01784	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Joanne Johnson	Response-00765	I am concerned that the extra traffic during construction will pose danger to the residents of Sandiacre, especially the children going to and from the local schools. Also with the extra traffic that will be generated by the building of the new houses, the UK average being 1.2 cars per household in the UK this could mean conservatively an extra 216 vehicles on these roads daily adding to safety concerns. The road by The Blue Bell pub is on Church Street being windy already sees collisions and near miss' regularly.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Joanne Lambert	Response-00494	Traffic outside schools at drop off and pick up times are already stopping on yellow zig zags due to there not being enough safe parking spaces, extra traffic will increase the incidences of this. Visibility will be impacted so crossing roads will become more unsafe for our young people.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Jodie Owen	Response-01688	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Jodie Shrive	Response-00601	As mentioned previously, adding more traffic to already very narrow roads highly increases the risks of accidents, especially to vulnerable local residents such as the elderly and children. Sandiacre is a quiet neighbourhood which is one of the most valuable things about this area, people wander freely as within their rights and to impose such a drastic change to the area puts our residents at risk and WILL lead to deaths involving RTA's, can you live with that?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Joe Sells	Response-01924	A single access point poses serious road safety & emergency response concerns.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Jo Gerhardt	Response-01286	As mentioned in the Traffic congestion comments, the safety of the roads would become an issue due to the increased influx of HGV's, lorries and cars etc. construction traffic leading to the site. The roads are very narrow approaching the proposed site, with residential cars being parked on the sides, which would make access difficult to manoeuvre. Its a residential area with children playing, elderly folk crossing roads etc so they would all have to be wary of the increased traffic. As mentioned, HGV's often speed past the bottom of Starch Lane, making it treacherous to cross.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	John Gardner	Response-01694	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	John G Brown	Response-01752	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	John Hibbitt	Response-01855	Very poor now. Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	John Ledger	Response-01605	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	John Payne	Response-01785	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	John Whiteman	Response-00450	Road safety is non-existent as it stands especially at school times. It will be absolutely dangerous with hundreds of extra trips up and down the hill every day.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Jon Burn	Response-01722	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Josh Williams	Response-01632	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	J Pearson	Response-01772	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Judith A Pulfer	Response-01863	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions. I cannot believe that is site will only have the one access/exit road of Larch Drive. The road infrastructure to this entrance has not ben built for the amount of traffic it will get. The entrance itself is very narrow taking into consideration the necessary footpaths needed for pedestrians. It would be interesting to see what is/isn't adopted highway at that point. The narrow roads leading up to Larch Drive and always the parked cars on them would cause problems. I believe the drivers on the i4 bus have a few problems.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Judith Blackburn	Response-01928	The bus service is often delayed which can be very difficult for attending appointments or waiting in cold weather at the stop. Heavy vehicles and traffic along Town Street and Derby Road make crossing safely very difficult for pedestrians.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Julie Hill	Response-01643	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Julie Taylor	Response-01503	If theres already an issue with parking and driving around that area how is it safe for people crossing the road when visability is an issue.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Karen Alldread	Response-01868	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions. The roads surrounding the schools are currently extremely hazardous with the volume of traffic and unsafe parking and at times illegal parking. The influx of additional traffic that would result from further development in Sandiacre would exacerbate this already precarious situation.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Karen Blain	Response-01732	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Karen Evans	Response-00523	Busier round schools.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Karen Harwood	Response-01668	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Karen Pitts	Response-00643	With increased volume of traffic, the children attending both Cloudside and Ladycross schools would be put at risk. The quiet roads in the nearby estate where children can often be seen playing will be a thing of the past. We should be encouraging them to spend more time outdoors but parents will be fearful to allow this with the increase in traffic. Cars park on all of the roads around the schools and those near the shop on Stanton Road making it difficult to cross the road at times especially if children cannot see the road properly due to parked vehicles. Then there are impatient drivers. You often have to give way many times when driving near the football club and Cloudside school but there are some who can inconsiderate leading to confrontation and arguments.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Kathryn Lovatt	Response-00497	I feel that the increased number of vehicles on Beech Avenue, Stanton Road, Coronation Avenue and Cloudside Road which would occur due to the proposed housing develoment, would make these roads more dangerous. There are many sharp bends and blind spots in the roads leading to the proposed new housing development - these bends/blind spots include Coronation Avenue onto Cloudside Road (hill), top of Cloudside hill onto Cloudside Road, and Cloudside Road onto Larch Drive. The danger would be considerably increased with the many large construction vehicles needing to access the new housing construction site over a long period of time.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Kathryn Martin	Response-00527	Access is poor. Children struggle to play out and this will only increase the risk.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Katie Morrice	Response-00664	There is a significant amount of on street parking throughout larch drive, cloudside Road, chestnut Grove, coronation avenue, beech avenue and maple avenue. With these streets being part of the main and only proposed route towards the new builds this will significantly increase the amount of cars going through daily. This will heighten the risk of accidents, as more cars navigate through these already congested roads. Additionally, the area is frequented by pedestrians, including families with children and dog walkers, who access the green fields and nature reserve via the twitchell areas. The increase in traffic raises serious safety concerns for the pedestrians trying to cross the roads and avoid any potential accidents on the roads. The roads on and around Cloudside are steep, twisting and with blind narrow corners already difficult to navigate with poor visibility with parked cars. This area could not contend safely with additional traffic or indeed construction traffic. At peak times there is congestion of traffic making road safety for pedestrians very difficult. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloudside Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The increase in the volume of traffic and construction vehicles would also be detrimental to the road safety of the children and parents at the peak times when children are arriving and leaving schools in the area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Katie Robinson	Response-00943	Roads are very busy with parked cars but you can cross the roads without fear as the top of the estate is a quiet part of the estate. However adding on average 180 cars (that's at least one per new house) would completely change this. The roads would become a lot busier and at this stage the roads are very small in this area also - this would cause congestion on the roads which would also cause safety concerns for people wanting to cross the roads. There are a number of elderly residents at the top of the estate and a number of families with young children. In addition to this cars already have to reverse and make way to allow on coming cars to exit these small roads just adding to this would cause further safety concerns. The school is at the bottom of the estate also - already busy on school runs or events on a Saturday however adding further cars to this area will also make this unsafe for the children/school and for the planned activities on the weekends that they attend. We are not talking 1/2 extra cars on the road - we are talking 180 at least and then times this by how many journeys they make in cars makes the roads busier and unsafe.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Katrina	Response-00628	The amount of heavy duty vehicles that will be driving round during construction will cause major amounts of damage to the roads. Also the amount of blind corners there are on this estate, example at the top of cloudside and in front of the football club especially while primary school children are being picked up and dropped off will cause a major risk for children with the added vehicles on the road
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Kelly Randall	Response-00591	Strategic Policy 1.7 requires junction improvements; however, physical constraints, particularly along Cloudside Road and Coronation Avenue, make such upgrades impractical. Increased construction and residential traffic will endanger pedestrians, particularly near local schools. Has the impact on school safety been formally assessed?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Kelsey Green	Response-01666	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Kenneth Cooper	Response-01720	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Kern-Paul Lewis	Response-01715	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Kerry Meadwell	Response-01655	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Kerry Smith	Response-01271	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Kerry stokes	Response-00769	The increased traffic will cause an increase in risk, to not only my children, but all of the children that attend cloud side school & the park play area just off Stanton road. My children are finding it increasingly difficult to cross roads safely due to the increase in traffic in Sandiacre. We live on Stanton road & I feel the need to cross them over the road still (they're teenagers) to get to the park because at times we've had vehicles mount the pavements to get past one another because of the increase in cars. How are emergency vehicles going to get to the proposed site quick enough & how is a fire engine meant to get through the area that should be a road to enter the site. The width of the road & proposed pavement areas is just far too small.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	KH Taylor	Response-01663	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Kim Helm	Response-00632	Narrow roads being blocked by lorries and bus, adults and children having go on the roads or round parked cars Horse riders at risk with increased heavy traffic
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Kirk Moss	Response-00439	Existing bus routes struggle with narrow roads near the proposed development. Heavy machinery will have difficulty navigating streets already tight for standard cars. Construction traffic will likely cause further congestion, damage to road surfaces, and increased safety hazards for pedestrians and road users.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Kirsty	Response-00970	My partner was involved in an accident due to lack of vis ability from parked vehicles on bend
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Kirsty Handa	Response-00445	This proposed development is going to have a sever negative impact on the road safety in the area. The roads surrounding the development are already all single file due to parking, there are a lot of blind corners which cannot be improved and there are severe access issues to this proposed development of only 1 vehicle at a time. The safety of any potential residents of the development cannot be kept safe with such a single access to that estate. The roads are already very small and struggle to cope with the current traffic without adding additional cars to the roads and that is without considering the road safety of the vehicles that will be trying to access the development whilst it is being built. The streets are far too small and dangerous for this to be sustainable. In winter these roads are really bad due to the incline. They become very icy, the council do not deice or grit any of the surrounding roads and it is already very dangerous coming down the hills and trying to stop at the bottom. They cannot cope with additional vehicles
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Kirsty Meredith	Response-01462	Cloudside academy is on Stanton Road, and it is already extremely dangerous with the amount of traffic at school times. It causes congestion and there are cars mounted on pavements and blocking driveways. Adding extra volume to the area is madness. Let alone the type of vehicles required for the building works.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	K Reynolds	Response-01916	There's already people racing around on motorbikes dangerously, and cars speeding. Really don't need to add more traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Kristie Rugers	Response-01864	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Kyle Jones	Response-01764	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	L A Keen	Response-01659	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Laura Hallam	Response-01711	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Laura Thompson	Response-00702	Worried about close nature to school. Lots of children walking home through the estate.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Laurence Luck	Response-01727	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Lauren Freeman	Response-01562	This is one of my biggest concerns with the proposal. My children attend Cloudside school, and my eldest will be moving up to Friesland in September. Despite living on Stanton Road opposite the shop I do not let my children walk to or from school alone. I already struggle to cross the road with them because of safety issues with parking and traffic at school start and end times so I cant guarantee they could safely cross the road alone. The sheer number of vehicles passing along Stanton Road is enormous already there is really no safe place cross so adding to this is a terrible accident waiting to happen.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Lauren Rose	Response-01446	Increased vehicles = reduced road safety. An elderly lady was sadly killed in 2019 due to a heavy goods vehicle not being able to see her at a crossing near the Co-Op. Current roads in the area are steep, some have close or blind bends. There are school children locally who may take risks crossing roads and increased children from the proposed development will only add to this risk. The proposed development has an access point at Larch Drive via the surrounding roads which already currently struggle with existing traffic. Larch Drive simply is not fit for access purposes and could increase the risk of traffic collisions due to the narrow nature of the access point.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Leah morral	Response-00712	People have chosen to buy houses on larch drive and surrounding areas as a safe place to raise young children, making this a through route is going to make this so much unsafer
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Lee Wilcock	Response-01670	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Lesley Bruce	Response-01397	The pavements in much of the route which children would be walked to school at Ladycross, Cloudside and Friesland are narrow, and many are used by residents to park as the roads are not wide enough to accommodate the number of homes which now have 1 or more cars. 180 houses would potentially generate around 200 more children on these already inadequate routes. The volume of traffic and length of time during required for heavy plant and machinery, multiple daily deliveries plus the metres width of digging required to install new services through this area would cause a great deal of danger on already inadequate roads which were never built to come with this. The proposed entrance from Larch Drive is entirely inadequate to service the needs of both construction and living.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Lesley Carter	Response-00536	The roads leading through the estate to the proposed site are not suitable for increased traffic. Due to lack of drives, and multiple car ownership, there are cars parked along all streets and passing is difficult. Increased traffic would lead to more congestion and be unsafe. Particularly at school drop off and pick up times, putting children at increased risk. There is also a blind bend on Cloudside Road which causes problems with parked vehicles meaning cars are often on wrong side of the road. One access point and increased pedestrians will lead to poor pedestrian safety. This is due to increased traffic and blocked footpaths by parked cars. Cars pull onto the pavements to try not to block the roads but this means pedestrians, prams, buggies, mobility scooters and wheelchairs etc often have to use the road.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Lesley Morral	Response-01920	The roads around the access to proposed site are already over crowded & extremely narrow.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Lia Thims	Response-01766	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Lilly stokes	Response-00767	the number of big lorries on the road will increase making the roads more cramped initially making it hard for cars to fit on the road with the lorry's there.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Linda Castledine-Davies	Response-00850	Town street is a constant cacophony of noise, dirt and fumes as a never ending cavalcade of lorries and trucks hurtle up and down the road from Wards Recycling and Johnsons Aggregates to name a few. To pull out of the blind corner on Stanton Road waiting for a gap in the traffic is frightening especially at peak times of the day. The enormous build that is taking place at Stanton just outside the parish will add hundreds of more heavy duty vehicles to this same route so to add even further public traffic will turn this into one big congested and dangerous area to either drive in or negotiate on foot. The access to this proposed site is too narrow for heavy use and heavy vehicles. The current pavement is shorter than legal requirements of 2meter and so is the gap for vehicles. Even for light vehicle use this is unacceptable.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Linda Oscroft	Response-01927	With road safety compromised by on-pavement parking even on the corners of junctions, pulling out from driveways & junctions is dangerous & carried out blind. The proposals add to this danger.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Lindsey Rawlinson	Response-01624	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	LISA ANNE GILLIGAN-LEE	Response-00710	The addition of hundreds of new homes will drastically increase vehicle numbers in an area already struggling with traffic congestion. Local roads are narrow and not built to handle such heavy use, raising the risk of accidents and making it dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists. Children walking to school, elderly residents, and people with mobility issues will all be affected. Increased traffic will also lead to more vehicle damage in residential streets already limited by on-street parking. More traffic will significantly increase the risk of accidents especially near schools; quiet suburban roads not designed to cope with high levels of traffic and will ultimately make them unsafe and noisy for residents.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Lisa Coates	Response-00695	Already busy on Stanton road during school hrs
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Lisa Heppell	Response-00878	The roads are congested especially at certain times of the day
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Lisa J Pearson	Response-01762	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Liz Woodhouse	Response-01584	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	L Mee	Response-01777	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Logan Fox	Response-00746	The roads are narrow and tight, cars already park everywhere, which means you sometimes walk in the street. If we had more houses we will see many more vehicles which will result in accidents with people and animals. Even with the current amount of residents, we see so many near misses with cars around the bends. Adding more to the equation will not be favourable for anyone's safety

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Lorraine Hands	Response-00534	Traffic is already an issue on many roads in the surrounding area, buses at times have real difficulties getting round Coronation Avenue and down Beach Avenue! In particular when school traffic is added during the day where many cars park on surrounding rounds???.Safeguarding of children going to and leaving school is already a challenge, to build such houses is going to have an impact on classroom sizes too!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Louise Felfoldt	Response-01733	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Louise Harper	Response-01571	Narrow entrance on larch leading to sleep roads with plenty of parked cars
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Louise Harrison	Response-01719	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Louise Jacks	Response-01767	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Louise Libberton	Response-01693	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Louise Robinson	Response-00647	An increase in the number of cars in an area already busy with cars and industrial vehicles (some extremely large) will only result in more road safety issues. Especially considering the schools in the area and the size of the roads expected to accommodate the traffic. It is not fit for purpose at the moment and more houses = more cars, which will only increase issues.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Lucy johnson	Response-01369	Like I said above, the roads aren't safe enough as it is! The conditions on the road are terrible, people driving like idiots and getting away with it, is disgusting! Think of the children and elderly in Sandiacre!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	lucy victoria garner	Response-00949	Already significant risks at Cloudside School with careless dangerous parking and poor parenting and children with no road sense.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Luke Chein	Response-01779	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Luke Hinchley	Response-00699	Additional traffic on narrow roads with already parked cars makes it difficult to see round corners
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Lynda Morton	Response-01606	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Lynsey Blackburn	Response-01227	Already unsafe toad for cyclists which would be made worse with additional traffic from this development, plus toad surface is poor and lorries delivery supplies to this development will make it worse
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Macie Brothwell	Response-01633	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Malcolm Dillon	Response-00722	The access roads to the development are narrow and below the statutory width requirements for a new development. Access to the development access roads in one case is via a double, blind bend, from a road that is not even a "B" class road. The access rout is littered with junctions and ninety degree bends on narrow roads that regularly have vehicles parked either side of the road.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Malcolm Fox	Response-00215	Small, tight roads with blind spots due to current parking and bends. Vehicle collisions will be a regular occurrence simply down to the increased traffic. Dog walkers and pedestrians will need to be highly aware and we will see an accident. The current roads are not a drive through, so there is relative safety for all with most traffic being residential. So when accidents occur, and they will simply down to the amount of traffic that you will introduce, who do we hold accountable?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Malcolm Riedlinger	Response-00743	A few months ago, a large sink hole fell in on the pavement outside number 34 Stanton Road. This caused a significant danger to anyone using the pavement directly opposite Cloudside Academy. With my wife, we personally had to barricade this hole until it was attended to by the council. This clearly shows that the pavement and roads should be properly assessed for safety and strength, and I am concerned that the increased traffic and heavy machinery that will use Stanton Road during the long duration of this build and beyond, will compromise this further.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Malcolm Riggs	Response-01680	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Malc Orbiston	Response-01673	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Mandy Rait	Response-01587	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions. The existing roads are unsuitable to accommodate such a development.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Mark Gough	Response-00888	Stanton Road and Beech Avenue congested with cars , lorries, deliveries to the shop , cars parked double near the school , traffic coming from Stanton by Dale to the shop . I have had trouble trying to get my van out of Beech Avenue at the bottom and cannot see very well any oncoming traffic , I've nearly had several accidents . I am extremely concerned for the safety of the children going to the Cloudside school, there?s no crossing for them to get across the road and with the cars they can?t see . It?s going to be an absolute tragedy if some child gets knocked over , or anyone wise for that matter . No mobility scooters can get by due to parking on the pavement?s . Another 180 houses built will be absolute hell !
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Mark Leek	Response-01740	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	mark skelton	Response-01341	Narrow road up beech ave where we live. Cars already have to park half on curb due to bus route and amounts of vehicles vs households. Road gets jammed regularly already when cars double park for bus. School at bottom corner gets busy. Cars speed up the road as on hill to get to the top with a run up. My children often crossing the road to visit neighbours and really have to be so careful. This will be a nightmare either there another 180 properties with cars heading our way!!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Mark Thompson	Response-00750	It is already dangerous for children outside the cloudside School due traffic . This make it more dangerous
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Martin Driver	Response-01387	Re the comments regarding congestion. This additional development brings more danger for local children playing on the streets. If this was correctly risk assessed this development wouldn?t go ahead!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Martin Ford	Response-01908	Heavy vehicles using main road increasing during building.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Martin Hardy	Response-01413	As a parent I am concerned that increased traffic, both for construction and eventually residential, will increased the risk for my children. They walk to school and have to cross several roads with no pedestrian crossings. More traffic and larger vehicles increases the risk of them being hurt.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Martyn Locker	Response-00903	My thoughts on this tie in with my traffic thoughts. One concern I have is with the quality and longevity of the local roads. The narrow Beech Avenue in particular seems to be struggling with the demand of the local thoroughfare. Again, I dread to think how this would be impacted with another 180 households (potentially 200+ new cars) using that single road to commute in and out of the estate.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Martyn Maxted	Response-00435	This proposed development would further increase road traffic and generate increased risk to both road users and pedestrians along the proposed access route as well as impacting the local residents.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Matt Bancroft	Response-00916	As stated earlier the existing access is too narrow twisty and covered in blind bends to be safe with the proposed four or five fold increase of the traffic
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Matt Hallam	Response-00476	Having more traffic would make more risk too anyone especially doing the school run at cloudside. At the minute it's a nightmare with busses getting stuck on Beech avenue and stanton Road with cars flying up and down it and the amount of traffic. Its chaos. Traffic in sandiacre town centre is bad as it is
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Matthew Buckland	Response-00615	Already, I have to avoid driving past the school on Stanton Road, during the morning drop off time. It isn?t safe to drive through, as cars are parked all the way along, from the off license, to the football club. Often parking is on the pavement, and blocking the view if trying to exit Beech Avenue. Cloudside Road, Larch Drive, Chestnut Grove , Sycamore Crescent and Coronation Avenue all have parked cars all the way along at all times of the day, which makes it difficult to navigate along at the moment. There is a blind bend at the top of Cloudside Road which you can't pass another car safely when driving round the corner, and I have had a number of near misses here, as I drive this way every day.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Maurice Mason	Response-01617	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Maxine Sutton	Response-00471	Sandiacre is a small village with small village roads. The amount of traffic going through the village is already considerable and the main junction is a small three way light bridge over the Erewash canal. Unless the road infrastructure is improved it will not be able to cope with the extra traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	M Dougle	Response-01749	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	M Eastwood	Response-01757	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Melanie	Response-00586	Strategic Policy 17 acknowledges that the local road network requires upgrading. However, there is limited physical space to accommodate such improvements, particularly at known bottlenecks such as Clowes Road and the junction with Coronation Avenue. These areas are already hazardous, especially for schoolchildren walking to Risley School. Increased vehicular traffic would significantly heighten the risk to pedestrians, including vulnerable road users such as children. There is no clear plan to mitigate these risks. There have been deaths from people being run over in Sandiacre already.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Melanie Caumont	Response-01272	The increased vehicle volume poses a direct safety risk, especially to pedestrians and schoolchildren. Larch Drive and surrounding roads are not designed to accommodate heavy traffic or construction vehicles. Access for emergency services, delivery vans, or public service vehicles is already compromised by parked cars; further traffic will exacerbate this and increase the risk of accidents. Additionally, in winter months, grit lorries cannot service the estate due to its narrow layout and parked vehicles, making roads treacherous. It is unclear how construction vehicles or eventual homeowners will navigate this safely.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Melanie Howarth	Response-01621	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Michael Anderson	Response-00461	With the extra residents of this suggested new development. There will be more children going to the schools in the area and with the already busy narrow roads one can only assume more accidents will happen in all of the local area. An example of this is Stanton Road and the entrance to Cloudside Academy. The road is absolutely packed with parked cars dropping off or picking up children from the school. This is a major bus route which serves Ilkeston, Sandiacre, Nottingham, Derbyshire but are delayed because they can't get through because of congestion.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Michael Oscroft	Response-01926	With road safety compromised by on-pavement parking even on the corners of junctions, pulling out from driveways & junctions is dangerous & carried out blind. The proposals add to this danger.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Michell Birkin	Response-01657	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Michelle Alsop	Response-01645	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Michelle Cox	Response-01724	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Michelle Ledger	Response-00815	TOO MANY VEHICLES IN THE AREA AS IT IS, NARROW ROADS MEAN TRAFFIC CANNOT FLOW FREELY IN THE AREA AS IT IS BEFORE ANY DEVELOPMENT KEY AREAS OF CONCERN - OUTSIDE THE SCHOOL ON STANTON ROAD, SCHOOL DROPOFF TIMES IT IS UNBEARABLE FAR TOO MANY CARS AND ITS NOT SAFE FOR THE KIDS, NEVER MIND ADDING TO THIS NUMBER
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Michelle Wenham	Response-01650	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Mick Helm	Response-00021	The i4 bus that services the estate already has trouble negotiating a safe passage with existing road parking. With the building traffic and the cars from the potential new houses I can imagine it would be withdrawn. Would that be right?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Mick Hughes	Response-01701	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Mike Darnell	Response-00698	As in the previous comment these factors make at least 200 or more cars coning out of the junction in to a school road
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Miss Garratt	Response-00905	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Miss R Cordon	Response-01648	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Mollie Snow	Response-01729	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Molly Newbold	Response-00486	Adding 180 houses could mean up to 360 new cars in the area if each house averages 2 cars per household. Of course it?s going to increase the risk of car accidents and scratched cars as they move to our streets for parking
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Mr & Mrs Turton	Response-01660	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Mr and Mrs R Skelton	Response-01274	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Mr and Mrs Wright	Response-01275	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Mr David Ainsworth	Response-00621	With Stanton development along with this, there will be way too much volume of traffic. There are not enough speed humps; or traffic calming schemes in place and this endagers people's lives. I have now formally recorded my warning that both health effects on worsening air pollution and resident safety is being put at risk. If this goes ahead and proves me to be correct, I will have to pursue a legal challenge on decision making and risk assessments.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Mr John Hickingbotham	Response-01431	Increased risks to pedestrian safety, especially in the vicinity of the local school, is a consequential effect of traffic generated from this proposed development. It is also most unlikely that there will be any significant number of sustainable cycle journeys to or from this development, given the steep gradients on Coronation Avenue, Beech Avenue and particularly Cloudside Road.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Mr K Turton	Response-01706	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Mr Luke	Response-01703	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Mr P J Tanner	Response-01728	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Mr R M Draper	Response-01856	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions. The increase of traffic along Stanton Road would pose a clear and present danger to pupils attending Cloudside School.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Mr R Widdowson	Response-01734	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Mr S. Haywood	Response-01585	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Mrs Christina Pope	Response-00732	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Mrs Donna C. Ball	Response-01594	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Mrs Froggatt	Response-00449	Congested roads. A lot of houses do not have off street parking. Many roads are blocked up with parked vehicles. Any more residents will enhance this problem causing road safety problems
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Mrs Griffin	Response-01698	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Mrs J. Cooper	Response-01596	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions. Existing roads are steep, narrow and have blind corners, cars are often parked leaving little visibility to cross the road safely.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Mrs Jennifer Fry	Response-00581	Traffic on this side of Sandiacre is already horrendous, more cars will cause even more problems
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Mrs Joanne Thompson	Response-01690	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Mrs J Reeder	Response-01909	I am over 90 & feel scared with all the proposed traffic using our roads.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Mrs Lee Farabella	Response-01899	More risk of accidents. Narrow streets could become hazardous for children & elderly.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Mrs Linda Cox	Response-01753	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Mrs Luke	Response-01704	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Mrs M. Rose	Response-01583	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Mrs Marie Draper	Response-01755	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Mrs M Burke	Response-01887	Risk of accidents on narrow streets, for children & the elderly.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Mrs N Taylor	Response-01896	Risk of accidents on narrow roads & surrounding streets for children/elderly.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Mrs Rachel Coats	Response-01623	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Mrs R Cordon	Response-01647	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Mrs Rigby	Response-00641	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak times traffic congregates along Stanton Road and is dangerous to attempt to cross the roads by the especially the elderly, disabled wheelchair users and children crossing roads. Access via the narrow cart track at top of larch Drive and Cloudside Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Mrs Shani Wainwright	Response-00754	Existing roads are twisting and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and many parked cars to contend with. Some roads are steep and rise to approx 80m in places. At peak times congestion on the corner of Beech Ave and along Stanton Rd is already terrible and is both dangerous for drivers and pedestrians (especially the school children trying to get safely to and from school). The proposed access to the new development along Larch Drive and Cloudside road is totally unsuitable for the number of cars and construction traffic it will bring. No consideration given to nearby residents at all, re the danger, pollution and disruption to their lives.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Mrs Sheila Hickingbotham	Response-01338	The development of this site will result in more traffic using the only two access roads from Stanton Road - Coronation Avenue and Beech Avenue. There are already road safety issues around Cloudside School and the junction of Stanton Road and Spencer Avenue with inconsiderate parking increasing the risk of accidents.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Mrs Shirley Victoria Riggs	Response-01685	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Mrs Susan Bantle	Response-01612	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Mrs Turton	Response-01707	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Mrs Whittaker	Response-00595	The increase in traffic to an already busy road near a school.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Nasim Rashid	Response-01103	Potential accidents narrow road 2 very tight corners leading to site
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Natalie Bentley	Response-01646	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Nicole Cooper	Response-01597	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Nigel Percy	Response-00524	Increased traffic will bring obvious increases in safety especially for schoolchildren and young people accessing the sports and social club
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Nikki Vincent	Response-00688	I have 3 children who walk to school and road safety is already a huge concern of mine. The traffic and parking issues will only increase with this proposed build, particularly in the vicinity of Cloudside Academy. The blind corner near to the blue bell pub/Sandiacre town football club is an accident waiting to happen and I dread to think if heavy load vehicles are using this route, not to mention the increase in household cars accessing this road too.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Normn McCrea	Response-01754	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Oliver Marriott	Response-00679	Road Safety Existing roads are steep, rising to 80m, twisted and narrow road with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak times traffic congregates on Stanton road and it's dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloudside road is unsuitable for the volume and size of vehicles required to complete this project.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Paige Walker	Response-01669	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Pamela Bassett	Response-00608	There is already an issue on Stanton Road and other roads around the proposed plot around speed. Dangerous levels of speed where children and high traffic of pedestrians is a real issue in addition the HGV drivers are not taking into account the smaller roads
			Pam shepherd	Response-00453	This goes without saying more cars and buses in an already extremely busy area with increase the amount of tias in the area
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Pat Hardy	Response-01739	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Paula Darnell	Response-00665	The narrow windy roads with many 90 degree bends and parked cars are an accident waiting to happen the roads around that area just cannot take any more vehickes. The children near the school are especially vulnerable as the traffic is so bad already without the extra two hundred or so more vehicles
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Paula Luck	Response-01710	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Paula Sims	Response-01687	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Paul Randall	Response-00131	Strategic Policy 1.7 states that local junctions will need upgrading ? how? There is not the space to do so. Indeed Cloudside Road is at best single lane when residents are parked, and the corner is already problematic and the junction with Coronation Avenue is tight. Residents already park on pavements causing pedestrians to walk in the road. Cloudside Road is popular with dog walkers accessing Stoney Clouds, so more traffic here is a risk. Access is also required for the developers. Do you expect heavy plant and HGVs to access the site via Larch Drive? If so, does this mean a temporary removal of the 7.5t weight limit on Rushy Lane / Stanton Road? If not, are you routing this traffic past the local junior school? Has the school been consulted on the increased risk posed to their students? The Church Street exit is hampered by its configuration, and the large number of HGVs that frequent Lenton Street. This junction is already dangerous (large accident only last week) and further vehicles using it will make the situation worse. Consequently, the existing rat-run of Spencer Avenue and Travers Road would become more used, presenting a clear and present danger to those that use it, and especially the children who walk that route to get to the local schools. Stanton Road has a 7.5 tonne weight limit. This would prevent large construction plant and deliveries accessing the area. Both the Stanton Road / Rushy Lane junction, and the Church Street bends are unsuitable for large vehicles. Indeed the local buses regularly have trouble negotiating these roads. Additionally, the school run for Cloudside Academy causes traffic congestion, and any sort of HGV in that area would cause enormous problems and pose real danger to the children attending the school. NOTE: I received an apology from TrentBarton (after they reviewed their in-bus CCTV) when a bus nearly hit my son walking home from Cloudside school as it was driven down the pavement on Beech Ave. Additionally a bus side swiped my parents' car at the top of Beech which resulted in a significant insurance claim that TrentBarton paid. Access can ONLY be via Larch Drive since alternative access would require the demolition of an existing property. Almost all properties bordering this area are semi-detached. Access via Larch Drive would require plant, machinery and large vehicles negotiating Cloudside Road. In the winter this is a difficult to negotiate road as it is not on the gritting route. Bin lorries have been known to miss areas in this estate due to access.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Paul Vleeton	Response-01770	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	paul wheeldon	Response-00582	many children live in this area adding to the traffic burden will only increase the risk of death or injury
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Paul Wilkes	Response-00599	We fair for our children and grandchildren with the extra cars ei: at least 1800 if not more. With no raid infrastructure put in place and no additional junction for the M1
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Peter Anthony	Response-01866	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Peter Nicholls	Response-01622	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Pete West	Response-01700	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Phil Creasey	Response-01342	There is a significant amount of on street parking throughout larch drive, cloudside Road, chestnut Grove, coronation avenue, beech avenue and maple avenue. With these streets being part of the main proposed route towards the new builds this will significantly increase the amount of cars going through daily. This will heighten the risk of accidents, as more cars navigate through these already congested roads. Additionally, the area is frequented by pedestrians, including families with children and dog walkers, who access the green fields and nature reserve via the twitchell areas. The increase in traffic raises serious safety concerns for the pedestrians trying to cross the roads and avoid any potential accidents on the roads. The roads on and around Cloudside are steep, twisting and with blind narrow corners already difficult to navigate with poor visibility with parked cars. This area could not contend safely with additional traffic or indeed construction traffic. At peak times there is congestion of traffic making road safe for pedestrians very difficult. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloudside Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The increase in the volume of traffic and construction vehicles would also be detrimental to the road safety of the children and parents at the peak times when children are arriving and leaving schools in the area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Philip Reed	Response-01449	I have concerns for the safety of local residents. With many school children, elderly residents, and other vulnerable individuals using these roads daily, the addition of heavy construction vehicles during the build phase?and permanent increases in traffic thereafter?will significantly heighten danger.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	P Sandes	Response-01682	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Rachel Crossley	Response-01661	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Rachel Skelton	Response-01241	Dangerous congestion especially around school times is a major issue, the increase in traffic would make this exponentially worse. This is particularly a problem for children to and from the school site.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	R Barratt	Response-01664	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Rcahel Sharp	Response-00652	Road safety has always been a concern in the area. My children are in their twenties and both attended Ladycross and Cloudside Schools. At the time I complained to the school and the police about the school drop off and pick up traffic and how dangerous this is. Motorists mounting the kerb, parking wholly on pavements and close to junctions. Sometimes parking on the zig zag lines. The development would mean more cars and as they would be family homes more school traffic. The bend near Sandiacre Town Football Club is also problematic and them towards Town Street.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Rebecca Longmuir	Response-00253	How can there be road safety?? when you plan to increase congestion by adding more housing and blocking with more parked cars and traffic?s flow coming in and out of Sandiacre. This will only add to possible accidents. And put people/children at risk.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Rhiannon Lowater	Response-01592	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	R Hibbitt	Response-01862	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions. Like a slalem course now.
			Richard Broughton	Response-01352	The increase in traffic in this previously quiet area is bound to increase the chances of accidents occurring
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Richard Haines	Response-01674	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Richard Jenkins	Response-00264	With several local schools in the area I have real concerns for child safety due to increased traffic. School traffic means children ? walking/running/meeting siblings/going to the local parks etc. In quiet times it is not uncommon to see ?boy racers? on Stanton Road (a problem known to PSCO Ian Hawksworth 13089, Erewash, Derbyshire Constabulary). These are certainly not advocated, nevertheless they are a real issue. The road infrastructure is not only incapable of supporting the required construction traffic and post development, the residential traffic, I believe that the narrow access and tight corners leading to/from the site mean that even with the removal of trees the widest possible opening to access the site would be 5.7 metres. Given the required amount of space for safe pedestrian access I believe that the access would not be in compliance with NPPF Paragraph 110. Also, I fail to see how the access as proposed and taking into account the roads leading up to the proposed site could possibly comply with NPPF Paragraph 111, and given the current traffic loading in the area I do not believe it possible for this development to fulfil the requirements of NPPF Paragraph 112. The proposals for this site appear to have taken no account of the safety of individuals living in the locality and I consider this a serious breach of trust.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Richard Marriott	Response-00675	Road Safety Existing roads are steep, rising to 80m, twisted and narrow road with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak times traffic congregates on Stanton road and it?s dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloudside road is unsuitable for the volume and size of vehicles required to complete this project.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Richard Naylor	Response-00066	The access road is very poor. The road is currently a small cul-de-sac and is not suitable for an additional 180 houses, with 2 cars each, that's an extra 360 cars in a very small area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Richard Shrimpton	Response-01301	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at top of Larch Drive and Cloudside Rd is unsuitable for this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Rob Lowe	Response-01768	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Roger Farnsworth	Response-01910	Roads are already too busy & will lead to the inevitable increase in accidents (& Potholes).
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Rosemarie Gough	Response-00997	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Roy Drew	Response-01614	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Ruby Sharp	Response-00886	Road safety has always been a concern in the area. Sandiacre is a dangerous place to drive and to cross the road. On every street you see parked cars making it harder to see oncoming traffic and cross the road. I often have to cross in between parked cars and rely on engine noises to see if the road is clear, which is becoming increasingly harder with new cars. There are no crossings near our schools and our children are not safe.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Ryan Selby	Response-00479	The roads would be less safe as there would be more through-fare traffic, once cul-de-sac would now be a busy road to a new estate, increasing the risk of a road accident. Would be busier going past the local school which would pose a risk to the children there.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	S. Brailsford	Response-00598	Observed: Overly congested with cars parking in undesignated parking spaces, Busses that have to mount the pavement to get through, Constant traffic waiting, causing impatient drivers to drive too fast when they do get space to go, Not enough safe spaces to cross Drivers already ignoring anyone wanting to cross the road, Additional cars will make this even more unsafe Lorries going to and fro in the building process will make the area extremely unsafe Visibility between parked cars is already dangerously bad
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	S. Jones	Response-01615	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Sally Davies	Response-01294	Traffic through Sandiacre is already a problem. Adding all these houses will make the area busier. Roads will not be able to cope with the additional vehicles.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Sally Peake	Response-01893	Poor access with lots of cars already parked on access roads. I can see there being an accident involving children.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Samantha Anne Whitney	Response-00757	Due to the traffic congestion mentioned in my first comment it's going to make the roads very unsafe in the local area. Specifically around Cloudside School when your adding another 360 cars travelling down that road going to work, it's already not safe with the current traffic, let alone extra. There are going to be so many collisions and stuck cars/busses and bin lorries on the estate due to extra traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Samantha Whildes	Response-01270	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Sam Buckland	Response-00600	Already, I have to avoid driving past the school on Stanton Road, during the morning drop off time. It isn't safe to drive through, as cars are parked all the way along, from the off license, to the football club. Often parking is on the pavement, and blocking the view if trying to exit Beech Avenue. Cloudside Road, Larch Drive, Chestnut Grove, Sycamore Crescent and Coronation Avenue all have parked cars all the way along at all times of the day, which makes it difficult to navigate along at the moment. There is a blind bend at the top of Cloudside Road which you can't pass another car safely when driving round the corner, and I have had a number of near misses here, as I drive this way every day.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Sam Fleck	Response-00821	A 2 way road requires a width of 5.5 to 7.3 metres plus space for pedestrian footpath. Therefore even with the minimum width after bend fails to allow safe access alongside vehicular movement for residents to access a safe route in our out the site. This conflicts with NPPF paragraph 110 which requires developments give priority to pedestrians and cycle movements and create places that are safe, secure and attractive for all users. There is also a huge worry on emergency vehicles having access to the site in a timely manner. Serious concerns regarding access for emergency services and safety management of construction traffic is in conflict with NPPF paragraph 111 which advises that development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. NPPF paragraph 112 which stresses the need for developments to enable safe and suitable access for all users and minimise conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians is not being met as stated in my reasons therefore I strongly object to the proposed vehicular access and ask the planning authority to reconsider a solution that ensures both safe pedestrian connectivity and appropriate vehicle access without compromising the surrounding residential streets.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Sam Greatorex	Response-01695	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Sandra Cooke	Response-01613	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Sarah Favell	Response-00038	Again, sandiacre is not fit for the amount of traffic going through the village, there are a number of schools in the local area
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Sarah Harrison	Response-01658	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	S Bryne	Response-01677	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Sebastian Roberts	Response-01675	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Shanead Ligton	Response-01689	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Shannon moss	Response-00454	Similar to my previous point, the roads are not wide enough and in need of repair due to pot holes etc, you've allowed a huge construction site of warehouses, factories to take place between ilkeston and sandiacre with the only through route to the m1 being sandoacre meaning this alongside the extra traffic from this housing will cause the roads to even worse
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Shannon Robinson	Response-01635	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Sharon Grant	Response-00219	Pulling out and around bends you are doing so blind, it's very dangerous. With all the extra traffic that will be generated, the roads are so congested, people are turning around on the lanes to find an alternative route, again. very dangerous as vehicles do tend to drive as speed on the lanes.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	sharon thornhill	Response-00448	roads are already busy around the proposed site and there is the safety on roads to consider especially around the primary school just down from the site
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Sharon weston	Response-00440	To many cars which results in children not being safe on paths,kids walking on rds cus cars are parked on paths,wheelchairs n disabled people struggle,dog walkers walking in rds n struggle to cross the easiest of rds because of traffic
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Shaun Green	Response-01773	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Sheila	Response-00587	Strategic Policy 17 acknowledges that the local road network requires upgrading. However, there is limited physical space to accommodate such improvements, particularly at known bottlenecks such as Clowes Road and the junction with Coronation Avenue. These areas are already hazardous, especially for schoolchildren walking to Risley School. Increased vehicular traffic would significantly heighten the risk to pedestrians, including vulnerable road users such as children. There is no clear plan to mitigate these risks. There have already been RTC deaths in sandiacre. When the Lorry park has been completed there will be added road safety concerns too.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Sheila Payne	Response-01782	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Sian Knox	Response-01679	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	S Leek	Response-01737	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Sonya Birkin	Response-01656	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Sophie Bennett	Response-01631	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Sophie Farnsworth	Response-01913	Roads are already too busy & will lead to the inevitable increase in accidents (& potholes).
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Stephen Davies	Response-00214	Cloudside Road and Larch Drive already seriously congested with parked vehicles and road layout (sharp bend)
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Stephen Sacker	Response-01598	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Steve Bilbie	Response-00285	The roads are narrow and sharp bends with public access to the ancient wood on a blind bend. The risk to the public is going to be huge and could lead to serious injuries and potentially death.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Steven Wiseman	Response-00452	With narrow roads and more parked cars on the pavements, this is making roads already difficult to traverse especially for wheelchair users. Increasingly you have to mount the curb to let buses pass
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Steve Whittaker	Response-01781	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Stuart Pensom	Response-00049	Not enough safe place to cross roads near schools. Speed of some of vehicles is horrendous and speed cameras not working
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Sue Harrison	Response-01629	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Susanne Beaven	Response-01618	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Sylvia Plampin	Response-00624	No road safety measures in place. Lots of young children around, cars always parked dangerously.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Tamara Partridge	Response-01780	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Tarnya Hinman	Response-01786	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Thomas Ilett	Response-01088	As highlighted in Traffic Congestion, parking congestion is a already a prevalent issue in Sandiacre, with emphasis on the surrounding area to the proposed housing development. In particular the parking outside the shop on Stanton Road, Cloudside school on Stanton Road (at drop off/pick up times), Sandiacre Town Football Club on Stanton Road (during match days/events) and the Scout Hut on Stanton Road is very poor and often illegal at times. The parking in its current state is dismal and often results in dangerous situations and near misses. The proposed housing would further exacerbate this problem parking, further increasing potential to dangerous situations. Furthermore Cloudside School currently has no Road Safety mitigation in place. There are no Zebra Crossings, Pelican Crossings, Traffic Lights or any approved crossings. 180 new houses nearby will result in increased traffic on Stanton Road and higher demand on Cloudside school itself. With no improvement in approved Crossings, this exposes children, parents, carers and the general public to a greater danger risk to what can already be a dangerous situation. In order to remedy this, it is likely the council will be required to improve Road Safety solutions in the area at potential great financial cost.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Tim Derbyshire	Response-01681	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Tim Gough	Response-00996	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Toby Moran	Response-01769	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Tom Ball	Response-01672	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Tony Weston	Response-00990	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Tracey Howe	Response-01860	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Tracey Hughes	Response-01699	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Tracy Jones	Response-00436	The access brings most of the new cars past the junior school which is an accident waiting to happen each day
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Trevor Rowston	Response-01678	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Tricia Herbert	Response-00944	Traffic around the local school in the area is already causing safety concerns and these roads simply cannot take anymore traffic
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Try church	Response-00033	Heavy traffic in the Larch Drive and Cloudside areas will put children at risk who currently enjoy a relatively quiet area in which to play.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Tyler Hobbs	Response-00879	An increase of this scale could introduce hundreds of additional vehicles to local roads daily, significantly raising the risk of accidents?particularly on narrow residential streets like Cloud Side Road and Larch Drive, which are already struggling with congestion. These roads often lack proper pedestrian pathways, traffic calming measures, or sufficient visibility at junctions, making them unsafe under current conditions, let alone with a surge in traffic. More cars also mean more potential conflicts with pedestrians, school children, cyclists, and emergency services trying to navigate the area quickly and safely. Without substantial improvements to infrastructure, the influx of vehicles would increase the likelihood of collisions, pose a greater risk to vulnerable road users, and reduce the overall safety and livability of the community.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Vanessa Asbach	Response-00700	The roads are not designed for the amount of cars coming and going in this area. Peak times such as school pick up and drop off are already ridiculous with people parking all over and illegally, making the walk for children unnecessarily dangerous
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Verity Lamb	Response-01298	probability says that more cars on the road increases the chances of an accident in some way
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Vickie Wright	Response-01552	More traffic increased the risk of accidents, particularly in areas near schools, pedestrian crossings and narrow residential streets. The added pressure could turn quiet, safe neighbourhoods into hazardous zones for children, cyclists, elderly residents and pets.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Vicky	Response-00485	Why destroy more green belt when there are houses empty!! We already have the local hotels filled with immigrants where does it end . Already a cut through to Stanton , local schools are going to be impacted on added road usages
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Victoria Abraham	Response-01652	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Victoria Galpin-shrimpton	Response-01009	Green Belt ? You should be protecting the green belt, it provides recreation & wellbeing to everyone as well as animals, insects, amphibians, lizards and birds. There are plenty of alternative more suitable sites. Landscape- This proposal will change the existing beautiful landscape forever and turn it into a sterile concrete jungle. The fantastic views across the parishes and its beautiful walk will be destroyed and the skyline blotted out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Victoria Greatorex	Response-01730	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Victoria Marriott	Response-00674	My main concern is the suitability of the access to the proposed site. It's a very narrow road with several sharp bends and a sharp incline. I use this road on a daily basis to collect my friend's son to take him to school. It's always a struggle to get up the road, I find it very hard to believe that any type of commercial lorry would be able to get up there safely. The bus route misses this area for this very reason. Existing roads are steep, rising to 80m, twisted and narrow road with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak times traffic congregates on Stanton road and it's dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloudside road is unsuitable for the volume and size of vehicles required to complete this project.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Vivien Davis	Response-01582	Existing roads are steep rising to 80m, twisted and narrow with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak time traffic congregates along Stanton Road and it is dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloud side Road is unsuitable for this volume of traffic. The presence of heavy duty construction vehicles would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Wayne Major	Response-00408	Please see comments on congestion. I wish to object to the currently proposed vehicular access for this development. Based on the plans, the access appears to be significantly constrained. Even with the removal of trees and the construction of the highway over existing root zones which should be protected the widest achievable opening is only 5.7 metres with the current gate being only 2.7m. This also assume they own the current land to achieve the 5.7m. A two-way road typically requires a width of 5.5 to 7.3 metres, plus space for a pedestrian footpath. Therefore even with the absolute minimum road width just after a bend this proposal fails to allow for safe pedestrian access alongside vehicle movement. As a result, the development of 180 homes would leave residents without a safe pedestrian route in or out of the site. This conflicts with NPPF Paragraph 110, which requires developments to give priority to pedestrian and cycle movements and create places that are safe, secure and attractive for all users. Additionally, the route leading to the site from the main road consists of narrow residential streets, which are frequently lined with parked cars. There is existing evidence of buses getting stuck, indicating that large vehicles including construction traffic would be unable to safely navigate these roads. I am also concerned that a fire engine or ambulance would struggle to access the site in a timely manner due to these same constraints, particularly where parked cars restrict manoeuvrability. This raises serious concerns regarding access for emergency services and the safe management of construction traffic, in conflict with NPPF Paragraph 111, which advises that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. The proposed development will also increase the number of vehicles using these currently quiet roads. At present, drivers patiently wait for one another to pass parked vehicles. However, with significantly more traffic generated by 180 homes, the parked cars that currently cause little disruption are likely to create congestion and hazards for pedestrians. This runs counter to NPPF Paragraph 112, which stresses the need for developments to enable safe and suitable access for all users and to minimise conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians. For all of these reasons, I strongly object to the proposed vehicular access arrangement and urge the planning authority to reconsider a solution that ensures both safe pedestrian connectivity and appropriate vehicle access, without compromising the surrounding residential streets.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	William Marriott	Response-00676	Road Safety Existing roads are steep, rising to 80m, twisted and narrow road with blind corners, little visibility and parked cars to contend with. At peak times traffic congregates on Stanton road and it's dangerous to attempt crossing the road. Access via the narrow cart track at the top of Larch Drive and Cloudside road is unsuitable for the volume and size of vehicles required to complete this project.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Road Safety	Zoe Hughes	Response-01919	Access will not be viable via Cloudside Road due to the narrow & steep nature. No bus access. Restricted parking. Dangerous & not accessible in snow and ice.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Aaron Locksley	Response-00711	I have heard the nearby schools are already at capacity, what is being done around the local area to increase capacity of the education system?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Alexander Love	Response-00626	Schools full already
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Alice Ilett	Response-00571	My daughter is too young to know too much about the school capacity. However building that amount of houses in a small area without any infrastructure improvements is concerning.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Amy Cray	Response-01223	My kids school is already oversubscribed
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Amy Skinner	Response-01447	Schools in the area are, I believe at or close to full capacity and potential residents would struggle to find places for their children at the local schools.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Anastasia Anthony	Response-01865	Town + Country Planning Act 1990 indicates planning authorities must ensure developments are supported by adequate infrastructures. Schools are already overcrowded but the public hasn't been presented with plans to combat this.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Andrew Marvin	Response-00255	I have no ideas how the three local schools can cope with this capacity !!! The parking outside the schools is already so dangerous So much illegal parking when children are being dropped off and collected at present causes gridlock
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Andria Nyilasi	Response-00672	Local schools are full and there are no plans for a school in this development, which will increase parents' need to drive to other areas.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Angela Whitehead	Response-00544	The schools in Sandiacre have not increased in size in the 50years I have lived in Sandiacre we've seen the Springfield Park development, Bridge Street development how much more can these schools absorb
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Annabel Marriott	Response-00760	Cloudside Academy's current new year 3 group is at full capacity. Will extra residents in this small town be able to cope with the pressure of more children? Will my children's education be negatively affected by this increase?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Anne Butler	Response-00385	Local schools are already full.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Anne Castledine	Response-00499	The schools are full of now, dropping off and picking up times on Stanton Road should be avoided now.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Anne Jenkins	Response-00350	Scrolls are already over subscribed
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Annette Jones	Response-00961	The schools are already to capacity in this area and further influx is bound to impact on the quality of education delivered. It is not right that children have to be split up to go to different schools of the same age group.
	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Ann Foxall	Response-00748	overloading facilities such as schools
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Anthony Smedlewick	Response-01877	Lady down the road says her kids class is already stretched.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	April	Response-00469	An influx of new residents will place a serious strain on our local schools, many of which are already operating near or at full capacity. Without significant investment in new facilities, staff, and resources, the quality of education will decline as classrooms become overcrowded and teachers are stretched too thin. This impacts not only the incoming families but also the current students, who may face larger class sizes, reduced individual attention, and fewer extracurricular opportunities. For families like mine who are already part of the school system, this raises serious concerns about the long-term educational outcomes for our children.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	A R Gregory	Response-01918	
	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Barbara and John Morrell	Response-00509	Building these houses will surely have an impact on schools in the area. I hope this factor will be taken into consideration.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Barbara Warton	Response-01886	Can't facilitate any more.
	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	ben riley	Response-00607	Adding housing comes with the need of providing extra infrastructure to the community. I doubt there are plans to support this.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Bill Meadwell	Response-00864	The local junior school, Cloudside, is full. If children have to attend other schools, they will not be willing or able to walk that distance and would have to rely on parents? cars to get there and back.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Britta Solloway	Response-00959	Not enough capacity at schools now
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Callum binnall	Response-00460	Another perfect reason to not want any more houses built as how would my son get a placement in ladycross or cloudside.
	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Caroline Blackmore	Response-00451	Schools are already seeing an increase due to the new homes built off Longmoor Lane which is mainly social housing
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Caroline Driver	Response-00618	I live on Beech Avenue and when we moved here over 5 years ago, I couldn't get places for my 4 children at cloudside school at the bottom of the street, they had to go to school in stapleford.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Catherine Greenaway	Response-00429	The local schools are already at capacity and with the extra children from the new houses could make it that not all children in the catchment area will get a place.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Catherine Richardson	Response-00531	The local school would not be able to accommodate so many new pupils
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Charlotte Hunter	Response-01376	Not enough space for further families to live here - schools have reached max capacity.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Chris Hume	Response-01373	The congestion at School start and finish times is horrendous now, I avoid going out at these times, the cars park everywhere, this development with make it worse
	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Christine Anderson	Response-00484	Our schools are already full to capacity and lack of teachers is an ongoing problem.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Christine Gough	Response-00578	We have 3 schools in Sandiacre . All full and after speaking to some people who say that they cannot get their children into these and have to travel to other ones in neighbouring areas . How can these cope with more children !? There is no more room ! If they have to be ferried to other schools that would be more problems for traffic already critical here .
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Claire binnall	Response-00459	There are no spaces for these extra children you are having brothers and sisters split up from the same families and sent to other school because we cannot accommodate the children in the area
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Clair Ellis	Response-00475	Another 180 house with the possibility of 180 children, which school are they going to go to? Our local infants and junior schools will not have the capacity.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Clare franks	Response-00498	Cloudside academy has had to increase the number of classes this year to cope with the increased number of children, how much more can they accommodate. Ladycross has had previous years of full capacity. What provision is being made for new children going to school in the area?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Colin Billington	Response-00227	Schools not big enough
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Colin Marriott	Response-00686	All the local schools are full. Some Sandiacre residents are having to send their children to schools in Stapleford and beyond.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Courtney Bennett	Response-00593	schools are already underfunded, overran, uncontrollable students, under resourced so presumably a least a minimum of 2 nurseries, 2 primary schools and 2 secondary schools are going to be built and included in this plan to accommodate for the increase education needs as well as help with the already struggling education sectors in the area? Education is so important. Why don't we spend the time educating the current residents and children on the green spaces we have left. Provide education on how to look after our planet environment and wildlife. Provide a public greenhouse or allotments for the residents to have and use to assist with mental & physical health, to provide education to the younger generations to provide education to growing fruit and vegetables while keeping a safe space for wildlife to thrive.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Craig Freeman	Response-01561	Cloudside Academy is a great school and already seems to be bursting at the seams to accommodate the number of children that wish to attend. I don't see how this could accommodate more children from the new development without having to extend and reduce the green space the children enjoy on the existing school premises.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	DAllen	Response-00525	School placement always an issue and class sizing will also be affected and not conducive to learning
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Daniel	Response-00545	Local primary and secondary schools are already at or near capacity. The influx of families from 180 new homes will put unsustainable pressure on these facilities. There is no evidence in the planning documents that new educational infrastructure will be created or that schools have room to expand.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Daniel Hands	Response-00057	Where will the extra children go? The schools we have, are already very nearly at full capacity. To increase this capacity would mean exceeding their already over stretched resources. Classes are already overwhelmed, teachers do not have enough time to dedicate quality 1-2-1 support for students as it is. The resources schools have available and the budgets allowed do not lend themselves to delivering quality curriculum and development of our youngsters as they are now. To simply add to these dynamics will only serve to further dilute and weaken an already overstretched system.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Danielle Harrison	Response-00568	Cloudside primary school and Friesland Secondary School are already popular and over subscribed schools. The local amenities do not support an additional 180 family unit in the area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Daniel Naylor	Response-00680	Current school allocations are already in short supply without an extra 180 new homes to add to that. Youngsters from nearby towns are students at sandiacre freisland school due to this problem and with 2300 homes approved for development in the 2022 Erewash core strategy in neighbouring kirk hallam and Stanton, parents getting their children into their first choice school would be an impossibility. As I've stated above, I live in nearby Ilkeston where first choice secondary school places are not a guarantee, as I found out when my children didn't get their first-choice school, but they were lucky enough to get their second-choice school in the same town. Some children in my area had to go as far as their third choice which means daily commutes over to the secondary school in sandiacre (sandiacre friesland school). As you could imagine, this has a knock-on effect to the children of sandiacre as they're forced to travel further afield to schools in neighbouring towns due to schools' capacity unable to meet the local population demands. 180 new homes in the area would exacerbate this issue further which would mean more children having to commute to other towns at peak times, adding to the traffic problem I stated at the start of this objection.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Darran and Emma Rea	Response-00597	The local schools in the area are already at full capacity, even local residents struggle to get their child into these schools, the development will house families so where will their children go
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	David Fry	Response-00596	The local schools are already at full capacity and in use evenings and weekends too. The Cloudside Academy on Stanton Road is open until the early evening for after school and swimming clubs.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	David Tindsley	Response-00515	I wish to object to the proposed development on the grounds of insufficient local school capacity to accommodate the likely increase in pupil numbers. I believe that Cloudside School is currently operating at capacity, and I understand that other nearby schools are in a similar position. While there is some indication that pupil numbers may fall in the future, we have yet to see any significant evidence of this locally, and any such changes would take time to materialise. An additional 180 dwellings would undoubtedly bring more families to the area, many with school-aged children. Without proper forward planning and investment in additional classroom space, local schools will be unable to provide the places required. This could result in children being allocated places far from their homes, creating further strain on transport infrastructure and undermining the principle of community-based education. This situation is contrary to Paragraph 95 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which states that "it is important that a sufficient choice of school places is available to meet the needs of existing and new communities" and that local authorities should take a proactive approach to ensuring this. I therefore urge the planning authority to ensure that any future development is matched by appropriate investment in education infrastructure, including the expansion of existing schools such as Cloudside, so that we are in a position to accommodate new pupils without impacting the quality of education provided. Until such assurances and plans are in place, I must object to this development on the basis that the local education system is not currently equipped to support it.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Dean Peake-Whitehurst	Response-00488	Having just started a family, this is a major concern for us. School places are already low and adding close to 200 new homes will inevitable worsen this situation
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Debra Michell	Response-01346	Only having 3 schools which are over subscribed, how do you make more spaces for more children.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Debra Scully	Response-00288	Very limited spaces at Cloudside academy and Ladycross school. However Friesland school is always over subscribed
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Debs Washer	Response-00487	Cloudside school is already over subscribed, additional housing will cause more pressure on an already at capacity school
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Denise bennett	Response-00030	There are only 2 primaries and high school they will struggle to maintain standards
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Denise Creasey	Response-00786	Consideration needs to be made for increased capacity at the local schools for years ahead.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Derrick Hunt	Response-00437	I don't think we have capacity In the schools if these are homes built for family's with average 2 children per household
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Diane Mcmorrow	Response-00433	Schools are already overwhelmed local children having to go alternative schools surely they should be prioritise
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Diane Meadwell	Response-00807	The local junior school is fully subscribed and other schools in the area are a long way from the proposed development. This would lead to more car journeys and greater congestion in an already over used road system in the surrounding area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Donna Steele	Response-00781	Building 180 houses will put so much pressure on our local schools which are already over stretched. There just isn't the places in our local schools for more children who could possibly move into the area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Dorothy Deeprise	Response-00817	You would need to build a new school to take the extra people
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Emily	Response-01880	Not enough room in schools or doctors now!!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Emma Ryan	Response-00503	Ladycross Infant School and Cloudside Academy are already full schools. Where would the children of these extras homes go for education? There is not the schooling capacity for them.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Emma Wall	Response-00319	There's no way the schools can cope with this
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Emma Wilson	Response-01222	If you are planning to build schools as part of it then it's mad. Class sizes are already huge and children are not getting into preferred schools
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Fay Cresswell	Response-00701	Unknown if the school can cope

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Geoff Tindsley	Response-00755	I wish to object to the proposed development on the grounds of insufficient local school capacity to accommodate the likely increase in pupil numbers. 1. I believe that Cloudside Academy is currently operating at capacity, and I understand that other nearby schools are in a similar position. While there is some indication that pupil numbers may fall in the future, we have yet to see any significant evidence of this locally, and any such changes would take time to materialise. 2. An additional 180 dwellings would undoubtedly bring more families to the area, many with school-aged children. Without proper forward planning and investment in additional classroom space, local schools will be unable to provide the places required. This could result in children being allocated places far from their homes, creating further strain on transport infrastructure and undermining the principle of community-based education. I must object to this development on the basis that the local education system is not currently equipped to support it.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Georgia Marvin	Response-00261	There are three schools in the town of Sandiacre. An infant, primary and secondary. Which partners have to fight for a place for their children to attend. The schools are overran, overworked, overpopulated as it is. With 180 new homes being built, how many more children will we need to make room for? How are teachers supposed to stretch their very already limited time for? And what about the children the schools already host? Will they be neglected and overlooked to make way for new children? I will be interested how the government plan to solve this creeping issue?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Gordon Bruce	Response-01455	Residents already struggle and worry about there being a place for their child in over subscribed schools and nurseries. This would make the problem worse.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Greg Watts	Response-00733	The proposed number of houses would place unsustainable pressure on local infrastructure, including schools
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Helen	Response-00883	Schools are already up to capacity. Further housing will bring more children which when the schools are full will need to go to schools further afield causing more traffic issues
			Helen Gillain	Response-00964	Schools would be stretched to cope with the extra pupils this would create
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Helen whiteman	Response-00447	The local schools are full to capacity already. Where are all the extra children going to go
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Ian	Response-00493	Increase in population will put further strain on freisland school which already has high class numbers and not enough classrooms
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Ian herbert	Response-00939	cloudside school is already at capacity with an ever widening catchment area and significant traffic issues on stanton road.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	IAN TAYLOR	Response-00972	If the development goes ahead with 180 units, it is unlikely that the current schools in the area will be able to absorb the increased numbers of students expected to be living in a development of that size.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Ian telfer	Response-00991	Schools here are already at capacity and taking kids from ockbrook and Spondon now
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Isabelle Love	Response-00529	Obvious issues with the introduction of 180 houses. Stretch services stretch even thinner, the schools seem to only just be recovering (I have lived here my whole life and attended Friesland school from 2004-2009 - the teachers struggled back then with classes of 30, pupils are failed there).
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Isobel Ball	Response-01092	Our schools are already far above max capacity, especially with the recent influx of asylum seekers taking up housing in erewash. There simply isn't enough room, children living here already are struggling to secure spots in our schools and are having to redirect to the next closest catchment areas. It is unfair to have more children who currently and have always lived here being moved to various other schools because of a sudden increase in population. Particularly for cloudside. It is equally unfair for families moving into these new planned houses to have to send their children to school far away because they cannot rely on convenience.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Jacqueline Marshall	Response-01436	Have local schools and childcare facilities been advised in advance of the influx of children and are they fully equipped and financially stable enough to handle the increase.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Jane Dennett	Response-00965	Worried re school placements as most at capacity . Where's funding for new schools !!! I know how hard for schooling as my granddaughter does 4 bus journeys a day.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Jane Elizabeth Tindsley	Response-00669	I wish to object to the proposed development on the grounds of insufficient local school capacity to accommodate the likely increase in pupil numbers. I believe that Cloudside School is currently operating at capacity, and I understand that other nearby schools are in a similar position. While there is some indication that pupil numbers may fall in the future, we have yet to see any significant evidence of this locally, and any such changes would take time to materialise. An additional 180 dwellings would undoubtedly bring more families to the area, many with school-aged children. Without proper forward planning and investment in additional classroom space, local schools will be unable to provide the places required. This could result in children being allocated places far from their homes, creating further strain on transport infrastructure and undermining the principle of community-based education. This situation is contrary to Paragraph 95 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which states that 'It is important that a sufficient choice of school places is available to meet the needs of existing and new communities?' and that local authorities should take a proactive approach to ensuring this. I therefore urge the planning authority to ensure that any future development is matched by appropriate investment in education infrastructure, including the expansion of existing schools such as Cloudside, so that we are in a position to accommodate new pupils without impacting the quality of education provided. Until such assurances and plans are in place, I must object to this development on the basis that the local education system is not currently equipped to support it.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Janet Edwards	Response-01906	Services are already overstretched & the proposed building would put even more pressure on them.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Jane Warton	Response-00662	A strain on schools
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Janice West	Response-00989	School places will be much harder to secure with more residents.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Jeffrey Whittaker	Response-00594	Three local schools are at full capacity as it is

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Jennifer Tindley	Response-00751	I wish to object to the proposed development on the grounds of insufficient local school capacity to accommodate the likely increase in pupil numbers. 1. I believe that Cloudside Academy is currently operating at capacity, and I understand that other nearby schools are in a similar position. While there is some indication that pupil numbers may fall in the future, we have yet to see any significant evidence of this locally, and any such changes would take time to materialise. 2. An additional 180 dwellings would undoubtedly bring more families to the area, many with school-aged children. Without proper forward planning and investment in additional classroom space, local schools will be unable to provide the places required. This could result in children being allocated places far from their homes, creating further strain on transport infrastructure and undermining the principle of community-based education. I must object to this development on the basis that the local education system is not currently equipped to support it.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Joanna hardy	Response-01304	Both ladycross infant school and cloudside junior school are at capacity. Building so many new homes would bring more families into the area who would need school places. Ladycross, in particular, has little to no capacity for expansion so would be unable to accommodate more children. So forcing more traffic onto the roads with parents having to drive their children further afield for a placement.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Joanne Johnson	Response-00765	The capacities for our local schools are nearly full, class sizes are already too large generally.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Joanne Lambert	Response-00494	Friesland school is planning on building a new school, when this is completed the class sizes are going to be around 40 pupils. Extra housing in the area is going to impact our children's education as resources are going to have to go even further.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Jodie Shrive	Response-00601	As you will be aware Sandiacre is a small town with very few schools, the school system in this area is already experiencing too high of a demand for the level of children in the area. Adding another 180 homes will put an enormous amount of pressure on schools and children will end up missing out on crucial education. Cloudside school is the only junior school within this catchment area and already in the mornings & afternoons almost entirely closes the road with the amount of traffic that already exists while parents are dropping off and collecting their children, there isn't physically room for any more.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Jo Gerhardt	Response-01286	Overcrowding of schools in an already overly populated area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	John whiteman	Response-00450	Schools are bursting to capacity already where will the extra children go
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Karen Alldread	Response-01868	The 3 local schools in Sandiacre are at full capacity, therefore could not take the strain of additional numbers. The consequences of this oversubscription are significant. Our schools are struggling to provide the individual attention and resources that our children deserve. Further strain on these already stretched resources will undoubtedly impact the quality of education and the overall learning environment.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Karen Evans	Response-00523	More pressure on already stretched services.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Karen Pitts	Response-00643	Ladycross, Cloudside and Friesland schools are already full to the brim with teachers totally overloaded and at times unable to cope. My daughter completed her PGCE internship at one of these schools so has first hand knowledge. She was there to learn the craft of teaching however her mentor rarely had time to give advice or reflect on practice (a vital part of the learning) due to the large class sizes and workload. There is also a high turnover of staff because these issues are making retention of good teachers harder and harder. An inevitable increase in the number of children to this catchment will only add to this predicament.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Kathryn Martin	Response-00527	Schools already at capacity
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Katie Morrice	Response-00664	The area surrounding beech avenue and station Road are significantly higher during school times and the traffic around the area already is an issue due to the on street parking just across from the school. The potential of adding a number of homes with families in will increase the commotion around this area especially during school times and elevating the risk of pedestrian safety, particularly for children.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Kelly Randall	Response-00591	Ladycross Infant School is already oversubscribed and spatially constrained. No clear plans exist to expand school capacity. Have local schools outside the borough been consulted?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Kerry stokes	Response-00769	We have spoken to the school near us (cloud side) & they are already at full capacity. Where are more children going to attend school?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Kim	Response-00473	Not enough local schools to cope with extra children to educate
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Kimberley Selby	Response-00478	Means more families fighting to get their kids into their local school and having to travel further afield when they can't
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Kim Helm	Response-00632	Schools will be oversubscribed and giving substandard education
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Kirk Moss	Response-00439	Local schools are already overburdened. The proposed development will increase demand on school places, resulting in longer waiting lists and stretched resources.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Lauren Freeman	Response-01562	I know from enrolling my year 3 age daughter at Cloudside that this school year is at capacity. These children have another 3 years at the school so no other children can join this school year. I cannot comment on whether the other years are full.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Lauren Rose	Response-01446	There is only 1 secondary school and a handful of primary and pre-school settings for the existing children in the area. A further 180 homes would place further strain on already underfunded education settings. There is also an ongoing teaching recruitment and retention crisis in education which may mean that students do not have the qualified staff in front of them.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Leah morral	Response-00712	Schools are already at capacity, where are the children to these families going to go?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Lesley Bruce	Response-01397	Local parents already wait with bated breath to see if their child has been awarded a place at a school they can walk to. How much worse would the situation be if the children applying from an extra 180 homes are factored in? There is simply no capacity in schools or nurseries.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	lilly stokes	Response-00767	In my school all of my classes are already so full and adding 180 more houses with no other school this will massively increase the amount of students here and make the school quality even worse than it already is. At the moment my lunch time is only 30 minutes as they don't have enough space for a lot of people in the hall at a time, if there is more students coming to the school our lunch time will decrease after it already being such a short amount of time and the classes will become increasingly difficult to study in.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Linda Allen	Response-01904	
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Linda Castledine-Davies	Response-00850	All local schools are at full capacity and could not absorb another estimated 300 plus children (ONS data).
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Linda Oscroft	Response-01927	We see no spare capacity in the health care facilities, nor schools to accommodate increased demand generated from the addition of high density housing residents.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Lisa Heppell	Response-00878	Cloudside school and Friesland school are running at full capacity
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Logan Fox	Response-00746	I go to school at Bramcote College and I think the school is full. Classrooms have a lot of kids already.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Lorraine Hands	Response-00534	Having Granchildren and also teachers in the family knowing how schools are already stretched the idea of such an increase even if it was on 2-3 a class would effect there education!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Louise dix	Response-00975	Where are all the extra kids gonna go with most local schools at capacity
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Louise Harper	Response-01571	The schools are at capacity and more increase will be detrimental to the area, more cars dropping kids off as nobody seems to walk to school anymore, kids never look when getting out of school , more traffic on already crowded roads will be an increase in accidents
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Louise Robinson	Response-00647	Schools in the area are already very busy.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Lucy johnson	Response-01369	My son attends Cloudside Academy! He is currently in year 4 and he is in a class of 32! To me that is absolutely absurd! He and his classmates aren't going to get the full benefit of what they need to learn to further their educations! It's absolutely mental to add more children to the already overcrowded schools!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	lucy victoria garner	Response-00949	local schools already at capacity risk of quality of learning and teaching being reduced by over filled school classes and dilution of support for teaching
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Lynsey Blackburn	Response-01227	Extra developments cause extra strain on public services. No more school places are made available for the additional housing being created.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Malcolm Dillon	Response-00722	The schools in the Sandiacre township are already running at maximum capacity. This proposed development does nothing to provide additional resources to the township and would create hardship to all current, and new, residents with families requiring school services.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Malcolm Fox	Response-00215	Most schools in the area are already at capacity and although there will almost always be some spaces, 180 homes with an average of 1.74 per children per home equals almost 320 extra places. All this will result in, is a lack of required school spaces locally and people having to travel further out to get their children to school. More traffic, more travelling only supporting more CO2 emissions linked to poor air quality, more congestion on the already struggling roads in peak time. Again, infrastructure needs to be in place, not simply adding more pressure on the local area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Marcel Janovsky	Response-00481	No school capacity
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Mark Gough	Response-00888	Where are the children going to go from the 180 proposed houses ? The schools are already at full capacity, locals are having trouble getting their children in . I spoke to someone who lives on Maple Avenue and they cannot get their children into the schools in Sandiacre and have to travel out of the area . It's so not thought out at all !
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	mark skelton	Response-01341	Already very busy schools. Not much space left.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Mark Warton	Response-00693	Schools: how is the current Education System in the area going to cope, it will be playing with our children's education, this cannot be right.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Marta McManus	Response-00646	There are other property developments at the moment in Sandiacre (Gas street, Longmoor lane) which will contribute to the school numbers which are already stretched. Cloudside school already lost lots of funding for SEN pupils
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Martin Driver	Response-01387	Schools are already oversubscribed and classes oversized! . Where's are these children going to go to school
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Martin Hardy	Response-01413	Ladycross infant school and cloudside junior school are both full to capacity. Ladycross is a small site and as a result has no additional space to expand. So cannot increase the number of children it could take. 180 extra houses would naturally include families with young children. Where would these children go to school?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Martyn Locker	Response-00903	I'm not a parent and so I can't speak for how easy or hard it may be to place a child into a school, or average class sizes etc, but additional residents will of course increase demand and put a strain on schools. 180 houses could in theory bring 360 children into the area - do our local schools have the capacity, facilities and staff to give these young people, that will form our future, a fighting chance to excel during these crucial years of their lives? Even one or two years of delays in bringing school capacity and quality up to a required standard to accommodate the additional children would not only have a huge knock on effect on their lives, but think about the long-term. Poorly educated children are more likely to end up in less skilled and lesser paying jobs, or unemployed, which has the twofold impact on our local economy and additional reliance on government services for decades to come.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Matt Hallam	Response-00476	This could cause schools to be possible over capacity and with the likes of ladycross being a small school, they cannot build bigger. Cloudside and friesland might be ok tho
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Matthew Buckland	Response-00615	The schools in the area are already at capacity, with no possibility of increasing. This will mean additional traffic on the roads, as children will need to be driven to alternative schools.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Melanie	Response-00586	Ladycross Infant School is already operating at or near capacity and cannot be easily expanded due to site constraints. The nearby Cloudside Academy is also under pressure. The proposed development would significantly increase demand for school places, and no concrete plans or funding commitments have been provided to address this issue. Traffic from parents is unmanageable currently never mind adding to it.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Melanie Caumont	Response-01272	Local schools are already at or near capacity. With 180 new homes, potentially housing over 300 children, there will be significant strain on school places. No provision has been made for new educational infrastructure, meaning families may be forced to send children far outside the area, undermining community cohesion and increasing traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Michael Anderson	Response-00461	Will the schools be able to accommodate more students with the problem of insufficient teachers?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Michael Oscroft	Response-01926	We see no spare capacity in the health care facilities, nor schools to accommodate increased demand generated from the addition of high density housing residents.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Michelle Ledger	Response-00815	there a few schools in the area, having spoken personally to some of the mums there is major concerns that there simply is not enough capacity to support additional children should 180 houses be built, they would indeed end up having to travel outside the area for schooling, this in addition means driving as walking them wouldnt be an option, which then only adds to traffic conjection
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Mike Darnell	Response-00698	Cloudside junior school is full to capital
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Molly Newbold	Response-00486	Our kids will probably no longer get into the local school because there will be no extra school or development to take another 360 kids, if each household has average of 2 per family.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Mr Colin Key	Response-01841	Existing limited amenities that are already stretched to capacity and fully subscribed ie Schools.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Mr K Gubb	Response-01838	Existing limited amenities that are already stretched to capacity and fully subscribed ie Schools.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Mrs Froggatt	Response-00449	Schools are already at full capacity. More pupils will effect our children's education
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Mrs Lee Farabella	Response-01899	180+ houses will put pressure on schools.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Mrs M Burke	Response-01887	More houses will add more pressure on schools.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Mrs Shani Wainwright	Response-00754	The local schools are already under immense strain and are over subscribed,. They do not have the capacity to accommodate the places required that an additional 180 + homes will bring.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Mrs Sheila Hickingbotham	Response-01338	The type of housing proposed would suggest an increase in the number of school age children. Is there sufficient capacity in the three Sandiacre schools to accommodate an increase in pupil numbers?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Mrs Whittaker	Response-00595	The local school is already over subscribed, additional children from the new housing may well mean that children are forced to travel further to obtain places
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Nikki Vincent	Response-00688	Local school?s are likely to struggle to accommodate the influx of families this build will bring. With schools already at capacity and particularly Ladycross infant school which is small and unable to be extended, this is going to cause more problems.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Oliver Marriott	Response-00679	School Capacity School - We only have two schools in sandiacre, one infant, one junior. My understanding is they're current both at capacity - assuming within the new development there will be a percentage of children, where will they go to school? How will you accommodate the, and future children from that development?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Pam shepherd	Response-00453	The schools are already at capacity surely this will only make it worse?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Paula Darnell	Response-00665	Cloudside School is full to capacity
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Paul Randall	Response-00131	Ladycross Infant School is physically constrained in size and often over subscribed. How will you gain extra places? Who will fund them? Other schools are nearby but outside of Erewash. Have you consulted them? Cloudside Academy is on the main road. Have you or the school conducted a risk assessment against traffic increases during construction and later? The local schools (Ladycross, Cloudside) are already at full capacity.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	paul wheeldon	Response-00582	Schools are already at capacity
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Philip Reed	Response-01449	Building 180 new homes will significantly strain local schools, leading to overcrowded classrooms and reduced quality of education. Current infrastructure cannot accommodate the likely increase in student population, risking compromised learning environments, stretched resources, and pressure on staff. Adequate planning and investment must precede any housing expansion to protect educational standards.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Rachel Skelton	Response-01241	Capacity at the local schools is likely to be an issue with an extra 180 houses, meaning children already in the local area may be forced to go out of area for education
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Rcahel Sharp	Response-00652	I hear that school capacity is at a premium locally. Adding more potential pupils will not help this.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Rebecca Longmuir	Response-00253	There is barely enough capacity for the already established people who've been living in Sandiacre for years! Schools and Doctors included. Locals can't get in themselves. Now you want to add in more people when there isn't the room! What about the impact on the locals and the families already here.?!? Good to know ?our local council putting its self first above its PAYING residents??? and ignoring our worries and concerns!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Richard Broughton	Response-01352	Potentially around a 1000 people could live on this proposed development, with possibly 300 children, can the local schools absorb these numbers
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Richard Deeprise	Response-00816	Extra people will put more strain on schools
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Richard Jenkins	Response-00264	Our primary schools are already at capacity, and adding 180 new homes will overload the system.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Richard Marriott	Response-00675	School Capacity School - We only have two schools in sandiacre, one infant, one junior. My understanding is they're current both at capacity - assuming within the new development there will be a percentage of children, where will they go to school? How will you accommodate the, and future children from that development?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Richard Naylor	Response-00066	Where will all of the additional children go to school? Is there capacity?



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Ruby Sharp	Response-00886	We only have one infant school, one junior school and one secondary school in the area. If all 180 houses occupy 2 children, that's 360 school places. Schools do not have the teachers, rooms or funding to deal with this. They also do not have the capacity of 180 cars parked around them for school pick ups/drop offs!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Ryan Selby	Response-00479	More houses, more family?s, more children at the local schools which are already becoming overcrowded
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	S. Brailsford	Response-00598	If 1/2 the proposed houses has 1 child it puts a huge pressure on an already full school system where there is a waiting list to attend. Classes become bigger affecting the children from year 1 all through to the secondary stage. Many pre school nurseries in the area are already full to capacity with a waiting list so additional population will add to the pressure
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Sally Davies	Response-01294	Schools in this area have good reputations and do not need to have their capacity expanded and to lessen the quality of them.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Sally Peake	Response-01893	The schools are already overflowing with immigrant children swelling numbers from social housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Samantha Anne Whitney	Response-00757	Where will the children from these houses go to school? If every house has 2 children that's a extra 360 school spaces. Are there that many spare school places at Ladycross School, Cloudside School and Friesland School? I don't think there is. You can't build all these extra houses without the infrastructure such as schools, doctors, dentists etc in place. Everything is already over subscribed.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Sam Buckland	Response-00600	The schools in the area are already at capacity, with no possibility of increasing. This will mean additional traffic on the roads, as children will need to be driven to alternative schools.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Shannon moss	Response-00454	Within sandiacre their is both only 1 primary and juniors within catchment the rest you have to apply out of catchment, putting further pressures onto other areas for schools. We have 1 nursery and 2 preschools again with the increase in the 30 free hours being made form 9 months plus where are these children going to go?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Sharon weston	Response-00440	Bad enough trying to get kids into schools as it is,let alone there safety going to and from school
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Sheila	Response-00587	Ladycross Infant School is already operating at or near capacity and cannot be easily expanded due to site constraints. The nearby Cloudside Academy is also under pressure. The proposed development would significantly increase demand for school places, and no concrete plans or funding commitments have been provided to address this issue. There will be even more parents driving their children on the school-run which will negatively impact Sandiacre.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Simon Chambers	Response-00668	180 new homes will possibly mean 180 families moving to the area with only one school for each age group with in the towns boundaries, this will put extra pressure on those schools
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Sonny Bestwick	Response-00901	With children at both cloudside and Friesland, we as parents are constantly reminded of school place shortages without the added pressure of yet another 180 plus homes on the doorstep with still a peep to come from the councils about where the residents children will be educated when no extra schools at being planned
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Sophie	Response-00472	School all over Derbyshire are at full capacity, and families are already having to look for schools further away for their children to attend. Adding potentially 200/300 children to the already overpopulated schools in ridiculous
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Stephen Davies	Response-00214	I understand Cloudside Academy to be fully subscribed. Note in addition to this rush hour traffic in area severely impacted by parents dropping off and collecting children. Cloudside School is currently operating at full capacity and an additional 180 dwellings would undoubtedly bring more families to the area. Paragraph 95 states that it is important that a sufficient choice of school places is available to meet the needs of existing and new communities. Without forward planning and investment in additional classroom space this cannot be achieved
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Steve Bilbie	Response-00285	Schools haven?t got the capacity for the increase in children. Schools are already over subscribe.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Stuart Pensom	Response-00049	School are all ready at breaking point. Not enough place
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Susan Heinke	Response-00468	Our schools are already full to capacity with too many children to teachers
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Thomas Ilett	Response-01088	I do not have children of school age and am therefore unsure of school capacity for the local schools. However I reiterate that parking and road safety are already significant problems and pose serious risks for Cloudside School. The proposed housing allocation will significantly worsen this, exacerbating already poor/illegal parking, traffic congestion and danger to children, parents and the public (as mentioned in road safety).
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Tina Mcinerney	Response-00954	Schools already over stretched
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Tony Weston	Response-00990	Our primary schools are already at capacity, and adding several hundred new homes will overload the system, leaving our children with limited educational resources
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Tracy Jones	Response-00436	The school and feeding secondary school is at over capacity
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Tracy Kerry-Cliff	Response-00801	Where is the infrastructure so that current schools, colleges etc aren't overran? This needs to be in place BEFORE any houses are built as immediately there will be children wanting school places that are not available.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Tricia Herbert	Response-00944	Senior school in this area already at breaking point.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Tyler Hobbs	Response-00879	Building 180 new homes on the greenbelt in Sandiacre would significantly impact local schools, particularly Cloudside Academy and Friesland School, both of which are already operating near or at capacity. Cloudside Academy currently has around 300 pupils enrolled. While the school has not been rated as "outstanding," it maintains a "good" Ofsted rating and offers a supportive learning environment. However, the addition of 180 homes would likely increase local demand for primary school places, potentially leading to oversubscription and larger class sizes. This could strain existing resources and impact the quality of education provided. Friesland School, the only secondary school in Sandiacre. Although specific data on its capacity is not readily available, the school's size suggests it is already operating at or near full capacity. An influx of new families would likely exacerbate this situation, leading to increased competition for places, potential overcrowding, and additional pressure on staff and facilities. The proposed development could also affect other nearby schools, such as Ladycross Infant School, which serves children aged 3-7. While specific enrollment numbers are not provided, the addition of 180 homes would likely increase demand for early years education in the area. An influx of families into the area would increase demand for school places?particularly at nearby primary and secondary schools?which could lead to oversubscription, larger class sizes, and reduced quality of education. If local schools are unable to expand due to space or funding limitations, some children may have to travel further afield for their education, putting additional pressure on transport networks and disrupting community cohesion. In summary, the proposed housing development in Sandiacre could place significant pressure on local schools, potentially leading to oversubscription, larger class sizes, and strained resources. Without adequate planning and investment in educational infrastructure, the quality of education for all students could be compromised.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Vanessa Asbach	Response-00700	Schools are already having to have around 30+ children in their classes. If we have an additional influx there will potentially 40+ children per class, making work for teachers even harder and unfortunately impact learning for children more difficult. Teachers will be even less able to focus on children's needs to help them succeed in their learning journey.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Verity Lamb	Response-01298	All local schools are full. Do you intend to build more?
	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Vickie Wright	Response-01552	There is already capacity issues in local schools. There is not enough school places to support another 180 new homes
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Vicky	Response-00485	Why destroy more green belt when there are houses empty!! We already have the local hotels filled with immigrants where does it end . Schools are at full capacity with local students plus immigrants
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Victoria Galpin-shrimpton	Response-01009	I have attached my objections as a list however, my main worry is the introduction of construction traffic and additional lorries and care near an already busy dangerous road near Cloudside Primary School. I have seen many near misses on this road and know it is just a matter of time before a child is injured and with an increase of further traffic it is only a matter of time. Therefore, I would urge you to reconsider adding further traffic to this congested area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Victoria Marriott	Response-00674	School - We only have two schools in sandiacre, one infant, one junior. My understanding is they're current both at capacity - assuming within the new development there will be a percentage of children, where will they go to school? How will you accommodate the, and future children from that development?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	Wayne Major	Response-00408	As a governor at Cloudside School, I wish to object to the proposed development on the grounds of insufficient local school capacity to accommodate the likely increase in pupil numbers. I am fully aware that Cloudside School is currently operating at capacity, and I understand that other nearby schools are in a similar position. While there is some indication that pupil numbers may fall in the future, we have yet to see any significant evidence of this locally, and any such changes would take time to materialise. An additional 180 dwellings would undoubtedly bring more families to the area, many with school-aged children. Without proper forward planning and investment in additional classroom space, local schools will be unable to provide the places required. This could result in children being allocated places far from their homes, creating further strain on transport infrastructure and undermining the principle of community-based education. This situation is contrary to Paragraph 95 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which states that ?it is important that a sufficient choice of school places is available to meet the needs of existing and new communities? and that local authorities should take a proactive approach to ensuring this. I therefore urge the planning authority to ensure that any future development is matched by appropriate investment in education infrastructure, including the expansion of existing schools such as Cloudside, so that we are in a position to accommodate new pupils without impacting the quality of education provided. Until such assurances and plans are in place, I must object to this development on the basis that the local education system is not currently equipped to support it.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	School Capacity	William Marriott	Response-00676	School Capacity School - We only have two schools in sandiacre, one infant, one junior. My understanding is they're current both at capacity - assuming within the new development there will be a percentage of children, where will they go to school? How will you accommodate the, and future children from that development?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Aaron Locksley	Response-00711	Construction traffic will struggle to navigate the busy narrow streets, which the vital bus service struggles with already, often having to get out and knock on people's doors to ask them to move their vehicle, the bus doesn't even go up Cloudside Road. With the addition of 180-360 cars passing by these quiet roads multiple times a day, and the construction traffic, what are the plans for road maintenance?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Adam Shooter	Response-01925	As has been proven by various potholes and small sinkholes opening along Stanton Road our current infrastructure cannot handle current traffic levels let alone more. Traffic can already build on many streets due to car width streets.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Adrian Randall	Response-00463	The proposed location is totally unsuited to further development. The site is only accessed via several small roads at the end of a large estate, the final access road being the smallest. The local already congested roads will not be able to cope with more traffic from 180 new houses crammed into a small space.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	A Harby	Response-01684	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Aimee	Response-00952	Getting out of Sandiacre during rush hour in the morning is already difficult enough as it is. With all these additional homes it will get even worse. There's only a few roads out of Sandiacre and the main routes all have schools along them which make it very difficult to get out. There's long queues of traffic which mean i have to leave much earlier that I should have to just to get to work on time. All these additional homes will have people also needing to commute to work and school which will make the morning congestion unbearable.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Alexander Love	Response-00626	More congestion Rushy Lane
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Alex Corns	Response-01151	I believe traffic to be the biggest issue; far too many vehicles already, even more now with the new development at Stanton. The roads up to Larch Drive and very narrow, steep, with tight bends. You do have to drive mostly on the other side of the road on cloudside road and there is a blind bend which people park on so you are turning without knowing what is coming the other way. If you encounter vehicles larger than you average car, you have to mount the pavement to get through, not ideal at all for the amount of houses being proposed, i assume more people walking up and down the hill. When it snows everyone struggles to get down or up the hill. People end up abandoning their vehicles. It is very tight for the buses, they have to mount the pavement regularly to get past parked vehicles.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Alex Lord	Response-00946	The roads around there already have parking issues and are tight to maneuver through [Stanton, Beech & Coronation] adding an entire housing estate that would have to pass through these roads, will increase congestion, and exceed the capacity for traffic on the road
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Alice Cooper	Response-01721	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Alice Ilett	Response-00571	The area is already heavily congested and I see the i4 get stuck regularly because of the parking/traffic and general lack of infrastructure for the traffic we already have.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Ali Harrison	Response-00947	This proposed development is positioned off a very small access road that will become clogged with vehicles whilst being built and also after with residents cars
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	A Malinski	Response-00620	Any additional traffic heading for the motor way would only impact further on the already congested and at times dangerous numbers. No additional routes showing the traffic flow and therefore none given for comment!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Amanda Leech	Response-01625	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Amelia Loosemore	Response-00537	It will cause more traffic and congestion in the town, which is already a busy town
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Amy Skinner	Response-01447	Traffic in and around the Sandiacre estates up to and including the roads surrounding the green belt land often suffer congestion. Cars are often parked along narrow streets that make it difficult for traffic to get through. This congestion would only get worse with the proposed changes, both during the work being carried out (heavy vehicles travelling to and from the site continually throughout the day) and once the development is complete. Even if each of the 180 households owned just one car that is still far too many to be travelling via Cloudside and Larch Drive. It is folly. This congestion would negatively impact both the residents already living in the area and those that would potentially be moving to the development. It is a logistical nightmare and I fear the consequences should any emergency vehicles need to gain access to any of the affected roads.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Anastasia Anthony	Response-01865	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic. NPPF Paragraph 11: Development should be refused if there is an impact on highway safety. A52 + B5010 get backed up as it is.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Andrew Bishop	Response-01186	We currently live on Town street and already the volume of traffic is excessive following the industrial site development at Stanton therefore anymore building in the area will only lead to further issues of congestion, road safety and emissions to residents of Sandiacre.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Andrew Davies	Response-01295	There is a danger that this will lead to congestion not only on Larch but also on Stanton Rd with implications for the junctions with Rushy Lane & Town St
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Andrew Marvin	Response-00255	Traffic is already an issue , turning into Coronation Avenue and the bend going into Cloudside Road is shocking !! Based on the amount of houses and potential for an extra 250 cars causing more pollution and driving past Cloudside Road everyday is disgusting! 100% accidents will happen I have no idea how the construction traffic will navigate these roads !!!!!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Andrew Meadwell	Response-01654	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Andrew Solloway	Response-00958	Houses without new roads?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Andria Nylasi	Response-00672	The roads to access the site are narrow and winding and would cause major disruption getting up to the site. The main access road is also extremely narrow for heavy plant machinery and lorries causing difficulties for the residents to access and leave their property.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Andy Martin	Response-01761	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Angela Roberts	Response-00681	The area is already congested and more houses will make the situation worse.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Angela Whitehead	Response-00544	Access is restricted to the development and increases existing traffic issues in and around Sandiacre roads especially given the new Stanton Ironworks housing increase. No more traffic through Sandiacre

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Annabel Marriott	Response-00760	The roads around the site are already busy especially due to the amount of parked cars making it difficult to navigate around the roads. An increase in traffic will not help this situation. The main road (Stanton Road) is chaos when it's school times and when Sandiacre town football club is in use. Accidents will happen, people are forced to drive onto the pavements which is also of risk to pedestrians.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Anne Butler	Response-00385	Site access through the back streets of Sandiacre will be a nightmare for anyone living in that area of the town. As it is the narrow streets are difficult to negotiate with all the on road parking that goes on, because when the estate was built, people did not have the amount of cars they have now.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Anne Castledine	Response-00499	Stanton Road isn't wide enough for the traffic we have now. Often buses can't get through, and cars often drive on pavements to get through on school pick up and drop offs.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Anne Jenkins	Response-00350	The area proposed cannot support any construction traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Annette Jones	Response-00961	Traffic congestion is already a problem getting to and from this area. I live on Chestnut Grove and there's not enough parking on the street as it is so parking on the pavement has become a norm. I have a driveway but getting off the drive because cars are parked at the front is a regular problem. What about the push chairs and mobility scooters nobody takes this into consideration. The school on Stanton Road causes parking and access issues to neighbouring streets. Commuting to work when it is school time or football club events has been a major issue and a 20 minute drive to work as to be planned carefully. The buses also have difficulty getting to and around the estate as accessibility is not always easy and because of the number of cars per home and space to manoeuvre or pull in is limited at times.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Ann Foxall	Response-00748	overloading already very busy roads through Sandiacre
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Ann Harrison	Response-01602	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Anthony Ford	Response-01921	I already struggle to get out of my drive because of the traffic. Kings Road is a prime route for drivers. There has already been a tragic accident this year, additional cars will not make things easier or safer. It will increase traffic flow on Kings Road & impact adversely on our life on this road.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Anthony Pearson	Response-01760	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Anthony Smedlewick	Response-01877	I stay at my girlfriends house several times a week & struggle to get out of Taft Avenue now, without more traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Antony M Ingram	Response-01626	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Antony Weston	Response-00438	Traffic along Coronation road is already congested due to parked cars, the bus struggles to get up on a daily basis also surrounding roads are very tight due to lack of off road parking, I live on Chestnut grove and we see refuse collectors and emergency services struggling to get up this and surrounding streets. Stanton road also sees congestion outside the school and football club. And you seriously want to add more misery on the roads to the established residents
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	April	Response-00469	One of the most immediate and pressing concerns with the development of a high-population state in our area is the inevitable increase in traffic congestion. Our current infrastructure is not designed to accommodate a significant surge in vehicular activity, and without substantial upgrades, residents will face longer commute times, increased air pollution, and a higher risk of accidents. Local roads and intersections, already experiencing periodic bottlenecks, will become overwhelmed, negatively impacting the daily lives of existing residents. Introducing thousands of new vehicles into the area without a comprehensive traffic management and public transportation plan will strain emergency response times and reduce overall quality of life.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	A R Gregory	Response-01918	
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Arleen Corns	Response-01146	The roads around Sandiacre are already in a terrible state and there are far too many vehicles traveling through, even more than ever due to the new development @ Stanton. Huge lorries thundering through a very small town. Sandiacre is called a town but is much smaller than say Long Eaton. The roads upto the proposed development are narrow, steep; they twist and turn with blind bends. The buses and other larger vehicles struggle around the streets, they often have to pull up and ask residents to move their vehicles or mount the pavement. At school opening and closing times it is utter bedlam with cars parked on pavements forcing other drives to pull out onto roads, driving blind as they cannot see what is coming. Also, if it snows is causes a big problem; if residents can get down they cant get back up. Lots of residents park on the road further down but if another potentially 300+ vehicles are trying to do the same, how will that work. There will be abandoned cars every where.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Ashley Cartlidge	Response-01423	There is already too much traffic in the area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Awson Wheldon	Response-01649	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Barbara and John Morrell	Response-00509	I live on Beech Avenue which is already used heavily by traffic other than residents. It is also a bus route running every 20 minutes and there is a school on Stanton Road at the bottom of the Avenue. During school drop-off and pick-up times there are cars everywhere on the Avenue, including the pavements. Buses sometimes can't get down the avenue because of parked vehicles. Also cars cannot see to get onto Stanton Road because of vehicles parked on the pavements at the bottom. I have been concerned for some time about the amount of traffic, and the speed, on this avenue and am even more concerned now with the proposal to build these houses. Most homes now have 2 cars and this fact will generate far too many cars travelling along Beech Avenue. Beech Avenue was never intended to be the thoroughfare it is today and I fear for the safety of children especially, but adults as well in this residential area. I strongly oppose this proposal to build 180 houses on this land.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Barbara Michell	Response-01787	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Barbara Warton	Response-01886	Huge lorries using Derby Rd regularly. Infrastructure not adequate to take the amount of traffic, roads are ALWAYS being damaged. The roads around Sandiacre are already congested as it is. Fire engines, ambulances will have great difficulty accessing the needy.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Barry Partridge	Response-01778	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Ben Hollins	Response-01651	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	ben riley	Response-00607	Traffic congestion is already causing enough pollution and a danger to the surrounding school as it is. Adding 180 homes will only increase this.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Ben Snowdon	Response-00428	Traffic along Stanton Road and the surrounding streets is currently untenable. The busses struggle to get past especially on Stanton Road and I have nearly been run over by cars driving on the pavement to get past. Added traffic congestion will compound this situation.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Bethany Oakes	Response-00960	On a work day between 7.30 and 9am, it is already impossible to access the motorway in under 30 minutes. Rushy Lane cannot cope with any more traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Beverley Gardner	Response-01692	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Beverley Green	Response-01686	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Bill Hartley	Response-01696	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Bill Meadwell	Response-00864	The area from Cloudside Road down to Town Street, Rushy Lane and beyond are congested at all times of the day. With the increasing amount of HGV traffic from the old Stanton site, it can take several minutes to get to Derby Road whichever route is taken. This is often due to the combination of parked vehicles and heavy traffic. Already the buses and dustbin lorries struggle to get through, and emergency services must have the same problem. The official figure is that each household will own an average of 1.2 cars, giving an extra approximately 220 vehicles from the development. These houses will need to be serviced by food deliveries, courier services etc, with only one route in and out of the site. The access from Larch Drive is narrow - without any parked cars it is difficult for two vehicles to pass side by side. With parked cars as well, it will be impossible.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Britta Solloway	Response-00959	Traffic going towards J25 Island a nightmare already
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	B T Duke	Response-01900	Roads not suitable for extra traffic. Dangerous for children.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	B T Keen	Response-01735	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	c/o The Equalised Club	Response-01603	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Callum binnall	Response-00460	The traffic will be ridiculous around cloudside. Sandiacre is a small nit place and adding all these additional houses will surely congest the area. Most likely have more accident/hit and runs
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	C A Partridge	Response-01903	There are 2 roads up to the proposed area location and Beech Ave leading to Cloudside, these roads have very tight, sometimes blind areas. These roads are just not suitable for extra traffic. Sometimes the busses get stuck in snowy weather, traffic can not get up the hills. Bus services could not be extended. I have even slid in my car down the hill.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Caroline Blackmore	Response-00451	Sandiacre already has traffic congestion from Derby Road and Stanton with huge HGVs all day.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Caroline Driver	Response-00618	The roads are too narrow for current traffic, never mind an additional 700 vehicles per day. During school start and finish there is dangerous parking, roads reduced to single file. It is already dangerous for motorists and pedestrians often having to edge out blindly before any extra vehicles. The bus gets stuck regularly with the driver honking their horn and knocking on doors. The additional congestion that Stanton park will already cause on the main roads to the motorway will already leave us gridlocked in the estate and the queues back up into the estate causing hazards to pedestrians.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Caroline Roy	Response-00945	Surrounding roads won't be able to support the construction traffic, plus these roads are already congested and blocked enough with parked cars, let alone adding in all the cars for these new homes that will need to get through
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Carol Marshall	Response-00736	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic. Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents for many years. The roads in Sandiacre are already congested with traffic coming from Stapleford which is in Nottinghamshire plus Stanton traffic also. A survey of traffic in Sandiacre is well over due.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Carol morrice	Response-00795	Cloudside road is a very small road and the extra volume of traffic going through there will be a nightmare
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Carolyn Hallam	Response-00489	There is already far too much traffic in Sandiacre. The lorry parking in Stanton has already caused more huge lorries to travel through the local streets. This development will add misery and gridlock to the narrow streets of Sandiacre
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Catherine Greenaway	Response-00429	The roads around the area, especially Beech Avenue and Coronation avenue cannot take the extra traffic, more so the construction vehicles. These avenues are not wide and buses already struggle to get through.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Catherine Richardson	Response-00531	The site proposed would be difficult to access. Too many parked cars on and off the pavement. A lot of people working from home now. Also heavy traffic and parking around the school on Stanton road is already a problem. The terrain is too steep and narrow for safe access especially HGV. Soon be a bad accident if this goes ahead
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Charles Hopkinson	Response-01831	Traffic is already a problem in the area drivers park on the pavement to allow buses and large vehicles to pass on stanton road.the whole of sandiacre is gridlocked at times more homes mean more cars .how long would this development take if approved the wildlife would also suffer.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Charlotte Fry	Response-00583	The roads are already tight enough when people park either side and we already have buses coming past. It will become gridlocked and nobody will be able to get in and out their houses
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Charlotte Hunter	Response-01376	This is a tiny road which is at the bottom of a bus route, cars will be struggling to pass as cars park on the road. therefore causing congestion.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	C Holmes	Response-01620	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Chris Hume	Response-01373	Cars and vans are always parked on the paths on Coronation Ave, Cloudside Rd and Chestnut Grove making access difficult without additional housing. This problem extends to the whole area, Stanton road is often congested and the quality lorries on Town street is currently is a danger.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Chris Jones	Response-01718	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Chris O Connor	Response-01641	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Christian Rearson	Response-01763	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Christine Anderson	Response-00484	Extra traffic congestion which would happen with the proposed 180 new properties would be catastrophic to this area. We already struggle with small roads and vehicles such as 14 buses, ambulances cannot get through. Cars are parked on pavements and access is very limited.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Christine Gough	Response-00578	The bottom of Beech Ave is congested with traffic every day with school drop offs, buses struggle down Beech Avenue as it is and gets blocked . You cannot see the road when trying to pull out onto Stanton Road from Beech Avenue as there are so many cars parked . Some serious injury is going to happen soon and worrying it could be a child . Mobility scooters cannot get on the pavement with cars parked on them . The pollution is horrendous, the air is bad with cars and traffic and it?s worrying for people with Asthma and lung problems . Stanton Road is very busy . All these roads cannot cope now with the traffic so another 180 houses and even more cars is absolutely beyond madness .!0
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Christine Ridgway	Response-00465	I have lived on Norbury Way for 27 years and worry that the proposed housing development will create more traffic from this part of Sandiacre, which will affect me able already struggling to cross the road to go to work and walk the dogs, due to more cars being on the road.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Claire binnall	Response-00459	The roads are already too busy on long Moor lane and town street I live on lawrence street and the lorry traffic is already dangerous and excessive
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Clair Ellis	Response-00475	I live on Spencer Avenue and traffic is bad enough as it is. Extra traffic coming up this bus route to gain access to a new estate further up the hill will be unbearable.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Clare franks	Response-00498	Traffic in and around the sandiacre area is already poor. Parking on and around the schools is terrible as well as parking around the football club. Adding homes will only add to this. The motorway junction also suffers with congestion. Road surfaces are poorly maintained and this will only make it worse
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Clare Green	Response-01751	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Cole Hawkins	Response-01714	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Colin Billington	Response-00227	Roads too narrow for access
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Colin Cox	Response-01716	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Colin Marriott	Response-00686	Access to the site would be up Stanton Road, an already congested road. Then onto Coronation avenue, Cloudside Road and Larch Drive which is only just over 5 metres wide and totally unsuitable for heavy traffic
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Collette Kenny	Response-00579	The Traffic on Stanton Road Especially weekdays during School hours is absolutely ridiculous.. Even the Buses struggle due to the Parking !!! We Don?t need Massive Lorries and Plant Machinery Hurting By The Roads are Not Designed For it
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Connor Murfin	Response-00926	It is already congested as it is round that area, this allocation will make it even worse.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Corrina loosemore	Response-00589	180 cars extra Existing roads already struggling with extra traffic Busses have to drive on pavements
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Courtney Bennett	Response-00593	There is already enough heavy traffic through the area of Sandiacre causing enough noise and air pollution that devalues the houses already in the area, causes damage to roads (such as potholes that are not repaired) and causes dust on the roads and in the air.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	C Owen	Response-01917	The roads are not built for all the traffic it has at the moment, let alone the construction traffic and all the new homes with their vehicles.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Craig Freeman	Response-01561	It is already very congested to drive anywhere towards Larch Drive for the handful of cars that have to go this far back from Stanton Road. Increasing the volume of traffic these access roads would be dangerous and cause bottlenecks for all users. Often cars are already frequently driving onto pavements to avoid blockages and this will only increase causing singinifacnt danger to pedestrians and frustrations to drivers.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Craig Richards	Response-01638	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Craig Thims	Response-01765	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Cristina Jenkins	Response-01588	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	C Thompson	Response-01634	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	DAllen	Response-00525	Definitely more cars on the road which will affect traffic which is already congested due to fourway traffic lights in Sandiacre bridge
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Dana	Response-01173	Will add to congestion at M1 roundabout
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Daniel	Response-00545	The local roads at the top of the estate and surrounding avenues, are already narrow with kerbside parking on both sides. This significantly reduces the effective road width, leaving very little space for two-way traffic and emergency vehicle access. There is a particularly hazardous blind corner on cloud side road, creating an unsafe environment for both pedestrians and drivers. Introducing a large volume of new traffic will dramatically increase the risk of road traffic collisions. An additional 180 homes could conservatively result in over 300 additional vehicles (assuming an average of 1.7 cars per household), further congesting roads that were not designed for such capacity.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Daniel Downes	Response-01630	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Daniel Hands	Response-00057	To access the site would mean increased traffic on an already busy enclosed estate. The roads, layout and current number of cars per residency are already creating issues in and around the area, especially around peak school hours when there is often gridlock caused by the number vehicles trying to access or exit the estate. At weekends when residents use on street parking, this creates further issues as lorries and large vehicles struggle to navigate through. To increase the number of vehicles trying to access this site will only negatively impact residents and will create increased frustration and risk. The current bus route is often blocked as the streets are simply not wide enough to accommodate parked vehicles and larger vehicles such as buses. I dread to think what would happen if a fire engine were to try to gain access at these times.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Danielle Harrison	Response-00568	This is already a densely populated estate. I have witnessed the bus and ambulance crews, struggle to navigate the routes through the estate due to the volume of parked cars and lack of off-road parking. An additional 180 homes, each with multiple vehicles, is sure to add greater congestion and pollution.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Daniel Naylor	Response-00680	With 2300 homes approved for development in the 2022 Erewash core strategy in neighbouring kirk hallam and Stanton, and the currently developing industrial units in Stanton using Sandiacre and Stanton by dale as direct access to the m1, it would be absolute lunacy to building 180 new homes in Sandiacre to add to this, as sandiacre is absolute gridlock already at peak times without all these developments adding to it. Sandiacre and nearby villages in the current day suffers huge traffic gridlock during peak times and with the development of the industrials units in nearby Stanton currently in its infancy, it's a 100% certainty that the weight of industrial traffic will increase, much to the detriment to the people of sandiacres way of life in the coming years. With the Erewash core strategy (that includes the development of 1300 homes to be built on greenbelt land in neighbouring kirk hallam and a further 1000 houses to be built in Stanton) of March 2022 approved by the previous conservative led council, Sandiacre is already at further risk to bear the majority on the traffic from those developments as sandiacre and Stanton by dale are the direct routes for gaining access to the M1. If both these examples aren't bad enough for the residents of sandiacres impending doom regarding traffic gridlock, imagine my absolute shock and bewilderment when I heard of an extra 180 homes proposed to be built on the edge of a sandiacre housing estate, namely west sandiacre? For the reasons given above, I object to this development profusely, for many reasons which will follow but mainly for the sheer weight of traffic that sandiacre will already struggle to cope with, without an extra 180 extra homes to add to the problem. Sandiacre just doesn't have the road infrastructure to handle the extra traffic capacity as it already struggles today, as it serves as a direct route to the M1 from nearby towns and villages. I understand that local councils are under pressure to build more homes which in turn generates more council tax income, but to add to an already ongoing problem is unfair to the local residents and I plead with anybody in authority to put their concerns as high priority above all other issues. I have 20+ years' experience working alongside the construction industry, project managing the delivery of utilities to new developments, so I can say with all confidence that the access proposed for this new development is nothing short of logistical lunacy. This development if approved would struggle to commence as the vehicles required to deliver materials and machinery required to complete these developments would find it impossible to navigate the narrow local roads, with tight bends that would make it mathematically impossible for some long base vehicles to maneuver. I would also question the load bearing of the local roads as these were never built to take such heavy traffic, and the heavy vehicles required on a daily basis over several years during development would destroy the roads over and over. This area of sandiacre is a quiet area and as such, this has been a huge factor when families and elderly people choose to live here. The risk of harm from extra traffic would multiply, with this area taking heavy traffic not common in this area during development, then afterwards with 180 homes adding to the area permanently.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Darran and Emma Rea	Response-00597	The area is already congested, it is an active bus route where the bus does struggle at times to get around, even worse when it is winter. Parking is a nightmare already even with houses that have off road parking.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	David Casey	Response-01608	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	David Cater	Response-01756	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	David Fry	Response-00596	The traffic through sandiacre is already too busy and causing problems
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	David Ruddock	Response-01776	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	David Thompson	Response-01324	Insufficient infrastructure for 180 homes
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	David Tindsley	Response-00515	I wish to object to the currently proposed vehicular access for this development. Based on the plans, the access appears to be significantly constrained. Even with the removal of trees/hedges and the construction of the highway over existing root zones which should be protected, the widest achievable opening is only 5.7 metres with the current gate being only 2.7m. This also assume they own the current land to achieve the 5.7m. A two-way road typically requires a width of 5.5 to 7.3 metres, plus space for a pedestrian footpath. Having measured the current road at the point near the gate, the actual road is only 5.4864m wide, which falls below the minimum required for a two-way road. If the existing footpaths are added to this measurement, the total width required to continue the existing footpath lines and the road itself is 9.04 m Therefore, even with the absolute minimum road width just after a bend, this proposal fails to allow for safe pedestrian access alongside vehicle movement. As a result, the development of 180 homes would leave residents without a safe pedestrian route in or out of the site. This conflicts with NPPF Paragraph 110, which requires developments to give priority to pedestrian and cycle movements and create places that are safe, secure and attractive for all users. Additionally, the route leading to the site from the main road consists of narrow residential streets, which are frequently lined with parked cars, both on the roads and on the pavements. The latter could cause significant accessibility and safety issues for people of limited or restricted mobility and parents with young children and pushchairs. The Sandiacre Neighbourhood Plan 2022-37, recently agreed following a referendum, clearly identifies many of these access roads as already being congested. There is existing evidence of buses getting stuck, particularly on Beech Avenue, indicating that large vehicles, especially construction traffic, would be unable to safely navigate these roads. I am also concerned that a fire engine, ambulance or any emergency vehicles, plus delivery vehicles, post office vans and supermarket/courier deliveries would struggle to access the site in a timely manner due to these same constraints, particularly where parked cars restrict manoeuvrability. This raises serious concerns regarding access for emergency services and the safe management of construction traffic, in conflict with NPPF Paragraph 111, which advises that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. The proposed development will also increase the number of vehicles using these currently quiet roads. At present, drivers patiently wait for one another to pass parked vehicles. However, with significantly more traffic generated by 180 homes, the parked cars that currently cause little disruption are likely to create congestion and hazards for pedestrians. Current ONS statistics suggest that there are an average 1.29 cars for each household in the country. This would suggest an additional 232 for a development of 180 properties. However, given that only 10% of the development would be earmarked for ?affordable? housing, with the remainder (based on the developer?s other sites locally) likely to be 3, 4 and 5-bedroom houses, the expectation is the number of cars will be significantly higher. This runs counter to NPPF
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	David Tindsley	Response-00515	Paragraph 112, which stresses the need for developments to enable safe and suitable access for all users and to minimise conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians. Cloudside Road, the ONLY access to Larch Drive, is on a steep gradient. In snowy or icy conditions, it actually becomes impassable. It is never gritted (presumably one of the reasons being that the gritter lorries cannot access the road), and it relies on local residents to grit the road manually accessing a grit-box halfway up the road. For all of these reasons, I strongly object to the proposed vehicular access arrangement and urge the planning authority to reconsider a solution that ensures both safe pedestrian connectivity and appropriate vehicle access, without compromising the surrounding residential streets.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	David Yeo	Response-01705	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Dawn Glennis Smith	Response-00510	Traffic congestion is already a problem in the existing area and would only get worse with the building of these houses.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Dean Bosworth	Response-01665	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Dean Lavelle	Response-01774	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Dean Michell	Response-01343	At school times the bottom of Beech Avenue is unsuitable already. Living on the corner of Beech Avenue I often see cars cutting the corner leaving on coming traffic to swerve. When a lot of people are parked on the road buses have problems getting down the Avenue.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Dean Peake-Whitehurst	Response-00488	The road system in the local village will not handle the increased volume of traffic and would be unfair on existing residents
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Debra Michell	Response-01346	Living on the corner of Beech Avenue for over 30 years I have seen many accidents . From cars cutting corners, buses hitting cars and knocking down their own bus stops. This is our road is narrow so when car park on the road everyone as problems using our Avenue. Police have been to my home on a number of time and ask us to park on the pavement. A lot of the time it?s not our cars.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Debra Scully	Response-00288	The road leading up is not suitable for the volume of traffic that the site will bring to the area. The roads leading up to the site have large amounts of in road parking already meaning the roads are essentially single carriageway. The access way to the site cannot be widened due to existing properties. The practicalities of the build itself is hugely problematic due to the narrow access on approach roads. Huge Lorries will not be able to access the site.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Debs Washer	Response-00487	Increase to traffic, parking around this area is already hard
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Denise bennett	Response-00030	Sandiacre already has substantial traffic through the centre - the valley is known for its high pollution already
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Denise Creasey	Response-00786	It is very unsuitable for the access to be from Cloudside as the very considerable increase in traffic would make this very dangerous on roads which are already busy with parking on both sides of the roads. The increase in volume of traffic would further increase the existing problems. Furthermore, the use of Cloudside for heavy construction traffic with the noise, vibration and dirt would be environmentally detrimental to both residents and wildlife for many years. These problems would be made worse in bad winter weather.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Denise Lingard	Response-01759	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Dennis Watts	Response-01726	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Derek Morton	Response-01607	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Derrick Hunt	Response-00437	Access to Stanton road from either end is very restricted to hgv's for this development. Cloudside Infants school already causes ridiculous congestion on Stanton road. The only one way bus route through the estate is regularly held up or diverted due to the narrowness of the roads and would not be able to get anywhere this new estate. Coronation ave cloudside road and beech AVE are all narrow roads with vehicles parked all over now. Most houses now have 2 vehicles and a lot on this estate don't have off road parking
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Destiny Jade-Blake	Response-01636	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Diane Jones	Response-00852	Sandiacre is already suffering from excess traffic accessing the A52 and M1. This will increase with the development of the Stanton site. Roads local to this proposal are totally inadequate for construction traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Diane Mcmorrow	Response-00433	Traffic congestion is already a problem especially around school times 8.30 till 9am and 2.30 to 3pm Monday to Friday on Stanton Road Beech Avenue Elm Avenue and Spencer Road. It's also on a bus route and some drivers use it as a short cut from the M1 junction 25
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Diane Meadwell	Response-00807	Access would be via Larch Avenue and along Cloudside Road, both of which are narrow and unsuitable for large numbers of vehicles. There is no other means of access. From Cloudside Road, traffic would only have the choice of turning left on to Maple Avenue and down Beech Avenue, or turning right and travelling along Coronation Avenue. Both of these roads are narrow and unsuitable for the additional traffic that this development would undoubtedly bring about. From there, traffic would either turn left towards Lenton Street/Town Street, or right along Stanton Road towards Rushy Lane. Both of these routes are already very congested, with queues forming for much of the day. Add to this the rapidly increasing number of lorries now being generated by the development of the Stanton land, and the roads that are already over used and in very poor condition will deteriorate further. Local residents are regularly reporting that they can take up to five minutes to get out of Church Lane and on to Lenton Street or Town Street. The junction at the bridge in Sandiacre is having to cope with more traffic than previously, with delays most of the day.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Diane Turner	Response-01744	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Donna Steele	Response-00781	I live on Larch Drive and the roads leading up to the proposed site are already full of cars parking, both Cloudside Ave and Larch Drive are very narrow roads and are not suitable for heavy Lorry's to access the site. Also once the houses are built this will put more pressure on the roads. Traffic is already a nightmare especially at school run times on Beech Ave and Stanton Road. The area is a beautiful quiet place which was one of the reasons moved here, this will all change if these houses are built.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Dorothy Deeprise	Response-00817	Traffic is bad now this will make it worse
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	D Pallett	Response-01627	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	D Simpson	Response-01712	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	E Cooper	Response-01923	Already too many parked cars for buses. Increase in traffic would cause more issues & worsen the already problematic issue.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Elaine Pickering	Response-00811	Sandiacre hasn't the infrastructure to cope the extra traffic
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Eleanor Moseley	Response-00799	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Eleanor Newman	Response-00718	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Elisha Gunn	Response-00585	We already live close to busy roads adding additional cars will increase congestion and make the roads less safe for school children
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Emily	Response-01880	Already too much traffic with the schools and HGV etc.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Emily Milnes	Response-00470	Traffic through Sandiacre already incredibly busy, further traffic will overload the roads

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Emma	Response-00492	Roads are hard to get up and down in that area as it is with added residence let alone the building work and vehicles they'll be using. This will cause a lot of traffic and difficulty to get up and down as the roads are narrow.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Emma Fox	Response-00230	The traffic is a nightmare as it is especially by the school. It means it's going to be even worse. At the moment larch drive is tight at the best of times and now with hundreds of extra cars it's going to be unbearable. We have also paid for this lifestyle, beautiful surroundings and now you are planning on building hundreds of houses which is now going to be damaged. I will not vote for this.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Emma Peterson	Response-00491	Traffic is bad now
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Emma Ryan	Response-00503	There are already plenty of vehicles in and around Sandiacre. The amount of vehicles has gotten worse over the years, this will just further compound that.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Emma Wall	Response-00319	The roads are not suitable for a large amount of traffic. They're already breaking apart on Coronation Avenue which is where you propose access through and up into this new spot of land that you're calling grey belt which is in fact greenbelt. The traffic is already bad around the school area in Stanton Road. There's parking on either side of the road everywhere in the smaller roads such as Sycamore, Chestnut, Cloudside etc
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Emma Wilson	Response-01222	Its horrific already at peak times at Sandiacre lights, putting in this many houses on top of all the additional lorries that will be there due to Stanton Park will make it 1000 times worse.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Esme Moss	Response-00592	Will contribute to additional traffic congestion, especially near the local schools which adds additional safety concerns to children.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Esther Cook	Response-01861	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Ewan Snowdon	Response-00766	The traffic congestion is already heavy at certain times of day, as a young driver it's very stressful and by building these new homes it will add further traffic and cause higher stress and anxiety when I'm trying to travel down to visit my dad and struggling to find a safe place to keep my car without having to worry about large Lorries and traffic causing damage to my car or forcing me to leave my car in a place that doesn't guarantee it's safety.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Fay Cresswell	Response-00701	Sandiacre West is already densely over run with traffic at peak times of the day. On Cloudside there are often people parked on the pavement causing it to be very difficult to get out of Chestnut Grove yesterday a van was parked on the corner and my husband had to inch forward to see then a car came driving round the corner from Maple making us have to reverse back into Chestnut Grove where vehicles were double parked. This was so dangerous and if it had been a van etc it would have struggled to reverse. There is a blind bend at the top of Cloudside turning right towards the proposed new development where vehicles park dangerously all ready. Further down the hill there is another blind corner in front of the Sandiacre Town Football Club and Scout hut which is particularly dangerous. When there's a match or event people park right up to the entrance both side of the CarPark down the road as far as Beech Avenue so if you come round the blind bend you instantly get obstruction and if a car decides to come the other way as it can't see you there's no option but to mount the curb which is outside the Primary school someone will get hurt.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Finlay Moss	Response-00588	There's a school nearby and there isn't enough infrastructure for the increased traffic this will create
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Gail and Tony Orme	Response-00805	We already have to suffer HGV lorries 'constantly' driving through Sandiacre. Heavy traffic is a problem now let alone having an extra 20,000 extra vehicles a year !
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Gail Berry	Response-01644	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Geoff Tindsley	Response-00755	I am a regular visitor to my father and step-mum?s house on Larch Drive and I wish to object to the currently proposed vehicular access for this development. 1. I am astonished that this even being considered by the council. The access itself appears to be significantly constrained. I would have thought that, even with the removal of trees/hedges by the access site, this would still be extremely narrow to allow for a 2-way road and footpaths. 2. My understanding is that a two-way road typically requires a width of 5.5 to 7.3 metres, plus space for a pedestrian footpath. My father has measured the current road at the point near the gate, and the actual road is only 5.487m wide, which falls below the minimum required for a two-way road. If the existing footpaths are added to this measurement, the total width required to continue the existing footpath lines and the road itself is 9.04, which appears to be significantly more than the available access width. 3. Therefore, even with the absolute minimum road width just after a bend, this proposal fails to allow for safe pedestrian access alongside vehicle movement. As a result, the development of 180 homes would leave residents without a safe pedestrian route in or out of the site. 4. I can confirm from personal experience that the route leading to the site from the main road consists of narrow residential streets, which are frequently lined with parked cars, both on the roads and on the pavements. The latter could cause significant accessibility and safety issues for people of limited or restricted mobility and parents with young children and pushchairs. I understand that the Sandiacre Neighbourhood Plan 2022-37, recently agreed following a referendum, clearly identifies many of these access roads as already being congested. 5. I believe there is existing evidence of buses getting stuck, particularly on Beech Avenue, indicating that large vehicles, especially construction traffic, would be unable to safely navigate these roads. 6. I am also concerned that a fire engine, ambulance, or any emergency vehicles, would struggle to access the site in a timely manner due to these same constraints, particularly where parked cars restrict manoeuvrability. This raises serious concerns regarding access for emergency services and the safe management of construction traffic. 7. The proposed development would inevitably increase the number of vehicles using these currently quiet roads. At present, drivers patiently wait for one another to pass parked vehicles. However, with significantly more traffic generated by 180 homes, the parked cars that currently cause little disruption are likely to create congestion and hazards for pedestrians. Current ONS statistics suggest that there are an average 1.29 cars for each household in the country. This would suggest an additional 232 for a development of 180 properties. However, given that only 10% of the development would be earmarked for ?affordable? housing, with the remainder (based on the developer?s other sites locally) likely to be 3, 4 and 5-bedroom houses, the expectation is the number of cars will be significantly higher. 8. Cloudside Road, is the ONLY access to Larch Drive, and is on a steep gradient. In snowy or icy conditions, it actually becomes impassable. It is never gritted (presumably one of the reasons being that the gritter lorries cannot access the road), and it relies on local residents to grit the road manually accessing a grit-box halfway up t
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Geoff Tindsley	Response-00755	he road. For all of these reasons, I strongly object to the proposed vehicular access arrangement and urge the planning authority to reconsider a solution that ensures both safe pedestrian connectivity and appropriate vehicle access, without compromising the surrounding residential streets.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Georgia C	Response-01296	Traffic congestion is already atrocious in the local area, Sandiacre cross road lights being a key example.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Georgia Marvin	Response-00261	- I?m rather worried about how the traffic will be once the houses are built. There?s already enough cars parked on cloudside road without more cars, vans and Lorry?s been brought into the mix! I genuinely don?t know how construction will take place as cloudside road is the only access point?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Gill West	Response-01725	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Glyn Holner	Response-01697	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Gordon Bruce	Response-01455	Traffic is backed up for several hundred m from the cross road at Bostocks Lane/Derby Road towards Rushy Lane on a daily basis. The potential developments at West Hallam and Stanton will only make this problem worse. Adding potentially a hundred or more cars exiting that area of Sandiacre will only worsen this already problematic situation. The huge problem with lack of parking at Cloudside will also be worsened by adding 180 more homes. There is no dedicated parking so cars already park on the pavement as the road is too narrow for parking and busses, lorries etc This is putting lives at risk.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Gordon Daris	Response-01639	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Greg Cox	Response-01702	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Gregg Bartrum	Response-01591	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Greg Watts	Response-00733	The proposed number of houses would place unsustainable pressure on local infrastructure, including roads
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Harriet Farnsworth	Response-01914	As a house of regular bus users, the extra traffic will make the already difficult bus route which regularly gets stuck will get worse with extra traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Helen	Response-00883	The traffic in Sandiacre is already congested especially week days from 7:45 - 9:00 am and 15:00pm -18:00pm. This is going to cause more issues with HGVs entering and leaving site with deliveries etc
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Helen Gillain	Response-00964	Roads are currently barely passable with vehicles parked either side, the roads could not cope with any more traffic

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Helen Richardson	Response-00432	I object to the proposed development of 108 new homes. My primary concern lies with the detrimental impact this will have on local traffic flow. The existing road infrastructure is not only poorly maintained but also lacks the capacity to absorb the additional traffic generated by this development. Without concrete plans and funding for significant road improvements and maintenance, this development will severely worsen existing congestion and further deteriorate the condition of our roads.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Helen Thompson	Response-01356	This area is already congested . It will make the roads less safe and more difficult for the bus to travel through. It is particularly difficult to navigate into and out of the junction of Church street and Town street/ Ilkeston road especially given the number of lorries coming from and to Stanton that have difficulty navigating the bend without using the other side of the road - more cars will increase the problems and safety issues. During building, lorries will add to the problems on already narrow streets. Have traffic studies been carried out ?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Helen whiteman	Response-00447	The traffic just getting in the heavy plant would be bad enough it is a very narrow access road and it would feel safe walking up the road with plant traffic and everything that goes with it. Plus if houses get built the extra traffic would cause considerable congestion on already well used roads
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Ian	Response-00493	Sandiacre already has high level of traffic due to the town being a thoroughfare from the m1 and lorries from the nearby industrial park
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Ian Bailey	Response-00505	The roads to and from are not suitable to accommodate this extra level of traffic
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Ian herbert	Response-00939	180 homes is a significant increase in the daily traffic movements feeding out through stanton road to either rushy lane or church and the busy/dangerous junction with town street/lenton street.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Ian Steele	Response-00780	Sandiacre,stone clouds is a peaceful area,more traffic will ruin it for those already here
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	IAN TAYLOR	Response-00972	Traffic in the adjoining area and on Stanton Road in particular is already overloaded , particularly on school days. It will be impossible to provide adequate and safe access to the site given existing conditions. It has also been demonstrated that construction vehicles will have considerable difficulty in accessing the site during development.
			Ian telfer	Response-00991	Already takes me ages to get off stanton road in the mornings. When the stanton lorry park really gets going it will be 24/7 gridlocked
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Ian Ward	Response-01628	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Irina Anthony	Response-01867	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Isabelle Love	Response-00529	Already issues with traffic in this area of Sandiacre, cars park all along roads as many houses do not have drives, increased traffic in this area will pose safety risks for pedestrians (particularly children). The bus already struggles in this area, further congestion will exasperate the issues. There will also be increased traffic down Rushy Lane once people take the back way through Sandiacre to gain access to the M1 & A52
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Isobel Ball	Response-01092	West sandiacre is a quiet area. Many people walk their pets in the green areas or even just to clear their heads. I am also one of these people. My dad is buried not too far from these plans and i would hate for it to turn into a congested, dusty and polluted area. This many houses will absolutely rise traffic congestion, it will attract lorry?s and cranes, which will disrupt and pollute the area with noise, dust, litter and disruption. Many people live here with small children and dogs, and enjoy the quiet nature in which they live. These plans will heavily heavily disrupt that and it is simply unfair
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	J. E. Lord	Response-01601	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Jack Greatorex	Response-01731	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Jacob Whitt	Response-01748	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Jacqueline Marshall	Response-01436	Sandiacre is a heavily congested area due to the closeness of Junction 25 of the M1, the A52 a major highway linking Nottingham and Derby, Stanton along with the Stanton ironworks Development plans The traffic from the motorway turning on to Derby Road is already excessive due to the large number of Lorries on both Derby Road and Town Street. A road system that is unable to cope with it and a traffic light junction over the canal in the centre of our small town was declared by DCC as a failed junction in 2016/2017.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Jade Smith	Response-01783	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Jake Simpson	Response-00667	Roads are congested already without extra cars on the road
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	james goddard	Response-01204	Our roads a full of large holes, which are constantly appearing due to the volume off traffic, and are a danger to cyclists. Parking is dreadfull, with the current volume of parked cars on the roads causing delays to bus services, waste disposal and emergency services. -The addition of new housing in an already
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	James Meadwell	Response-01653	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	James Roberts	Response-01708	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	James Seward	Response-01683	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	James White	Response-01883	Traffic will be considerably worse throughout Sandiacre, particularly on Church Street.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Jane Dennett	Response-00965	The roads cannot support more heavy construction traffic . Or cars per household. The side roads are already awkward with parked cars. The fumes for Asthma sufferers will increase
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Jane Elizabeth Tindsley	Response-00669	I wish to object to the currently proposed vehicular access for this development. Based on the plans, the access appears to be significantly constrained. Even with the removal of trees/hedges and the construction of the highway over existing root zones which should be protected, the widest achievable opening is only 5.7 metres with the current gate being only 2.7m. This also assume they own the current land to achieve the 5.7m. A two-way road typically requires a width of 5.5 to 7.3 metres, plus space for a pedestrian footpath. Having measured the current road at the point near the gate, the actual road is only 5.4864m wide, which falls below the minimum required for a two-way road. If the existing footpaths are added to this measurement, the total width required to continue the existing footpath lines and the road itself is 9.04m. Therefore, even with the absolute minimum road width just after a bend, this proposal fails to allow for safe pedestrian access alongside vehicle movement. As a result, the development of 180 homes would leave residents without a safe pedestrian route in or out of the site. This conflicts with NPPF Paragraph 110, which requires developments to give priority to pedestrian and cycle movements and create places that are safe, secure and attractive for all users. Additionally, the route leading to the site from the main road consists of narrow residential streets, which are frequently lined with parked cars, vans and lorries both on the roads and on the pavements. The latter could cause significant accessibility and safety issues for people of limited or restricted mobility and parents with young children and pushchairs. The Sandiacre Neighbourhood Plan 2022-37, recently agreed following a referendum, clearly identifies many of these access roads as already being congested. There is existing evidence of buses getting stuck, particularly on Beech Avenue, indicating that large vehicles, especially construction traffic, would be unable to safely navigate these roads. I am also concerned that a fire engine, ambulance or any emergency vehicles, plus delivery vehicles, post office vans and supermarket/courier deliveries would struggle to access the site in a timely manner due to these same constraints, particularly where parked cars restrict manoeuvrability. This raises serious concerns regarding access for emergency services and the safe management of construction traffic, in conflict with NPPF Paragraph 111, which advises that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. The proposed development will also increase the number of vehicles using these currently quiet roads. At present, drivers patiently wait for one another to pass parked vehicles. However, with significantly more traffic generated by 180 homes, the parked cars that currently cause little disruption are likely to create congestion and hazards for pedestrians. Current ONS statistics suggest that there are an average 1.29 cars for each household in the country. This would suggest an additional 232 for a development of 180 properties. However, given that only 10% of the development would be earmarked for ?affordable? housing, with the remainder (based on the developer?s other sites locally) likely to be 3, 4 and 5-bedroom houses, the expectation is the number of cars will be significantly higher. This runs
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Jane Elizabeth Tindsley	Response-00669	counter to NPPF Paragraph 112, which stresses the need for developments to enable safe and suitable access for all users and to minimise conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians. I am also concerned that the current proposal does not address the planned access required for construction traffic to deliver most of the materials to the site. In addition, I would imagine that these roads, which were built at least 30 years ago are not built to manage the load-bearing of the required transport for the development, and could potentially lead to serious road damage and possibly nearby properties. Cloudside Road, the ONLY access to Larch Drive, is on a steep gradient. In snowy or icy conditions, it actually becomes impassable. It is never gritted (presumably one of the reasons being that the gritter lorries cannot access the road), and it relies on local residents to grit the road manually accessing a grit-box halfway up the road. I have personal experience of having to abandon our car in snowy/icy conditions as I could not access all of Cloudside Road to get to Larch Drive. When this happened, I had to abandon the car on Maple Avenue during these winter periods. For all of these reasons, I strongly object to the proposed vehicular access arrangement and urge the planning authority to reconsider a solution that ensures both safe pedestrian connectivity and appropriate vehicle access, without compromising the surrounding residential streets.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Janet Edwards	Response-01906	This is already a problem & would certainly become worse.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Janet Whildes	Response-01869	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Jane Warton	Response-00662	there will be at least 20,000 vehicles a year in an area that is already congested. strain on parking.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Janice Taylor	Response-01743	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Janice West	Response-00989	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Janine Holmes	Response-01595	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Jason Deepprose	Response-00818	You need to get the cars off the roads.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Jason Harwood	Response-01667	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Jason Webb	Response-01637	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Jayne Rowley	Response-01279	The traffic in Sandiacre and Stanton by dale has already seen a noticeable increase in traffic with the Stanton Park development both cars and HGVs, making exiting the estate more difficult and causing regular delays. There is regular congestion at peak times especially with school traffic and those heading towards the most commonly used exits of the estate. A further 150-250 cars would further add to this congestion. The roads leading to the proposed development are narrow and not suitable for heavy volumes of traffic this increased traffic would cause a significant increase in congestion and the HGVs needing to access the site would further add to this problem. Cloudside Avenue is already blocked on a regular basis due to parking and the narrowness of the roads which frequently causes problems for those existing residents trying to pass. Also due to the same issues on neighbouring streets the bus frequently is unable to pass through without difficulty and has on occasion had to mount the pavements.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	J Cates	Response-01750	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Jeanette O Connor	Response-01640	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Jeffrey Whittaker	Response-00594	The roads can not accommodate more traffic
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Jenna Mitchell	Response-01407	Traffic is terrible already
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Jennifer Bailey	Response-01857	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic. I am extremely concerned with the amount of extra traffic additional housing will create and generate. Cloudside Road is a narrow road with a tight bend which is already overly parked up with cars. Its not a suitable road to take that amount of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Jennifer Saville	Response-00516	Sandiacre already has a significant traffic problem which is already increasing due to the industrial building at Stanton. All traffic comes up Derby Road which is at times congested making the road dangerous, this road is also used by the majority of Friesland school children going to school and returning home. The roads up to the proposed site are narrow, winding and steep at times. It is difficult for cars to access, lorries would not be able to get up some roads. Buses are sometimes unable to access their route due to parked cars and would not be able to access any new build
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Jennifer Tindsley	Response-00751	I am a regular visitor to my father and step-mum's house on Larch Drive and I wish to object to the currently proposed vehicular access for this development. 1. I am astonished that this even being considered by the council. The access itself appears to be significantly constrained. I would have thought that, even with the removal of trees/hedges by the access site, this would still be extremely narrow to allow for a 2-way road and footpaths. 2. My understanding is that a two-way road typically requires a width of 5.5 to 7.3 metres, plus space for a pedestrian footpath. My father has measured the current road at the point near the gate, and the actual road is only 5.487m wide, which falls below the minimum required for a two-way road. If the existing footpaths are added to this measurement, the total width required to continue the existing footpath lines and the road itself is 9.04, which appears to be significantly more than the available access width. 3. Therefore, even with the absolute minimum road width just after a bend, this proposal fails to allow for safe pedestrian access alongside vehicle movement. As a result, the development of 180 homes would leave residents without a safe pedestrian route in or out of the site. 4. I can confirm from personal experience that the route leading to the site from the main road consists of narrow residential streets, which are frequently lined with parked cars, both on the roads and on the pavements. The latter could cause significant accessibility and safety issues for people of limited or restricted mobility and parents with young children and pushchairs. I understand that the Sandiacre Neighbourhood Plan 2022-37, recently agreed following a referendum, clearly identifies many of these access roads as already being congested. 5. I believe there is existing evidence of buses getting stuck, particularly on Beech Avenue, indicating that large vehicles, especially construction traffic, would be unable to safely navigate these roads. 6. I am also concerned that a fire engine, ambulance, or any emergency vehicles, would struggle to access the site in a timely manner due to these same constraints, particularly where parked cars restrict manoeuvrability. This raises serious concerns regarding access for emergency services and the safe management of construction traffic. 7. The proposed development would inevitably increase the number of vehicles using these currently quiet roads. At present, drivers patiently wait for one another to pass parked vehicles. However, with significantly more traffic generated by 180 homes, the parked cars that currently cause little disruption are likely to create congestion and hazards for pedestrians. Current ONS statistics suggest that there are an average 1.29 cars for each household in the country. This would suggest an additional 232 for a development of 180 properties. However, given that only 10% of the development would be earmarked for 'affordable' housing, with the remainder (based on the developer's other sites locally) likely to be 3, 4 and 5-bedroom houses, the expectation is the number of cars will be significantly higher. 8. Cloudside Road, is the ONLY access to Larch Drive, and is on a steep gradient. In snowy or icy conditions, it actually becomes impassable. It is never gritted (presumably one of the reasons being that the gritter lorries cannot access the road), and it relies on local residents to grit the road manually accessing a grit-box halfway up t
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Jillian Hildridge	Response-01721	he road. For all of these reasons, I strongly object to the proposed vehicular access arrangement and urge the planning authority to reconsider a solution that ensures both safe pedestrian connectivity and appropriate vehicle access, without compromising the surrounding residential streets.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Jenny Stephens	Response-01723	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Joanna hardy	Response-01304	As a resident of sandiacre I already have severe concerns about congestion, particularly from lorries and industrial vehicles, in the area. We already have too many large vehicles travelling through sandiacre. This number is increasing with the new development at the old stonton works. However increasing this problem even further with large scale housing construction in a relatively inaccessible area will just compound this issue. The roads of sandiacre are already congested with residents, local people dropping off school children, through traffic and lorries. The traffic levels have increase noticeably in the 6 years we have lived in the area and would increase to unmanageable levels if this proposed home building takes place. Not only in the short term but as on ongoing issue of more residents vehicles on narrow roads. Coronation avenue is being proposed as an access road for the development of this site. However there are major problems with road parking and the associated traffic congestion. Many of the homes in the area have no off road parking. The homes on the left at the bottom of Coronation avenue (1-9) have none, nor do the homes on ash Grove. As a result they all have to park on Coronation avenue. This causes congestion and makes it difficult for buses to traverse the road. Construction traffic would find it difficult to navigate. Also potentially causing damage to residents vehicles.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Joanne Guyatt	Response-01784	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Joanne Johnson	Response-00765	The extra traffic that this development will generate will add to the already busy roads, main and side. With a school in close proximity which is already dangerous at drop off and pick times due to parked cars, the extra traffic will not help the situation. Town Street, Ilkeston Road and Derby Road already have way too much traffic on them, especially big lorries which should not be allowed on our small roads that aren't designed for them. We need a J25a adding to the M1. Surely the construction traffic will be too big for the access on narrow residential roads not to mention they will no doubt be passing the school. Taken from a report on the Erewash.Gov site /files in 2010 Vehicular Traffic The intrusion of vehicular traffic ? particularly heavy goods traffic ? makes a substantial negative contribution to the character of Sandiacre Crossroads. In October 2010 it was found that 'the junction operates above capacity? and that traffic approaching from Town Street experiences the greatest ?degree of saturation? compared to traffic approaching in other directions (TPA, 2010).
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Joanne Lambert	Response-00494	Traffic is already heavy through Sandiacre with the lorries from stanton using it as a through route to get to junction 25. 180 additional households will hugely impact the congestion on this already busy route.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Jodie Owen	Response-01688	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Jodie Shrive	Response-00601	Sandiacre is already overly congested especially during School hours for Cloudside school. Adding another 180 houses will mean families with at least one child per household adding to the congestion. The roads in this part of Sandiacre are NOT built for this much traffic, it will ruin our neighbourhood. More traffic will also increase the risk off accidents, Sandiacre is full of elderly people as well as Children and you will be putting them at risk should this go ahead.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Joe Sells	Response-01924	Building 180 homes will dramatically increase local traffic, causing congestion, longer commutes & reduce safety for school children.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Jo Gerhardt	Response-01286	Sandiacre is already densely populated. We simply don't have the infrastructure to be able to support the amount of traffic that the new development will bring. I live at the bottom of Starch Lane and the roads are teeming with HGV's; cars, vans etc. My Victorian house shakes as a result of HGV's especially when they going at speed. At the end of Starch Lane it really is quite hazardous and dangerous to cross the the road. It will be a matter of time before someone gets seriously hurt. The access to the proposed development is quite simply unsuitable for the envisaged amount of cars for the area. The small road network, steep hill and tight corners will be unsuitable for the amount of construction traffic and cars that will need access to the area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	John Gardner	Response-01694	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	John G Brown	Response-01752	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	John Hibbitt	Response-01855	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic. Traffic main concern. Concerned they may stop the i4 bus.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	John Ledger	Response-01605	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	John Payne	Response-01785	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	John whiteman	Response-00450	Traffic is bad enough in sandiacre with more traffic if each house has two cars getting on to Stanton road via coronation Ave or beech Ave will be impossible and dangerous
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Jon Burn	Response-01722	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Josh Williams	Response-01632	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	J Pearson	Response-01772	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	J Telfer	Response-01876	The traffic on Stanton Road is already mad. School site is dangerous & can't get out on Town Street or Rushy Lane.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Judith A Pulfer	Response-01863	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Judith Blackburn	Response-01928	The traffic congestion along Stanton Road and Coronation Avenue is becoming non-negational, double parking, even triple parking at times. It is difficult to cross Stanton Road at peak times especially to visit the local shops / post office. The bus drivers have a very difficult time on Stanton Road, Cloudside Road and Maple Avenue. Outside school - parking problems. Constant travelling by car for schools, doctors, hospital visits, shopping, and play areas.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Julie Hill	Response-01643	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Julie Taylor	Response-01503	The traffic around Sandiacre is already at breaking point especially around Beech Avenue, Stanton Road where Cloudside school and St. Giles park is without adding to it, some days you cant even get through, let alone emergency vehicles and buses so i dont know how extra construction traffic would manage and then extra cars.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	JWest	Response-01874	Also the access to the new homes will be a cause for concern for safety and congestion on the only road off the new site down into Sandiacre.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Karen Alldread	Response-01868	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Karen Blain	Response-01732	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Karen Evans	Response-00523	It is difficult for cars and buses to use the surrounding roads at present, this will add to this.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Karen Harwood	Response-01668	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Karen Pitts	Response-00643	The local traffic is already at capacity. Damaged surfaces and poor road quality throughout Sandiacre. Quick fix road patching does not last giving us an ongoing worsening problems. 180 extra houses in this position will probably equate to 200 plus vehicles all adding to the congestion and serious pollution levels. Buses struggle to get around the route at the moment. The addition of all that extra traffic will have a serious effect on a vital public transport link that many, especially elderly people rely on.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Kathryn Lovatt	Response-00497	This proposal would greatly increase the volume of traffic on the many already congested roads in the local area. During peak hours, (for example commuting to and from work, school picks ups) congestion is already a problem particularly around the junction of Beech Avenue onto Stanton Road and Beech Avenue onto Maple Avenue. This proposal would significantly increase congestion around these areas and has an obvious potential health and safety impact. As a family residence on Cloudside Road, we are greatly concerned about the number of vehicles which would pass our property on route to the new housing development. Increased vehicle numbers would have a detrimental affect on air quality/pollution, noise levels and pedestrian safety - thus negatively impacting our quality of life. With 180 proposed new houses, with a average of 1.29 vehicles per property (ONS government stats), a conservative estimate of one journey ( to and from) a day equates to 464 additional vehicles passing our property everyday and when factoring in further journeys e.g. additional family journeys, taxis, trades people, delivery vans etc the more realistic number of vehicles passing our property would be around 764 a day (conservative estimate). The road width, particularly on Larch Drive and Cloudside Road is not suitable for accessing this proposed development. The sharp bend at the bottom of Cloudside (Hill) from Coronation Avenue is a blind spot and vehicles presently have difficulty already passing each other with the many parked cars on the hill. Similarly the sharp bend onto the top of Cloudside Road is also already difficult to negotiate and would be made much worse by the additional 700+ cars per day. Additionally the tight junction between Cloudside Road and Larch Drive is already difficult for any vehicles wishing to access Larch Drive and this proposal would greatly worsen the situation. The road infrastructure particularly around Beech Avenue, Coronation Avenue, Cloudside Road and Larch Drive would not be able to cope with the large number of huge construction vehicles that would pass by daily over a long period of time. It would cause not only noise, pollution and health and safety issues, but massive access and parking issues for current residents.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Kathryn Martin	Response-00527	Main roads already cannot handle rush hour traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Katie Morrice	Response-00664	The proposed development will exacerbate the already existing traffic congestion around cloudside Road and it's surrounding roads. The road width at the top of the hill of cloudside Road does not accommodate 2 vehicles to turn simultaneously already which causes traffic build up. There is also a lot of on street parking throughout coronation avenue, maple avenue, cloudside Road and larch drive. Having an additional amount of cars come through these streets daily will further impede the flow of traffic, complicating car movement and potentially increasing the risk of accidents. Furthermore, there is a regular bus route through station Road, coronation avenue, maple avenue and Beech avenue. This route already has to avoid a lot of the on street parking around the area, having an increased traffic flow will cause a lot of congestion turning onto streets like cloudside Road where a bus stop is right at the bottom of it. It is very unsuitable for the access to be from Cloudside as the very considerable increase in traffic would make this very dangerous on roads which are already busy with parking on both sides of the roads. The increase in volume of traffic would further increase the exisisting problems. Furthermore, the use of Cloudside for heavy construction traffic with the noise, vibration and dirt would be environmentally detrimental to both residents and wildlife for many years. These problems would be made worse in bad winter weather. Access for emergency vehicles needs to be considered, its already difficult to navigate the roads due to the bends and narrow areas aswell as the multitude of cars parked on street.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Katie Robinson	Response-00943	At this stage the roads get smaller the higher you get up the estate - and this is the current proposed access to the build. At present most of the roads have cars either fully or partially parked on the pavements to ensure at least one side of the road is free and even then its sometimes not good enough. You are proposing 180 properties in a small area with tight roads. If we go on the average that each individual property will have at LEAST 1 car then that's an extra 180 cars if not more that will be servicing the top part of the estate. That's at least 1 journey to and from work, then add any school runs, extra activities and hobbies so it does not take a genius to work out that this will completely change the dynamic of the area and how busy it will be. The roads are safe to cross at the moment because despite being congested with parked cars its a quiet part of the estate however adding this amount of traffic will make things unsafe as well and as you are aware there is a school at the bottom of the estate also. Touching on this the roads are extremely busy at the bottom of the estate just with school runs - again this is just after a small and tight bend in the road which again with an increased volume of traffic would cause further safety concerns. Most of these concerns are also after the build - the roads are small and mostly on a hill towards the top where the build is proposed so the traffic for the build alone causing me huge amount of concerns over safety which large lorries and diggers needing to access the site.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Katrina	Response-00628	The access road would be unsuitable for the amount of lorries and construction workers to build the new estate and then with the extra cars that would be on the road after there would be massive congestion at rush hour and school opening and closing times as it is already hard to navigate especially when the 14 is driving down Beech Avenue.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Kelly Randall	Response-00591	Rushy Lane, a key route to M1 J25, already experiences significant congestion. Additional traffic would exacerbate existing issues. Alternative routes via Church Road and Town Street are similarly congested and hazardous. The proposed development relies on a single-lane cul-de-sac for access, with no realistic scope for widening. Has a full risk assessment been undertaken, and what mitigation strategies have been proposed?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Kelsey Green	Response-01666	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Kenneth Cooper	Response-01720	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Kenneth Spray	Response-00281	Sandiacre is already too congested. This will make things much worse
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Kern-Paul Lewis	Response-01715	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Kerry Meadwell	Response-01655	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Kerry Smith	Response-01271	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Kerry stokes	Response-00769	I live at the bottom of Stanton road & already have issues with the volume of traffic & congestion on the road. More houses bringing more people & cars will only exacerbate this. I have trouble getting on & off my drive when cars park on the street, the busiest times are when there are functions on at the football club & school pick up & drop off. Buses often get stuck & have to manoeuvre several times to get round the corner of Stanton road when cars park on the street. Stanton road is a very busy road already with the commercial traffic coming to & from the motorway. We've had experience of big Lorrie?s getting stuck down Stanton road when they meet public buses coming in the opposite direction, this results in them mounting the kerb which is really dangerous for me & my children walking on the pavements. We already have congestion with various businesses around us which bring in bigger vehicles, the construction of the new houses will bring even more & block up the roads. In recent months the time it takes me to drive through Sandiacre to go to work is taking longer because of the build up of traffic coming on & off the motorway, mainly lorries heading for Stanton. I regularly queue on derby road for 15-20mins at a time. This will get worse bringing more cars & Lorrie?s into the area. We had one incident where a bus & lorry met on Stanton road & couldn?t get past one another so the bus had to mount the pavement & manoeuvre several times before they could move any where. I worry that big vehicles like ambulances & fire engines would struggle to navigate easily & as quickly as needed in an emergency. Time is of the essence in an emergency & I worry for all residents safety if we need these services & have even more traffic on the roads.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	KH Taylor	Response-01663	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Kim	Response-00473	Traffic is already ridiculous with the extra hgv from stanton this is going to make it worse
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Kimberley Selby	Response-00478	It's going to make the local streets so much busier with cars and traffic causing more noise pollution and ruining the quiet area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Kim Helm	Response-00632	Large Lorrie?s delivering to the site. Each household will have at least 2 cars
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Kim Larwood	Response-00645	Sandiacre is gridlocked. There has been too much development
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Kirk Moss	Response-00439	Rushy Lane experiences significant delays most mornings, leading to major congestion issues. The canal bridge linking Sandiacre with Long Eaton and Stapleford is already a bottleneck. The Bulls Head island suffers from extreme congestion at peak hours. Derby Road is also severely impacted, with queues forming in all directions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Kirsty	Response-00970	Roads are already difficult to navigate with parked cars

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Kirsty Handa	Response-00445	I believe building on this proposed site is going to be severely detrimental to traffic congestion. The access to the development is going to through an area only large enough for a car, let alone large vehicles such as ambulances, fire engines etc. This access will be for ONE vehicle at a time and unable to create a road alongside a pavement for safety. This is going to create a bottleneck effect with the amount of possible vehicles that will be using the site not just once the building has been completed but even more so when the building is happening. This is going to cause traffic jams in a quiet cul-de-sac area. What happens if someone parks badly, something goes wrong with the access or a car breaks down in the access, that is not safe for any resident especially for the proposed development, what will happen in an emergency? In addition to the access, the surroundings roads are not suitable or sustainable for the proposed development, the roads are already single file due to parking and tight corners, adding an additional 180 cars minimum (that is only 1 per household) travelling up and down the roads and as I stated, this is going to create bottle necks. The bus that services this area already gets stuck on many occasions due to parking and often has to knock on people's doors. Also the local primary school which is located on the main road out of this estate, this is also only single file in which cars have to travel single file a good 500m hoping and praying nothing comes the other way. I have known cars to mount the pavement on several occasions because they have got stuck, thus causing a risk to someone and especially a child but there is just no room and there is also blind corners everywhere. It really is not safe nor sustainable for an additional development in this area. There are no improvements that can be made for this to be sustainable in any way
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Kirsty Meredith	Response-01462	The level of traffic that already uses Stanton Road, Coronation Avenue, Cloudside Road and Beech avenue is extremely high with access problems already occurring for buses and bin lorries. the narrow roads, tight bends and volume of parked cars is not equipped to add a further 180 houses that have no choice but to use these roads.
			K Reynolds	Response-01916	Which leads to pollution as below, and noise pollution.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Kristie Rugers	Response-01864	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic. Far too much congestion currently, this area will not be able to cope with such a development.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Kyle Jones	Response-01764	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	L A Keen	Response-01659	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Laura Hallam	Response-01711	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Laura Rawlins	Response-00500	Disagree
			Laura Thompson	Response-00702	It will drastically increase the number of vehicles going through the estate. Cause further disruption and congestion.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Laurence Luck	Response-01727	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Lauren Freeman	Response-01562	I live on Stanton Road and work in Long Eaton, often this 10 minute journey can take 30 minutes and most of that is spent trying to get out of Sandiacre - either along rushy lane, Sandiacre lights or from Steven's road onto Derby Road. Traffic is already heavy in the area, the idea of adding construction traffic to that and then new residents vehicles will surely only add to what is already a chaotic situation.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Lauren Rose	Response-01446	More houses = more traffic. Traffic is already a big issue in the local area with traffic queuing around the A52 / M1 junction and Bostocks Lane. I travel from Sandiacre to Derby via the Risley crossroads and can regularly get stuck in stationary traffic for upwards of 20 minutes. If there is an issue on either of the major roads this time can be increased. Increased traffic from heavy goods vehicles for the building of the proposed development would only add to this existing congestion. The additional vehicles belonging to each of the proposed new homes would further add to the already heavy traffic in the area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Leah morral	Response-00712	I object to the plans to build on this site as traffic is already bad through our village especially outside of schools. Another 180 houses will be detrimental to adding to this. The access is ridiculous and the road is not wide enough.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Lee Wilcock	Response-01670	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Lesley Bruce	Response-01397	The proposal access through Larch Dr, which is in itself entirely inadequate for a property development, would channel traffic through the narrow roads of an older area of Sandiacre where residents' cars are already parked on both sides of the road. On Coronation Avenue, as one of many examples, residents on one side already park on the pavement. This congested situation would be exacerbated by extra construction traffic plus the cars 180 households would generate. Deliveries and busses already struggle for access. Have the council taken any account of the horrific congestion at the cross roads of Bostocks Lane/Derby Road? The traffic is frequently queuing along Rushy Lane almost as far as the junction with Stanton Road. This will be worsened by the proposed new properties at Stanton and West Hallam. Congestion would also be worsened by the need for lengthy infrastructure additions to services and utilities. The approaching roads would face severe and protracted disruption, loss of parking amenity for many months as meters of road width are needed to lay services. Children already walk to school on very narrow pavements that were never built to run alongside the volume of traffic that runs along Stanton Road and other roads in the area. A greater risk to life would be caused by the volume of construction traffic plus 200+ cars from new housing. There is no dedicated parking for Ladycross school, which forces parents and taxis to pull on to the pavement on Stanton Road. After the school drop off period ends, baby and toddler swimming sessions start at the Ladycross pool, so the congestion there is not brief. People also take the opportunities before and after school to use the post office and Costcutter shop on Stanton Road near the school, so the congestion periods are lengthened.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Lesley Carter	Response-00536	The access to the proposed site from Larch Drive is not suitable for construction vehicles or the amount of vehicles the proposed housing will bring in to the estate. The roads leading down to Derby Road, Stanton Road and Town Street have cars parked along them and there is a blind bend on Cloudside Road. It is already a nightmare trying to navigate through the narrow side streets to the main road. At school times it is almost impossible. There is also the buses and bin lorries to add to the congestion. Emergency vehicles would find it very difficult to get through quickly. There have been occasions when the bus cannot get through. Having only one access in and out of the proposed housing through narrow side streets is potentially dangerous.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Lesley Morral	Response-01920	Traffic on the main road especially around school drop off and pick up is extremely dangerous.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Lia Thims	Response-01766	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Lilly Stokes	Response-00767	When crossing the road I am very anxious and scared of the cars as they come really fast around the bends and come up onto the curb mounting the pavement when cars are parked along the streets at busy points of the day, as a young person this puts me off walking and enables me to feel safe when having to walk to school in the morning.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Linda Castledine-Davies	Response-00850	The proposal of 180 high density housing would, according to Government ONS figure give rise to approx 230 vehicles based on 1.29 being the average cars per household. There is a total lack of existing amenities or facilities and none are proposed resulting in a substantial increase of traffic for commuting and leisure activities. Just one journey a day would equate to 500+ resident vehicles traversing the existing roads. However these numbers would increase substantially with 2-3 trips for school runs, extra curriculum activities, shopping, visiting friend and families, general trips out and about. In fact every single requirement would entail a car journey for most people especially as the steepness of the terrain rules out walking or cycling for the majority. Add on visitors to the site/residents, taxis, couriers and deliveries, trades people and a realistic number per day is in excess of 700 vehicles going up and down the existing roads and that equates to over 19000 extra vehicles per year based solely on 250 working days. This is an unsustainable amount of vehicles for small twisting roads built in the 1980s. The entry and exit to this site is believed to be the narrow farm track at the top of Larch Drive which in itself is a small cul de sac of low density houses culminating in 6 bungalows. This track is insufficiently wide to accommodate this number of vehicles and also provide safety to foot traffic. To access Larch Drive vehicles are required to negotiate the extremely steep narrow hill leading from Stanton Road via Beech or Coronation Avenue (rises from 55 to 80m just from the church to the top of the hill) onto Cloudside Road that has two difficult blind bends and a multitude of parked cars. Making it single track for most of its length. The current bus (Barton buses) cannot venture onto Cloudside and has extreme difficulty getting up Coronation or down Beech. This can be borne out by Barton Buses. There is no question of public transport being able to access this proposed site. The traffic at peak times to the local school on Stanton Road is extremely high with cars parked every which way and where. This occurs throughout the day and has to be avoided during school time. There are also a considerable number of vehicles who park on these streets every day to visit the adjacent nature reserve, Stoney Clouds, as there is no public parking available. If this proposal went ahead there would be up to 5 years of heavy construction traffic traversing these roads from early morning to evening every day. The disruption to residents and wildlife would be great and unbearable. Personally my bedroom wall is right next to the proposed site access which will be dangerous and noisy. The pollution in this area because of its proximity to the M1 was one of the highest in the country, The M1 has recently been widened so is even busier plus heavy duty vehicles are much closer and congestion is still a problem during commuter hours. This all exacerbates the pollution problem and an additional 180 houses will worsen this. This is neither a practical or reasonable proposal to inflict this number of vehicles onto a small residential area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Linda Oscroft	Response-01927	There is currently a problem on Stanton Road & Beech Ave at school times with on-pavement parking & driveways blocked. Friends, family, visitors & delivery people all have problems parking which are made worse in the case of heavy items & can only be made worse by these proposals.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Lindsay Wiseman	Response-00430	The roads currently are already narrow and congested with parking. Stanton Road and Beech Avenue have many parked cars and I have seen the bus unable to pass on two occasions this past year. The school drop off and the football club make the sharp bend near the pub dangerous as it is blind and this has meant on quite a few occasions cars have mounted the kerb to avoid collision. The idea that these roads would be able to support the access for a further 180 houses is ludicrous and dangerous.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Lindsey Rawlinson	Response-01624	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	LISA ANNE GILLIGAN-LEE	Response-00710	The proposed development would significantly exacerbate traffic congestion on narrow village roads, which are not designed to accommodate the volume and type of traffic that would result from both the construction phase and the permanent occupation of the new housing. The influx of heavy construction vehicles during development would pose safety risks to pedestrians, cyclists, and existing residents, as well as cause damage to rural road surfaces. Once completed, the new homes would generate a sustained increase in car journeys, further straining the limited infrastructure, leading to increased delays, noise, and pollution. This would fundamentally alter the character of the village and diminish the quality of life for both current and future residents. Adding hundreds of new homes significantly increases number of vehicles on already busy local village roads in Sandiacre which will lead to bottlenecks and slower journey times. There are various times that I will not venture into Sandiacre to visit friends; visit my hairdresser, due to the sheer amount of traffic congestion.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Lisa Heppell	Response-00878	There is already lots of traffic around the area including buses ,there is a school nearby and the shop has delivers through out the day
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Lisa J Pearson	Response-01762	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Liz Woodhouse	Response-01584	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	L Mee	Response-01777	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Logan Fox	Response-00746	The roads are already narrow, and with lots of blind corners, I have seen many occasions where accidents have almost occurred. When driving inn the car with my parents, we repeatedly have to stop and reverse to allow other cars coming up or down. We cannot have more traffic coming up such a short road with all the tight turns and blind spots. Not safe for pedestrians. We also have 2 dogs, and increased traffic would make me very concerned, not only for my dogs when we are walking them, but all the other dog walkers around.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Lorraine Daly	Response-00495	Sandiacre already suffers from poor air quality due to heavy traffic and HGVs passing through the village and proximity to A52 and M1. We need these green spaces as "lungs".
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Lorraine Hands	Response-00534	I cannot imagine the difficulties that would be incurred for residents on Larch and Cloudside if they had to deal with any construction traffic involved in building the proposed houses!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Louise dix	Response-00975	Traffic is already very heavy around the area and access to the site is through small street full of homes with cars parked on street so will be no access for material truck to access
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Louise Felfoldt	Response-01733	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Louise Harper	Response-01571	This is a quiet cul de sac, more traffic on very steep roads that have very little traffic at the moment which gets very icy in the wintertime
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Louise Harrison	Response-01719	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Louise Jacks	Response-01767	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Louise Libberton	Response-01693	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Louise Robinson	Response-00647	Traffic is already very congested in this area. Large numbers of car and industrial vehicles use this area to get to the M1, industrial areas and schools. An extra 180 cars (at least) will only add to the congestion. In particular, around Rushy lane and Town street where the queues are extremely long adding to pollution. Road infrastructure needs improvement first. Such as new access to M1 for the large number of industrial vehicles heading to the industrial sites. Passing schools and residential areas. Which is a massive safety concern.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Lucy johnson	Response-01369	Traffic through Sandiacre is bad enough at the moment, we don?t need to add any more cars and larger vehicles on the road. It?s not safe for our children!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	lucy victoria garner	Response-00949	already very limited access along stanton road and gridlocked trying to get out of sandiacre in all directions at rushhour. Already unsafe around cloudside school with dangerous and inconsiderate parking and risks of safety of children at school start/end times. Very limited and poor residential access via access points to new developments. Significant risk of increased congestion on already poor road quality.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Luke Chein	Response-01779	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Luke Hinchley	Response-00699	Roads are already too narrow with parked cars, additional residential traffic and traffic caused by the build itself will be a huge inconvenience.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Lydia	Response-00480	The roads are not adequate for that number of additional houses. It will also have a detrimental affect on the wildlife.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Lynda Morton	Response-01606	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Lynsey Blackburn	Response-01227	There is already traffic congestion in this area, adding this development will have an added negative impact
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Macie Brothwell	Response-01633	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Malcolm Dillon	Response-00722	Access to this proposed development is via narrow roads and footpaths with vehicles having to negotiate several junctions and ninety degree bends for up to one mile. Construction traffic will produce hazardous conditions, and pollution, for local residents and may lead to damage to the existing road structure. The addition of commuter traffic from this site would lead to a possible 360+ traffic miles per day disgorging onto, or leaving from, a difficult double, blind bend, small local road that is already struggling to cope with cars and increasingly heavy lorries. This condition will only increase with the current development of the industrial complex at Stanton.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Malcolm Fox	Response-00215	The roads leading into the area are already congested during peak times. Cloudside and Larch Drive are further congested with current residents and the addition of large vehicles for simple transport of materials is wholly unsuitable - disruption would be the norm in this neighborhood. Adding an additional 220 vehicles up and down these roads would result in vehicle collisions and simple traffic that cannot be sustained. This is the only access point/road in and the impact to all residents is simple not being considered. These roads have been designed to support the current residential numbers and adding 180 homes with an average of 1.2 vehicles per household is not smart planning, but simply ticking a box and disregarding and disrespecting the current people, tax payer, voters who live here is basically unacceptable. The plans state infrastructure support... How? These roads were designed as a cul-de-sac and are not suitable for the proposed additions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Malcolm Riggs	Response-01680	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Malc Orbiston	Response-01673	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Mandy Rait	Response-01587	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic. We already experience horrendous traffic with parked vehicles on Stanton Road and the traffic from the new houses would increase the usage. It would make it very dangerous to even cross the road.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Marcel Janovsky	Response-00481	Traffic problems
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Mark Gough	Response-00888	Huge congestion on a daily basis due to the traffic up and down Stanton Road, Beech Ave, especially school drop offs at Cloudside School, double parking, and the shop on Stanton Road with the only post office in there in Sandiacre. Traffic from people using the post office. It's only going to get worse with 180 houses built on Stoney Clouds. Beech Avenue has lorries and traffic going up all times of the day, it's not a main road, the house shakes sometimes. Can't have the windows open in the summer due to the traffic noise.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Mark Leek	Response-01740	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	mark skelton	Response-01341	Already a very busy during peak times. School times etc. lots of cars leaving the estate. Only two roads in and out plus a bus route to Nottingham. Delivery Lorry's and shopping tescos etc.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Mark Thompson	Response-00750	Traffic is already too much in sandiacre and this world make this even worse
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Mark Warton	Response-00693	An extra 20,000 plus vehicles a year on roads in and around Sandiacre
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Marta McManus	Response-00646	Traffic in Sandiacre is awful already especially at rush hour. Many Lorry's come through Sandiacre and additional cars with these homes will affect traffic in and out of Sandiacre.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Martin Driver	Response-01387	Narrow streets, too many cars, school and football club traffic. Bus route which struggles to get through. General traffic from Stanton park is ridiculous in sandiacre. 100's of additional HGV's never mind all the employees going to work at the estate each day. Sandiacre is already gridlocked! NO MORE DEVELOPMENTS IN SANDIACRE!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Martin Ford	Response-01908	Traffic congestion increasing at the junction of Taft Ave.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Martin Hardy	Response-01413	As a resident of coronation avenue, sandiacre I have serious concern for access, congestion and the durability of the roads if the proposed construction is undertaken. We already have access and parking problems as many residents have to park on the road as they have no drives. This leads to problems for buses, bin lorries etc. Many construction lorries would increase the issue. Also once completed the increased residential traffic would also make the situation worse. As an engineer I am concerned that the roads leading from Stanton road to the proposed building site are not rated for heavy traffic or large vehicles. Many roads in the area are in bad shape and as such extra traffic would cause further damage to the roads and cost more money to repair.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Martyn Locker	Response-00903	There would be a single access road through an already congested estate, in which the local bus - a key lifeline for non-driving residents in this remote corner of Derbyshire - already struggles to navigate due to excessive parked cars. Without the addition of new houses, I've often experienced the bus threading the needle between precariously parked cars and oncoming traffic, often needing to use the pavement to manoeuvre through the estates. I've also experienced the bus completely unable to pass through the estate for over 20 minutes due to multiple vehicles parked too close together on opposite sides of the road near the local convenience store. With so many new houses I really fear the worst in terms of access. I have many elderly neighbours without computer access to complete this form, but they rely on that bus service for crucial health appointments as a single example.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Martyn Maxted	Response-00435	As far as I know, the only access to the proposed development site is via Larch Drive, which itself is accessed by Cloudside Road via Beech Avenue/Maple Avenue or Coronation Avenue, all via Stanton Road. I know there are pedestrian accesses to the horse fields from the bend in Cloudside Road and via the garage block at the top of Linden Grove, but both of these ?routes? would require demolition of existing buildings. All these roads are already narrow and fairly congested, particularly at school opening/closing times and during the evening/weekends when there is a higher volume of roadside parked vehicles. This proposed development would significantly further increase congestion.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Matt Bancroft	Response-00916	The existing access to the proposed site is wholly inadequate for the proposed number of houses. There are only around 30 houses currently beyond the chestnut grove turn and the road is already such that you have to reverse to pass oncoming traffic. Adding around 360 new cars to this is unsustainable.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Matt Hallam	Response-00476	Adding that many houses back 30 years ago there was a reason why they didnt build on it and now you will find that most households will have 1-2 cars per house which will mean 180 -360 cars minimum travelling through larch drive everyday. Currently you will most likely have 10 cars a day. This will hit everyone in the area hard. The access from larch is too narrow and you cannot fit 2 lanes plus pavements on either side
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Matthew Buckland	Response-00615	The roads that lead to the site have a lot of parked cars at all times of the day, which would make it difficult for an additional 300 cars to navigate around (based on the average of 1.8 cars per house) During rush hour they are also significant queues along Derby Road and Town Street, which would be increased by the additional cars if the proposed build went ahead. Without significant investment there is currently no way construction traffic will be able to work on site safely and without adversely affecting local residents.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Maurice Mason	Response-01617	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Maxine Sutton	Response-00471	Sandiacre is a small village with small village roads. These roads are already congested and parking is a huge problem. The main road through the village goes over a small bridge over a canal. The traffic lights there are three way which means there are constantly long queues, and during rush hour it is horrendous. Adding 180 new homes will ensure it becomes grid locked for much of the week. The main junction is a three way traffic light bridge over the Erewash canal. This is always busy. The council have already approved new warehousing on the old Stanton Iron works site and the large lorries are only adding to the congestion. Some of them can hardly cope with the tight bends. All the extra traffic will put a dangerous burden on the already busy small roads, and the weight of all the extra Lorrie?s etc might damage the small bridges. If this project goes ahead a large sum would need to be put aside for improving the road network, and i doubt very much that this money really would be assigned to Sandiacre. If the plan to build these houses does go ahead there would also need to be a consideration of the type of people who are to live there. There must be a proper mix of affordable housing, starter homes and bungalows for the aging population. Just building four bedroom houses (which bring in the most profit) would be detrimental to the area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	M Dougle	Response-01749	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	M Eastwood	Response-01757	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Melanie	Response-00586	The area already suffers from significant traffic congestion, particularly along Rushy Lane in Risley, a key access route to Junction 25 of the M1. This congestion would be exacerbated by additional traffic from the proposed development. Furthermore, alternative routes such as Church Road and Town Street are already overburdened and unsafe due to narrow lanes, blind bends, and existing heavy goods vehicle (HGV) traffic. These roads are unsuitable for further traffic increases and present a serious safety risk. The proposed development would be accessible via a single entry point, which is highly inappropriate for a high-density housing estate. A comprehensive traffic impact assessment must be provided and independently reviewed.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Melanie Caumont	Response-01272	The proposed development will place significant additional pressure on already overstretched local roads. Larch Drive, the intended point of vehicular access, is a narrow residential street already suffering from persistent congestion, particularly during school drop-off and pick-up times. The average household in the area owns two to three cars, and on-street parking often renders the roads impassable to larger vehicles. Adding 180 homes?conservatively equating to 250?300 extra cars?will overwhelm the existing infrastructure. Congestion on nearby roads such as Cloudside Road and the junction with Derby Road already causes frequent delays and traffic hazards.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Melanie Howarth	Response-01621	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Michael Anderson	Response-00461	With 180 new homes being constructed I would suggest there would be around 400 extra vehicles belonging to the occupants of these houses. Plus the amount of service delivery vehicles such as vans lorries etc. that will be visiting this area. The roads adjacent to this area are which are essential to gain access are too narrow already which forces the people already living there to use pavements to park their vehicles. An example of this is the i4 bus route which at times struggles to continue on its journey because parked cars are blocking the road. With more traffic because of this suggested site will cause even more mayhem.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Michael Oscroft	Response-01926	There is currently a problem on Stanton Road & Beech Ave at school times with on-pavement parking & driveways blocked. Friends, family, visitors & delivery people all have problems parking which are made worse in the case of heavy items & can only be made worse by these proposals.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Mitchell Birkin	Response-01657	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Michelle Alsop	Response-01645	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Michelle Cox	Response-01724	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Michelle Ledger	Response-00815	i live on laburnum close to the site entrance, ben here 21 years, the increase in vehicles has gone up tenfold in my years here, most homes have 1 or 2 cars, the roads in the whole area are just too narrow as they are, if a car is parked on the street, any vehicle has to stop to let another past it, many cars especially on coronation avenue now park on the pavements due to the influx of traffic, there are alot of elderly and some disabled ppl in the area and having to go on the road to pass a car is unacceptable as it is people walking there dogs via the stoney cloud entrance - some people come in cars (as non locals use the stoney clouds too) and they park there cars down the side of my house on the corner of laburnum close/coronation avenue in which to do so, so parked vehicles has increased and this is also hard for residence to find parking at times, particularly weekends This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic. Disruption from heavy duty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. It would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Michelle Wenham	Response-01650	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Mick Helm	Response-00021	The site will be accessed by an extension to Larch Drive. Has anyone from the council actually been to Larch Drive? The road is barely wide enough for two cars and residents and visitors quite rightly park outside their house if their drive is full. How are large lorries full of building material supposed to access the site without causing damage? I'm afraid whoever approved this site works in the land of theory rather than practice! If they could be bothered to get out from behind their desk for a change they might find an on-site visit (with local residents) might provide a bit more truth than looking at a map on-line.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Mick Hughes	Response-01701	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Mike Darnell	Response-00698	Poor accessibility and make this site reliant on car usage and go against any claim to make it sustainable travel. Stuck up a steep hill at the top of sandiacre. This will be a traffic congestion nightmare
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Miss Garratt	Response-00905	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Miss R Cordon	Response-01648	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Misty McGrath	Response-01556	The access roads to the site are not appropriate for extra vehicles; it is already a difficult area with parking limitations which reduce access.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Mollie Snow	Response-01729	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Molly Newbold	Response-00486	This will cause additional traffic to Beech Avenue, could also lead to additional parked cars on our street Maple Avenue which already has enough.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Mr. Mark Lovatt	Response-00956	One of my main concerns is the access to the proposed site, particularly up the steep incline on Cloudside Road, the sharp turn to the right and the tight turn onto Larch Drive. Even during quieter times, it is difficult to navigate in the car. The one access point onto the proposed housing estate will exacerbate the problem even more. Larch Drive is far too narrow to be the only access to 180 houses. The large number of cars, vans, lorries etc which would use this narrow road (Larch Drive) would cause congestion and safety issues.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Mr & Mrs Turton	Response-01660	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Mr A Monk	Response-01905	
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Mr and Mrs R Skelton	Response-01274	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Mr and Mrs Wright	Response-01275	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Mr Colin Key	Response-01841	Only one narrow access point insufficiently wide for this number of vehicles (estimate 700+ a day based on ONS data) to enter and exit safely plus: heavy construction traffic and associated vehicles that will be required on site for 3-5 years. These local roads are steep, narrow and difficult to navigate and were not designed to cope with this volume of modern (bigger, heavier) vehicles, nor construction traffic. This number of additional vehicles will add yet more congestion to the already high volume of vehicles that currently use the area around Town Street, Stanton Road etc heading to and from the M1. To propose this, whilst knowing there will be an even more substantial increase in the near future from the new Stanton Industrial Park, is reprehensible. A full census is required especially at peak times to monitor current number of vehicles, type of vehicle and the associated pollution from exhaust, brake pads and tyres and this must be ongoing.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Mr David Ainsworth	Response-00621	The existing highways are not designed for such a high number of houses. 180 houses with an average of two cars per house with delivery vehicles and school runs - will equate to at least 900 journeys per day along the existing Cloudside Road. The road is not suitable for such heavy traffic. Not least the disruption and noise levels to existing residents but increased carbon monoxide air pollution effects on people's health. I am very concerned that service and emergency vehicles won't get easy access when needed as they already struggle to get round the two bends on Cloudside Road, often blocking the way for residents exit and entry. I am going to be delayed getting to and from work if this goes ahead due to congestion and I am needed on call 24/7. It is unacceptable when I am needed in a crisis not to be able to respond in a timely manner. Lives could be put at risk if I cannot exit Cloudside Road on time and with ease. I am also objecting because of other developments in Stanton are going to bring way too much volume of traffic to the streets in Sandiacre. I am concerned about road safety.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Mr Ivan Stevenson	Response-01875	A lot more traffic
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Mr John Hickingbotham	Response-01431	The single point of access via Larch Drive is unsuitable, primarily due to Larch Drive itself only being accessible from Cloudside Road which is a narrow street constructed to standards deemed sufficient in the 1950s when motor vehicles were considerably smaller than nowadays. Even now, vehicles are frequently parked partially obstructing the narrow pavements creating difficulties for parents with prams and residents requiring the use of mobility scooters. Further development will only create additional traffic, exacerbate these issues and create severe residual cumulative impacts. There will also be significant issues regarding access by large delivery vehicles during the construction phase.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Mr K Gubb	Response-01838	Only one narrow access point insufficiently wide for this number of vehicles (estimate 700+ a day based on ONS data) to enter and exit safely plus: heavy construction traffic and associated vehicles that will be required on site for 3-5 years. These local roads are steep, narrow and difficult to navigate and were not designed to cope with this volume of modern (bigger, heavier) vehicles, nor construction traffic. This number of additional vehicles will add yet more congestion to the already high volume of vehicles that currently use the area around Town Street, Stanton Road etc heading to and from the M1. To propose this, whilst knowing there will be an even more substantial increase in the near future from the new Stanton Industrial Park, is reprehensible. A full census is required especially at peak times to monitor current number of vehicles, type of vehicle and the associated pollution from exhaust, brake pads and tyres and this must be ongoing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Mr K Turton	Response-01706	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Mr Luke	Response-01703	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Mr P J Tanner	Response-01728	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Mr R M Draper	Response-01856	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Mr R Widdowson	Response-01734	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Mr S. Haywood	Response-01585	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Mrs Christina Pope	Response-00732	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Mrs Donna C. Ball	Response-01594	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Mrs Froggatt	Response-00449	Too much traffic travelling through Sandiacre already. The roads are not suitable for heavy traffic. Lots of the main roads are congested most of the day already. Moore vehicles will just enhance the problem
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Mrs Griffin	Response-01698	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Mrs J. Cooper	Response-01596	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic. Traffic would be increased on roads that are not suited to heavy duty construction vehicles. Residents having to cope with the noise and disturbance.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Mrs Jennifer Fry	Response-00581	The re is very limited access to the area which means traffic will build up
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Mrs Joanne Thompson	Response-01690	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Mrs J Reeder	Response-01909	Too many heavy vehicles using our road causing congestion at Taft Ave junction.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Mrs Lee Farabella	Response-01899	The existing road infrastructure is not designed to handle a sharp increase in vehicles.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Mrs Linda Cox	Response-01753	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Mrs Luke	Response-01704	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Mrs M. Rose	Response-01583	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Mrs Marie Draper	Response-01755	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic. I already find it difficult to get out of Kings Road onto Town Street because of heavy lorries and cars. This will prove more difficult if the building of houses is allowed on Stoney Clouds.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Mrs M Burke	Response-01887	Existing road infrastructure is not designed to handle a sharp increase of vehicles.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Mrs M Jones	Response-01884	The extra traffic
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Mrs N Taylor	Response-01896	Existing road infrastructure is not designed to handle a large increase of traffic. Very narrow roads with sharp bends.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Mrs Rachel Coats	Response-01623	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Mrs R Cordon	Response-01647	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Mrs Rigby	Response-00641	This would increase the traffic on unsuitable roads by over 700 extra vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a road not suited to this volume of traffic. More disruption from heavy duty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. It would be added more Ware and Tare to the roads surfaces creating more poor road conditions needing repairing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Mrs Shani Wainwright	Response-00754	The existing road infrastructure is not designed to be able to handle a very sharp increase in vehicle volume which a further 180 homes would bring. The increase in traffic of approx 700 vehicles a day on these already dangerous and over used narrow roads would be a living hell for residents. Bringing disruption, stress and a much reduced quality of life....in particular the noise, vibration, congestion, dirt and pollution from heavy construction vehicles initially and then additional cars thereafter. Especially at peak times the congestion would be life changing. These issues will all also impact the treasured wildlife in the area for many years to follow too. I live on Beech Ave and already there is a problem with cars parking everywhere at school times and buses getting stuck trying to go up the road. I expect to not be able to get off my drive at peak times especially, as due to the increased number of cars using the road in the future there will be a constant queue outside my house. This will be very distressing and cause much stress, plus the pollution from the queuing cars will be detrimental to my health. Sadly I see my quality of life diminishing sharply. 😞 This road is wholly unsuitable for construction vehicles and such an increased number of cars, it is quite frankly a very dangerous proposal....many children walk along Stanton Road and up Beech Ave to and from school, with there already being too many cars. So I'd dread to think what will happen if this proposal goes ahead.....very sad times indeed.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Mrs Sheila Hickingbotham	Response-01338	The centre of Sandiacre already suffers from acute traffic congestion at the traffic lights on the canal bridge and the addition of 180 new homes will only add to the problem. Stanton Road and the roads to the north of it already suffer from severe congestion especially at school times, resulting in frustration for residents and other road users especially buses and emergency vehicles. This edge of settlement site is distant from key services and will increase car dependence resulting in increased traffic both in the immediate vicinity and throughout the village as people access services and through routes.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Mrs Shirley Victoria Riggs	Response-01685	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Mrs Susan Bantle	Response-01612	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Mrs Turton	Response-01707	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Mrs Whittaker	Response-00595	There will be a significant increase in traffic, on roads which are already congested, causing issues for emergency services, and a danger to the children attending the local school
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Nasim Rashid	Response-01103	Narrow roads tight access to sites. Potential access if vehicles parked on the road either side
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Natalie Bentley	Response-01646	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Nicole Cooper	Response-01597	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Nigel Percy	Response-00524	The proposal will add significant traffic flow onto Church St and especially along Stanton Road. The bend at the top of Starch Lane and the School are particularly vulnerable pinch points
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Nikki Vincent	Response-00688	Traffic and congestion is already causing huge problems in the local area. Heavy duty vehicles and additional cars on our local roads will only add to this already existing problem. This is particularly worrying when thinking about my children getting to/from school safely as at these times of the day is when traffic and congestion is at its worst. Stanton road is my biggest concern, due to the parked vehicles and blind corner, it is already an accident waiting to happen.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Normn McCrea	Response-01754	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Oliver Marriott	Response-00679	Traffic Congestion Traffic / congestion - Road safety/ access - My main concern is the suitability of the access to the proposed site it's a very narrow road with several sharp bends and a sharp incline. I use this road on a daily basis to collect my friend's son to take him to school. It's always a struggle to get up the road, I find it very hard to believe that any type of commercial lorry would be able to get up there safely. The bus route misses this area out for this very reason. It's an unsuitable access point for the proposed site not only for access but for the expected volume of traffic estimated to rise to 19,000 extra uses of vehicles. With the current condition of the roads with the amount of potholes I'm not sure the roads could sustain the volume/ weight. What plan is in place to prepare the roads for this extra traffic? During the winter the steep road can become inaccessible particularly for larger vehicles. I think you're underestimating the impact on the roads the extra traffic - initially created by the workforce then subsequently the new occupants will create.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Olivia Allen	Response-00520	This will create lots more traffic a much more built up area. Sandiacre is already a busy area anyway
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Paige Walker	Response-01669	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Pamela Bassett	Response-00608	There is already too much traffic causing problems for the local area
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Pam shepherd	Response-00453	Sandiacre is already heavy congested with traffic and the roads in poor condition this will cause chaos around the area
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Pat Hardy	Response-01739	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Patricia Ancliff	Response-00948	It appears that access will use existing infrastructure through Sandiacre to use either Town Street, Stanton Road/ Rushy Lane or B5010 Derby Road to travel further. This route is already congested and Town Street/ Derby Road busy with heavy goods vehicles. HS2 bridge parts; railway tracks and Ward Recycling vehicles to name a few. With the Stanton Development this route will be polluting, dangerous and unsustainable. Adding more vehicles without major infrastructure plans ( Junction 25A?) is short sighted and to the detriment of Sandiacre residents and beyond.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Paula Darnell	Response-00665	The traffic is already very bad around stanton road and the hundreds of extra cars that this development would be coming out of coronation avenue would have a massive detrimental impact. Already the queuing outside the school leading on to church drive and spencer avenue is so bad, heaven knows how it would be then. Also leading on to busy lane and town street
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Paula Luck	Response-01710	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Paula Sims	Response-01687	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Paul Randall	Response-00131	Significant congestion is already present on Rushy Lane in Risley. This is a main route to M1 J25. Extra traffic here is unwelcome. Additionally the other route out of this estate is Church Road and Town Street - again severely congested at time, and also dangerous due to HGVs and blind narrow bends. Infrastructure includes access? access to the site via a single lane cul-de-sac. How has this been risk assessed? What does the traffic assessment for the area show? How can this access be widened when there is no scope to do so? This will be the ONLY road access to the new estate? The road system is barely able to cope with the existing houses. Cloudside Road is already regularly blocked to all but cars due to parking and the narrow roads. It would be impractical for building access to be made via Larch Drive as vehicles larger than a delivery van would be unable to access. Vehicles are currently parked fully on the pavement in order to maintain access, and if this was ever to be made illegal, would make the area impassable. An extra 100-200 vehicles using the existing road system, especially at peak times, is hard to imagine. Practically, most of the vehicles exist the estate via either Stanton Road westbound, or Church Street eastbound. The Stanton Road exit at peak times feeds congestion due to Junction 25, especially along Rushy Lane. More vehicles accessing J25 will make the situation worse. Attached are a couple of dash cam videos showing the typical traffic issues, including of an i4 bus using the pavement to pass vehicles. These videos are from 13/05/2025 around 8am.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Paul Vleeton	Response-01770	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	paul wheeldon	Response-00582	Traffic in the area is already horrendous adding to it will only exacerbate the situation
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Paul Wilkes	Response-00599	The roads and access points cannot sustain the extra traffic and pollution caused by the development. We are not happy
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Peter Anthony	Response-01866	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Peter brown	Response-00671	There's far too much traffic in sandiacre already it's an absolute nightmare
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Peter Nicholls	Response-01622	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Pete West	Response-01700	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Phil Creasey	Response-01342	The proposed development will exacerbate the already existing traffic congestion around cloudside Road and it's surrounding roads. The road width at the top of the hill of cloudside Road does not accommodate 2 vehicles to turn simultaneously already which causes traffic build up. There is also a lot of on street parking throughout coronation avenue, maple avenue, cloudside Road and larch drive. Having an additional amount of cars come through these streets daily will further impede the flow of traffic, complicating car movement and potentially increasing the risk of accidents. Furthermore, there is a regular bus route through station Road, coronation avenue, maple avenue and Beech avenue. This route already has to avoid a lot of the on street parking around the area, having an increased traffic flow will cause a lot of congestion turning onto streets like cloudside Road where a bus stop is right at the bottom of it. It is very unsuitable for the access to be from Cloudside as the very considerable increase in traffic would make this very dangerous on roads which are already busy with parking on both sides of the roads. The increase in volume of traffic would further increase the existing problems. Furthermore, the use of Cloudside for heavy construction traffic with the noise, vibration and dirt would be environmentally detrimental to both residents and wildlife for many years. These problems would be made worse in bad winter weather.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Philip Mason	Response-00239	Cloudside Road is a narrow road with several parked cars along it and is only suitable for traffic travelling in one direction causing you to pull to the side to let oncoming cars pass, An extra 180 homes with at least one car per household travelling up and down it several times a day is not feasible, The road is not suitable for any more extra traffic, It would become a massive bottleneck.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Philip Reed	Response-01449	Local roads, particularly those leading to main commuting routes, are not designed to support a sudden increase in traffic volume. This will lead to longer journey times, increased air pollution from idling vehicles, and greater wear and tear on infrastructure, all of which will negatively affect residents' quality of life.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	P Sandes	Response-01682	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Rachel Crossley	Response-01661	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Rachel Skelton	Response-01241	As a resident of Beech Avenue traffic up the road will rise dramatically as one of 2 ways to the new proposed site. There are already issues with busses struggling to get down the road and significant congestion at school drop off and pick times for cloudside. There are already parking issues causing dangers for children entering or leaving the school that need to be addressed and this will only make it more congested and dangerous.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	R Barratt	Response-01664	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Rcahel Sharp	Response-00652	There is already traffic congestion on the main roads in Sandiacre - Sandiacre crossroad traffic lights (particularly with the Lidl store), Rushy Lane traffic lights. There is already substantial HGV through traffic from the Stanton industrial estate with the increased pollution they cause. Family members used to live on Town Street and there was always grime from the HGV traffic inside and outside the house. The roads of the estate which would lead to the development have parked cars from the houses with and without drives making access difficult. Stanton Road is also particularly bad at the post office/shop, at school drop off and pick up time and also at Sandiacre Town Football club bend. Buses and lorries struggle to navigate the roads. I live on Coronation Avenue and use the i4 bus frequently and this is a regular occurrence. The high density of the proposed development will add considerably to what is already a congested area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Rebecca Longmuir	Response-00253	The roads are already narrow and have lots of double parked cars. This is already a nightmare and congestion occurring regularly. Adding more housing will NOT help.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Rhiannon Lowater	Response-01592	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	R Hibbitt	Response-01862	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic. Horrendous as it is now.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Richard Broughton	Response-01352	There is bound to be a considerable increase in traffic in this residential area. Both during construction and when residents move in
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Richard Chambers	Response-00745	This will make the centre of Sandiacre even more congested than it is already
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Richard Deeprose	Response-00816	This development will add to traffic congestion.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Richard Haines	Response-01674	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Richard Jenkins	Response-00264	The area is heavily congested by residential traffic and already a major headache for the bus companies. The roads accessing the general area are already overloaded with HGV due to the substantial industrial development on the Stanton Ironworks site. It has taken me up to an hour to travel the 1 1/4 miles to M1 junction 25 from my house in Sandiacre. More traffic, whether HGV during the building stage or residential after the proposed development is finished is madness. Stanton Road has long been a bottleneck for traffic. It is an important bus route for travel to both Nottingham and Derby, and thus a major lifeline for many residents in the area. It has regular deliveries by lorries up to and including 44 tonne articulated lorries. Staggered school times from the several local schools mean a lot of traffic in the area over multiple periods. Weekends mean increased traffic for school activities and for the Sandiacre Town (very popular). football club on Stanton Road. All of the above means traffic issues, elevated levels of pollution including microparticulate from tyre and brake wear, and physical risks to child safety. THEN, add in 180 additional households, which, according to government statistics will potentially mean some 20,000 additional vehicle movements per annum from this proposed development, all of which will have to use Stanton Road. From a personal perspective, I do drive when I have to, and it is a nightmare for me to get out onto Stanton Road from Elm Avenue except at quiet times. That is BEFORE the addition of 180 new households in the area. What then? What studies has EBC carried out with regard to traffic density in the area?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Richard Marriott	Response-00675	Traffic Congestion Traffic / congestion - Road safety/ access - My main concern is the suitability of the access to the proposed site it's a very narrow road with several sharp bends and a sharp incline. I use this road on a daily basis to collect my friend's son to take him to school. It's always a struggle to get up the road, I find it very hard to believe that any type of commercial lorry would be able to get up there safely. The bus route misses this area out for this very reason. It's an unsuitable access point for the proposed site not only for access but for the expected volume of traffic estimated to rise to 19,000 extra uses of vehicles. With the current condition of the roads with the amount of potholes I'm not sure the roads could sustain the volume/ weight. What plan is in place to prepare the roads for this extra traffic? During the winter the steep road can become inaccessible particularly for larger vehicles. I think you're underestimating the impact on the roads the extra traffic - initially created by the workforce then subsequently the new occupants will create.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Richard Naylor	Response-00066	There is too much traffic in this area and access to the land, especially during the build phase, will be horrendous.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Richard Shrimpton	Response-01301	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic. Disruption from heavy duty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. It would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Rob Lowe	Response-01768	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Roger Day	Response-00023	There are few job opportunities in Sandiacre and hence those potential new residents would have to drive to work in all probability increasing traffic in an already crowded road system.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Roger Farnsworth	Response-01910	As a house of regular bus users, the extra traffic will make the already difficult bus route which regularly gets stuck will get worse with extra traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Roger Fleck	Response-01083	The quiet cul de sac that is proposed to be the only access to the site of 180 houses is not wide enough to accommodate the extra traffic and construction lorries. The roads leading up to the access are also narrow and consist of tight bends that would make it nearly impossible for large lorries etc to access safely. There are many occasions that meeting another vehicle on these bends have nearly caused a bump as 2 cars are not able to pass at the same time.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Rosemarie Gough	Response-00997	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Roy Drew	Response-01614	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Ruby Sharp	Response-00886	There is already traffic congestion on the main roads in Sandiacre especially at the Rushy Lane traffic lights. On Tuesday 6th May at 7:30am it took me half an hour to get from Coronation Avenue to the J25 roundabout. There had not been any accidents or roadworks causing this, just the sheer amount of vehicles especially HGVs coming from Stanton. This made me late for work. There is already substantial HGV through traffic from the Stanton industrial estate with the increased pollution they cause. As this industrial estate develops, the number of HGVs coming through Sandiacre will increase and so will the congestion. The roads of the estate which would lead to the development have parked cars from the houses with and without drives making access difficult. Stanton Road is also particularly bad at the post office/shop, at school drop off and pick up time and also at Sandiacre Town Football club bend. Buses and lorries struggle to navigate the roads. I live on Coronation Avenue and use the i4 bus frequently and this is a regular occurrence. The high density of the proposed development will add considerably to what is already a congested area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Ryan Selby	Response-00479	There will be more traffic congestion with the extra houses if they were built, the added traffic on these roads, they weren't designed for this originally.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	S. Brailsford	Response-00598	Traffic congestion is already at a dangerous level in this area and in the surrounding close area. Buses are sometimes at a standstill due to the congestion too and this can be fact checked. Even if each of the proposed houses only had 1 car per household (instead of the predominant 2 cars per household), this would add unsustainable pressure to an already overly congested area. This in turn would add to the air pollution in this area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	S. Jones	Response-01615	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Sally Davies	Response-01294	Sandiacre has many traffic problems already. The site has limited access and there will be loss of open lland.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Samantha Anne Whitney	Response-00757	Having lived on Chestnut Grove for the first 35 of my life I've seen the struggles with traffic on these roads. It's a nightmare for buses and dustbins to get up onto the estate, they often get stuck. If you need to drive past Cloudside School in the mornings or afternoons it's a accident waiting to happen, I'm actually surprised a child hasn't been killed on Stanton Road, there's car's parked everywhere when the school is opening and closing. It's just not safe and adding more traffic is going to end in tragedy. When there's snow in Winter you can't get up either Cloudside Road or Chestnut Grove as it's too steep and the cars just slide down, bearing in mind to access the new development you will have to go via Cloudside Road or Chestnut Grove. You're proposing 180 new houses, so say every house has 2 cars that make just 2 journeys up and down the estate everyday to get to work and back, that's an extra 720 cars up and down Cloudside Road. Have any of you actually been and looked at that road? It's absolutely unbelievable that you think that is ok. Have you seen how congested that road already is? In reality the traffic will be more as I've only accounted for work journeys not social and pleasure! What about all the machinery that's needed to build the houses? Are you going to transport that up Cloudside Road too? We already have parking problems on the estate without adding anymore cars or traffic. It's not possible to build because of all the access problems, if you visited the estate or lived here, you would see that on a daily basis.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Samantha Whildes	Response-01270	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Sam Buckland	Response-00600	The roads that lead to the site have a lot of parked cars at all times of the day, which would make it difficult for an additional 300 cars to navigate around (based on the average of 1.8 cars per house) During rush hour they are also significant queues along Derby Road and Town Street, which would be increased by the additional cars if the proposed build went ahead.
1.6a	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Sam Fleck	Response-00821	Based on plans the access appears to be significantly constrained. The widest achievable opening is only 5.7 metres with the gate only being 2.7 metres. This assumes they own the current land to achieve the 5.7metres. Narrow roads on the residential streets leading up to the site Frequent bus/bin lorries getting stuck already indicates that large construction traffic would be unsafe. Development will significantly increase the number of vehicles using quiet roads. At present residents are aware of the current highway constraints and wait patiently for one another to pass parked vehicles however with traffic from another 180 house the parked cars that currently cause little disruption are likely to create congestion . The traffic along stanton road and rushy lane is already extremely heavy especially during rush hour and school drop off and pick up times. The amount of vehicles already trying to access the M1 alongside the industrial traffic from stanton cause huge delays and puts pressure on the roads leading to the slip road. Another 180 house on average 360 cars will just exasperate the already growing problem
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Sam Greateorex	Response-01695	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Sandra Cooke	Response-01613	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Sarah Favell	Response-00038	It is already busy enough on the roads in sandiacre and surrounding areas, the children walking to Friesland and nearby schools already have enough to contend with the amount of HGV that pass through the village plus the amount of pollution they must cause.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Sarah Harrison	Response-01658	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	S Bryne	Response-01677	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Sebastian Roberts	Response-01675	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Shanead Ligton	Response-01689	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Shannon moss	Response-00454	With 180 houses being built and the national average of cars being around 1.2 that means an additional 180+ cars on the road per day, multiple times per day once built. Let alone the transport of materials, diggers etc, we live on clouside road and the bends round here are not fit for purpose for two cars. The local infrastructure is already at its limits. Roads in the area are in severe disrepair, and public services?such as dental clinics, GP surgeries, and schools?are already overburdened. Introducing a large-scale development will exacerbate these issues, leading to longer waiting times, increased congestion, and overall deterioration of public resources. Without substantial investment in infrastructure and services, this development will create an unsustainable and hazardous living environment. Unmanageable Traffic, Poor Road Conditions, and Impassable Streets for Heavy Machinery Traffic congestion in the surrounding areas is already unbearable during peak periods. Adding more residents through this development would require massive infrastructure upgrades, which are already desperately needed. Rushy Lane experiences significant delays most mornings, leading to major congestion issues. The canal bridge linking Sandiacre with Long Eaton and Stapleford is already a bottleneck, frequently causing long queues and frustration for commuters. The Bulls Head island, connecting Sandiacre to Ilkeston, suffers from extreme congestion at peak hours, causing widespread disruption. Derby Road is also severely impacted, with queues forming in all directions due to poor road conditions and high traffic volumes. Additionally, the existing bus route that services Sandiacre already struggles to navigate the streets due to their narrowness, particularly towards the upper sections near the proposed development site. If a standard public bus finds it difficult to pass through these areas, it raises serious concerns about how heavy-duty machinery, such as cranes, concrete lorries, and grab hire trucks, would even begin to manoeuvre through these constricted roads. Even standard cars often struggle to navigate the tighter sections, meaning construction traffic would likely cause further congestion, damage to road surfaces, and an increase in safety hazards for pedestrians and existing road users. Let alone how services would be able to get around such tight roads ie fire engine, ambulances etc when the only access available is larch drive which again is not built for 2 cars
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Shannon Robinson	Response-01635	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Sharon Grant	Response-00219	The roads upto larch drive are very narrow. Many cars park on the road, at times you have to mount the pavement to get past. that?s just the cars, the lorrie?s and buses often have to knock on doors to get residents to move their cars; same goes on the surrounding streets. In the morning and afternoon when the schools are open/closing it?s utter mayhem. You are pulling out blind as the cars are parked actually on the pavement. In the morning going to work; the roads are at a standstill.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	sharon thornhill	Response-00448	sandiacre already carries an inordinate amount of traffic and this would increase it again. the roads around the proposed site aren?t wide enough as it is and i?d worry if emergency vehicles could get to homes in time. the refuse lorrie?s sometimes have trouble collecting. the roads surrounding just simply aren?t made for extra traffic
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Sharon weston	Response-00440	Traffic is horrendous at the best of times,stanton Rd cannot take anymore traffic,ie school times,and the football club extra parking,buses getting stuck cus of traffic,refuse collectors not emptying bins,cars have to park on paths as no room on rds absolutely shocking
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Shaun Green	Response-01773	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Sheila	Response-00587	The area already suffers from significant traffic congestion, particularly along Rushy Lane in Risley, a key access route to Junction 25 of the M1. This congestion would be exacerbated by additional traffic from the proposed development. Furthermore, alternative routes such as Church Road and Town Street are already overburdened and unsafe due to narrow lanes, blind bends, and existing heavy goods vehicle (HGV) traffic. These roads are unsuitable for further traffic increases and present a serious safety risk. The proposed development would be accessible via a single entry point, which is highly inappropriate for a high-density housing estate. A comprehensive traffic impact assessment must be provided and independently reviewed. There will be an alarming and detrimental amount of traffic increase once the Lorry Park development - Old Stanton Ironworks land is complete.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Sheila Payne	Response-01782	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Sian Knox	Response-01679	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Simon Chambers	Response-00668	There is far too much traffic coming through Stanton Road already. Furthermore, with the commercial build now commenced at the old Stanton iron works , the increase in traffic through town street will reach crazy levels. The approach / access road is completely inadequate for the construction contractors vehicles.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	S Leek	Response-01737	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Sonny Bestwick	Response-00901	It is already a very tight estate with lots of parked cars and limited acces
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Sonya Birkin	Response-01656	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Sophie	Response-00472	Sandiacre is gridlocked a lot of the time anyway. This could add another 300+ card to the area. Let alone the pollution etc
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Sophie Bennett	Response-01631	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Sophie Farnsworth	Response-01913	As a house of regular bus users, the extra traffic will make the already difficult bus route which regularly gets stuck will get worse with extra traffic.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Stephen Barlow	Response-01808	This new proposal has come as a shock to us. It will make our street an access road to the site and as there is only Beech Avenue and Coronation Avenue to use for access, will create chaos. Having a school on Station Road also creates a volume of traffic and congestion at times in the day and then there is the added complications of the bus route. I witness the bus get stuck on my road weekly due to double parking and not being able to get through.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Stephen Davies	Response-00214	Existing access to both Cloudside Road and Larch Drive severely affected by park cars not helped by sharp bends. Further issues with bus access for i4 route as a whole on all routes from Sandiacre due to parked vehicles. Access for emergency vehicles such as fire service currently very difficult. Larch Drive 5.45m wide + 1.8m pavement either side; these are below recommended minimums conflicting with paragraph 110 which requires developments to give priority to pedestrian and cycle movements (typical 2 way road requires 5.5 to 7.3m + 1.8-2m pedestrian access either side) It should be noted that the ownership of even the existing access is unclear in any event, notwithstanding the unacceptable width constraint noted above There is existing evidence of buses getting stuck on i4 route due to parked vehicles and general road layout; this is also likely to cause issues for emergency vehicle access and also for construction traffic. Paragraph 111 advises that a development should not proceed if it causes unacceptable impact on highway safety or the cumulative impact on the road network would be severe Paragraph 112 stresses the need for developments to enable safe & suitable access for all users and to minimise conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians. EBC Neighbourhood Plan page 65 clearly shows all routes up to the proposed access point to already have a high level of on street parking which can only be exasperated by 180 additional new homes
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Stephen Sacker	Response-01598	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Steve Bilbie	Response-00285	I strongly object to this development on the grounds of an unacceptable volume of traffic through an inadequate access and narrow roads leading to the site. Having been a councillor for Sandiacre some 26 years traffic congestion has been a constant problem. This proposal is for an area that cannot cope with existing levels of traffic and pollution let alone a substantial increase.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Steven Wiseman	Response-00452	The roads around the area are already busy. With more properties having 2 or more vehicles, more and more vehicles are parked on the road especially Coronation Avenue making passing difficult. Stanton Road in the morning is usually full of parked cars making passing dangerous especially towards the blind bend. With added vehicles around the area this will only get worse and become more dangerous.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Steve Whittaker	Response-01781	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Stuart Pensom	Response-00049	Traffic though sandiacre is a joke has been for years.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Sue Harrison	Response-01629	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Susan Hales	Response-00212	This area is not suitable for yet more traffic. Assuming every home will have at least 1 car, this will add 200+ vehicles negotiating already contested roads.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Susan Heinke	Response-00468	Traffic is already more than Sandiacre can handle without adding to it
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Susanne Beaven	Response-01618	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Sylvia Plampin	Response-00624	Regular parking on pavements, double parking, parking on blind bends. At school drop off/pick up cars are double parked, parked across pavements, the i4 bus is often unable to manoeuvre safely, and regularly gets stuck.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Tamara Partridge	Response-01780	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Tara Marshall	Response-01890	
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Tarnya Hinman	Response-01786	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Thomas Ilett	Response-01088	Traffic congestion has already been highlighted as an issue within Sandiacre, particularly the impact of increased HGV traffic passing through the village centre (specifically Town Street and Derby Road) on infrastructure largely unchanged since the 1950s/60s. Aside from increased HGV traffic, increased general traffic is also expected as a result of planned growth for employment and residential uses particularly around Stanton. Chapter 19, paragraphs 177 and 178 of the Sandiacre Neighbourhood Plan reference these traffic concerns as well as it being a common theme highlighted to Dr Adam Thompson MP. Chapter 19, paragraph 179 of the Sandiacre Neighbourhood Plan states 'Reducing the traffic congestion in the parish is an aspirational policy?it is the matter of greatest concern to local residents and as part of its on-going work, the Parish Council will continue to lobby the Borough and County Council to address significant transport issue?. The proposed housing allocation is likely to increase traffic congestion. As such, despite the Parish Council?s lobbying, the proposed housing allocation seeks to exacerbate ?the matter of greatest concern to local residents? demonstrating complete disregard of the Sandiacre Neighbourhood Plan and Sandiacre's residents. Chapter 19 of the Sandiacre Neighbourhood Plan also considers parking congestion within Sandiacre. Map 12 highlights Coronation Avenue, Linden Grove and Chestnut Grove as ?Examples of areas with limited residential parking which has a negative effect on the local area?. These three streets are next to the proposed housing allocation. The National Travel Survey 2022 (National Travel Survey 2022: Household car availability and trends in car trips - GOV.UK) highlights 34% of UK households have access to two or more cars or vans with 45% having access to one car or van. As such, the proposed housing allocation would likely exacerbate parking congestion, particularly prevalent in the residential area closest to the proposed housing allocation. The traffic congestion highlighted above, has the potential to be dangerous. In its current state, the congestion in Sandiacre and notably the streets mentioned is bad enough to potentially prevent emergency vehicles accessing properties and streets. This risk will be significantly increased should the proposed housing development go ahead, resulting in an outright dangerous situation, within the context of traffic congestion.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Tim Derbyshire	Response-01681	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Tim Gough	Response-00996	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Toby Moran	Response-01769	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Tom Ball	Response-01672	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Toni hopkins	Response-00539	Already over parking issues creating poor access for buses and emergency service
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Tony Price	Response-00977	It's busy enough already in Sandiacre without the added burden this will place on already overwhelmed resources.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Tony Weston	Response-00990	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Tracey Howe	Response-01860	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic. I have 2 jobs; carer and hairdresser and I frequent the area regularly - my clients are elderly. Personally, I have trouble getting through the estate especially school times its a nightmare to park at best of times, the area already feels insufficient for the residence as it is for parking / access, I've also seen the i4 bus have trouble at Beech Avenue and Coronation Road getting about.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Tracey Hughes	Response-01699	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Tracy Jones	Response-00436	We are currently overwhelmed with congestion without adding to it
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Tracy Kerry-Cliff	Response-00801	The congestion (already bad at times) this will cause will be tremendous, and the traffic hold ups, accidents etc will be massively increased. The whole community (and it is a community) will be lost with the influx of an extra 20,000 vehicles.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Trevor Rowston	Response-01678	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Tricia Herbert	Response-00944	Traffic on Church street and Stanton Road is already at breaking point most of the day and the roads leading up to this development are definatley not suitable for the amount of construction traffic needed before any house are occupied
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Try church	Response-00033	The roads up to and around Larch Drive are too narrow and too tight corners for heavy traffic. Disturbance to neighbours and wildlife will be totally unacceptable
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Tyler Hobbs	Response-00879	The proposed plan for 180 houses on the greenbelt land would place unsustainable pressure on local through roads such as Cloud Side Road and Larch Drive, which are already narrow, overcrowded, and ill-equipped to handle a significant increase in traffic. These roads were not designed to accommodate the volume of vehicles that would come with an additional 180 homes, and any increase would likely worsen congestion, create safety risks for pedestrians and cyclists, and lead to longer journey times for residents. The narrow layout and limited capacity of these routes make them unsuitable for high traffic flow, particularly during peak hours, school runs, and emergency situations. Without major infrastructure upgrades?which could further disrupt the area?this development would severely compromise road safety and quality of life for existing residents.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Vanessa Asbach	Response-00700	Traffic is already bad in this area. It is highly unsafe for the children at school times, not to mention the amount of cars parked all across the roads to drop children off or pick them up. Additional homes and therefore cars are going to impact those times even further and result in more unnecessary danger



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Verity Lamb	Response-01298	If each house has two cars minimum the additions to the roads at commuting time alone will make a miserable situation even worse
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Vickie Wright	Response-01552	The existing road infrastructure is not designed to handle the sharp increase in vehicle volume that over 180 new homes would bring. This development could mean hundreds of additional cars using already congested local roads, especially during peak hours. I leave for work at 8am every week day and struggle to get onto the main routes like town street.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Vicky	Response-00485	Why destroy more green belt when there are houses empty!! We already have the local hotels filled with immigrants where does it end Sandiacre is already a cut through to Stanton and we are adding more congestion
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Victoria Abraham	Response-01652	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Victoria Galpin-shrimpton	Response-01009	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic. Disruption from heavy duty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to residents and wildlife for many years. It would be dangerous to residents property during icy weather conditions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Victoria Greatorex	Response-01730	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Victoria Marriott	Response-00674	Traffic / congestion - Road safety/ access - My main concern is the suitability of the access to the proposed site It?s a very narrow road with several sharp bends and a sharp incline. I use this road on a daily basis to collect my friend?s son to take him to school. It?s always a struggle to get up the road, I find it very hard to believe that any type of commercial lorry would be able to get up there safely. The bus route misses this area out for this very reason. It?s an unsuitable access point for the proposed site not only for access but for the expected volume of traffic estimated to rise to 19,000 extra uses of vehicles. With the current condition of the roads with the amount of potholes I?m not sure the roads could sustain the volume/ weight. What plan is in place to prepare the roads for this extra traffic? During the winter the steep road can become inaccessible particularly for larger vehicles. I think you?re underestimating the impact on the roads the extra traffic - initially created by the workforce then subsequently the new occupants will create. My main concern is the suitability of the access to the proposed site. It?s an unsuitable access point for the proposed site not only for access but for the expected volume of traffic estimated to rise to 19,000 extra uses of vehicles. With the current condition of the roads with the amount of potholes I?m not sure the roads could sustain the volume/ weight. What plan is in place to prepare the roads for this extra traffic? During the winter the steep road can become inaccessible particularly for larger vehicles. I think you?re underestimating the impact on the roads of the extra traffic - initially created by the workforce then subsequently the new occupants will create.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Vivien Davis	Response-01582	This would increase traffic on unsuitable and dangerous roads by over 700 vehicles a day giving rise to an excess of 19,000 vehicles a year on roads not suited to this volume of traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Wayne Major	Response-00408	I wish to object to the currently proposed vehicular access for this development. Based on the plans, the access appears to be significantly constrained. Even with the removal of trees and the construction of the highway over existing root zones which should be protected the widest achievable opening is only 5.7 metres with the current gate being only 2.7m. This also assume they own the current land to achieve the 5.7m. A two-way road typically requires a width of 5.5 to 7.3 metres, plus space for a pedestrian footpath. Therefore even with the absolute minimum road width just after a bend this proposal fails to allow for safe pedestrian access alongside vehicle movement. As a result, the development of 180 homes would leave residents without a safe pedestrian route in or out of the site. This conflicts with NPPF Paragraph 110, which requires developments to give priority to pedestrian and cycle movements and create places that are safe, secure and attractive for all users. Additionally, the route leading to the site from the main road consists of narrow residential streets, which are frequently lined with parked cars. There is existing evidence of buses getting stuck, indicating that large vehicles including construction traffic would be unable to safely navigate these roads. I am also concerned that a fire engine or ambulance would struggle to access the site in a timely manner due to these same constraints, particularly where parked cars restrict manoeuvrability. This raises serious concerns regarding access for emergency services and the safe management of construction traffic, in conflict with NPPF Paragraph 111, which advises that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. The proposed development will also increase the number of vehicles using these currently quiet roads. At present, drivers patiently wait for one another to pass parked vehicles. However, with significantly more traffic generated by 180 homes, the parked cars that currently cause little disruption are likely to create congestion and hazards for pedestrians. This runs counter to NPPF Paragraph 112, which stresses the need for developments to enable safe and suitable access for all users and to minimise conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians. For all of these reasons, I strongly object to the proposed vehicular access arrangement and urge the planning authority to reconsider a solution that ensures both safe pedestrian connectivity and appropriate vehicle access, without compromising the surrounding residential streets.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	William Marriott	Response-00676	Traffic Congestion Traffic / congestion - Road safety/ access - My main concern is the suitability of the access to the proposed site it's a very narrow road with several sharp bends and a sharp incline. I use this road on a daily basis to collect my friend's son to take him to school. It's always a struggle to get up the road, I find it very hard to believe that any type of commercial lorry would be able to get up there safely. The bus route misses this area out for this very reason. It's an unsuitable access point for the proposed site not only for access but for the expected volume of traffic estimated to rise to 19,000 extra uses of vehicles. With the current condition of the roads with the amount of potholes I'm not sure the roads could sustain the volume/ weight. What plan is in place to prepare the roads for this extra traffic? During the winter the steep road can become inaccessible particularly for larger vehicles. I think you're underestimating the impact on the roads the extra traffic - initially created by the workforce then subsequently the new occupants will create.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Zack Snowdon	Response-00764	The traffic on Stanton Road which leads to the area being developed is already incredibly backed up and there is too much traffic parked on the road which causes buses to have to mount the kerb near pedestrians walking including myself on the pavement which makes me feel unsafe and puts me off walking.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Traffic Congestion	Zoe Hughes	Response-01919	Road not designed for through route/access. Very steep/narrow. No passing places & only one car's width due to parking on Cloudside Road.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	A Harby	Response-01684	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Aimee	Response-00952	We don't need any more properties in Sandiacre being lost to house illegal migrants. We already have many properties owned by private landlords that are being leased to Serco to house these people. Further housing should not be given to these people. It's putting the residents of Sandiacre at great risk of sexual assault, violence and terrorism.
			Alexander Love	Response-00626	Social housing, already housing ex convicts at the old red lion pub
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Alice Cooper	Response-01721	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Alice Ilett	Response-00571	We were told that the houses were being built on greenbelt as we were in need of social housing and there wasn't anywhere else. To then find out there was an alternative site behind Lidl that was proposed and they won't all be used for social housing. There's so many empty houses and alternatives that should be prioritised for this. The development isn't for "social housing needs" it's to make developers rich.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Amanda Leech	Response-01625	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Anastasia Anthony	Response-01865	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Andrew Marvin	Response-00255	Be nice to know what the type of housing is Yes 10% affordable so what are the other houses going to be ??????
			Andrew Meadwell	Response-01654	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Andria Nylasi	Response-00672	House prices will be too expensive for local young people, as only 10% is being considered for social housing.
			Andy Martin	Response-01761	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Anne Castledine	Response-00499	It's green belt land, there are other brown areas more suitable.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Anne Jenkins	Response-00350	Houses would overwhelm the bungalows already built on Tarch Avenue
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Annette Jones	Response-00961	How high are these houses supposed to be? Bungalows are not suitable if you are getting older as the hills are too steep and will have to depend on a car or other transport. Will they accommodate the need for average two cars per household? Will they just be houses with a drive and no garden so further impact on the environment? Other areas within Sandiacre should be considered closer to amenities and easier access to transport.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Ann Harrison	Response-01602	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Anthony Pearson	Response-01760	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
			Antony M Ingram	Response-01626	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	A R Gregory	Response-01918	
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Awson Wheldon	Response-01649	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Barbara Michell	Response-01787	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
			Barry Partridge	Response-01778	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Ben Hollins	Response-01651	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	ben riley	Response-00607	It's been described as dense housing. Not only would you be removing beautiful scenic landscape, you'll be replacing it with awful looking brick and tarmac.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Beverley Gardner	Response-01692	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Beverley Green	Response-01686	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Bill Hartley	Response-01696	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	B T Keen	Response-01735	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	c/o The Equalised Club	Response-01603	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Callum binnall	Response-00460	A thousand reasons why we don't want anymore housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Caroline Blackmore	Response-00451	We don't want more social housing thank you.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Caroline Driver	Response-00618	There is no transparency about what the proposed housing is for. I saw Angela Rayner admitting on TV that most of her 1.5 million homes will go to immigrants. In a professional capacity I have met many unvetted illegal migrants from the hotels in long eaton and the vast majority that I met were rude, entitled, misogynistic and aggressive. I am already horrified that they are walking the streets with my children in the local area, never mind housing them at the top of my street. Please publish an exact breakdown of what you intend the housing to be used for. I have written to councillor Curtis Howard more than once asking this question which he is refusing to answer.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Carol Marshall	Response-00736	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Carolyn Hallam	Response-00489	Why are there so few affordable homes being built. The comment of spending money outside the build area is dependent upon other factors? Just a loophole to get out of doing so
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Catherine Greenaway	Response-00429	What type of houses are being built, will they be council houses or private? Or will they be used for the immigrants currently in hotels?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Catherine Richardson	Response-00531	180 houses being built in the proposed area would be like sardines in a tin. All crammed together right next to the M1
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Charlotte Hunter	Response-01376	This type of housing isn't environmentally friendly and will impact the local nature. Including the endangered hedgehog.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	C Holmes	Response-01620	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Chris Hume	Response-01373	The antisocial behaviour in the area is bad now, this development will add to the problem centering the problem in an area that has an elderly population, police are never seen in this area there will be no more officers to police the social housing
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Chris Jones	Response-01718	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Chris O Connor	Response-01641	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Christian Rearson	Response-01763	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Christine Gough	Response-00578	The proposed building on Stoney will I imagine be type of housing will be all cramped together ? No gardens , no where for the children to play, no where for birds and wildlife . No space for community for the people , nothing good for well being . This can cause social problems , more noise and more traffic parking problems . It doesn't matter if it's social housing , private homes , affordable homes , 180 homes will cause more problems because we don't have the right inferstructure to warrant the building of these homes
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Claire binnall	Response-00459	Unaffordable housing not for the masses just to try and keep up on one of your many election promises that you usually break
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Clare Green	Response-01751	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Cole Hawkins	Response-01714	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Colin Cox	Response-01716	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Colin Marriott	Response-00686	The site is not suitable for this amount of properties. No details of what the properties would be like.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Courtney Bennett	Response-00593	The majority of the new build houses don't have gardens or adequate green spaces. These houses need to be detached or semi detached and all have mandatory gardens with trees that are legally not allowed to be removed as well as plants, grass verges so that the wildlife in the area can still attempt to have a home and some quality of life. There are already so many empty houses in the area that can be repurposed, reused and recycled because of the unaffordable housing crisis. Why don't we reuse and recycle what we already have instead of killing a green space.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Craig Richards	Response-01638	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Craig Thims	Response-01765	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Cristina Jenkins	Response-01588	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	C Thompson	Response-01634	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Daniel	Response-00545	Who exactly is this housing for? To my understanding this is part of the government scheme to build a million new homes, but the houses here are mostly privately owned, is this new social homing? who is living there exactly? While affordable housing is important, clustering large numbers of social homes in one area with a class disparity without proper infrastructure or amenities risks creating social imbalance and strain on local services.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Daniel Downes	Response-01630	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Daniel Hands	Response-00057	The current desirability of the area is largely due to type and scope of houses that make up the surrounding area. Maple avenue for example is made up largely of self build and small development properties which offer a wide range and variation on sizes and layouts. Where as the ex council houses that make up the majority of housing in the area offer larger gardens good sized rooms and potential future development for occupiers. These ideals are not seen in modern developments where space is at a premium and housing is built for profit and to maximise budgets. I think the type of housing would need to accommodate families and meet the same desirabilities offered by the current housing stock in the area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Danielle Harrison	Response-00568	We live across from Norbury Way in Sandiacre which is testament to the issues caused by social housing allocations. Alcohol and drug addiction is rife. Yesterday I called the police to remove a knife stashed in undergrowth. This is already a blight on the local crime rates with anti social behaviour, as police records support. If you add any more social housing be prepared for the local community to suffer the consequences
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Darran and Emma Rea	Response-00597	The housing won't be in keeping with the area, currently we have semi detached, terraced and detached housing with good back gardens and spaced out, the new development will be crammed in, limited parking to maximise how many houses they can build
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	David Casey	Response-01608	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	David Cater	Response-01756	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	David Ruddock	Response-01776	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	David Tindsley	Response-00515	I wish to object to the proposed development on the grounds that it does not appear to be in accordance with the local Neighbourhood Plan, particularly in terms of housing scale, type, and density. The Sandiacre Neighbourhood Plan 2022 -2037, developed in consultation with the local community to guide appropriate and sustainable development. This plan sets clear expectations that new development should reflect the character of the area, including the type and density of housing, and should be proportionate to the existing built environment. A proposal for 180 dwellings on this site would represent a significant increase in density compared to the surrounding area. It would result in a development that appears out of scale and out of keeping with the established residential character. Such a large number of homes in a single location also risks undermining the carefully considered planning policies agreed through the Neighbourhood Plan process. This conflicts with Paragraph 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which recognises the legal status of Neighbourhood Plans and supports giving local communities the power to shape development in their area. It also contradicts Paragraph 127, which states that developments should be sympathetic to local character and align with the expectations set out in local design guides or codes. Restricting the number of ?affordable? houses to just 10% appears to conflict with the Sandiacre Neighbourhood Plan, which recommends (para. 145) that ?the Parish diversify its housing mix, increasing the number of 1-2 bedroom dwellings to balance out the high proportion of 3+bedroom dwellings on offer and ensure that both younger households and downsizing older people have a broader range of options than they do at present?. I suspect that to include a higher percentage of affordable housing would make this a much less viable and lucrative development for the developer.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	David Yeo	Response-01705	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Dean Bosworth	Response-01665	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Dean Lavelle	Response-01774	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Dean Michell	Response-01343	To many house already in sandiacre.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Debra Scully	Response-00288	Unable to comment as no plans seen as yet
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Debs Washer	Response-00487	There is no need for any more social housing and green belt to be used for this purpose, use some of the empty buildings and bring them back to life.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Denise Creasey	Response-00786	The high density housing is not in keeping with the current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Denise Lingard	Response-01759	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Dennis Watts	Response-01726	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Derek Morton	Response-01607	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Derrick Hunt	Response-00437	There are no specifics as far as I am aware as to what is actually being proposed in terms of bungalows 2beds 3 beds 4 beds etc
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Destiny Jade-Blake	Response-01636	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Diane Jones	Response-00852	No houses on this site.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Diane Mcmorrow	Response-00433	Don't want the house were a village bursting at the seems we don't have the infrastructure to support additional homes
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Diane Turner	Response-01744	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	D Pallett	Response-01627	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	D Simpson	Response-01712	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Eleanor Moseley	Response-00799	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Eleanor Newman	Response-00718	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Emma Ryan	Response-00503	There just does not need to be another 180 homes added to Sandiacre. It's completely ludicrous.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Emma Wall	Response-00319	The only type of housing I object to is having housing on that piece of land
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Esther Cook	Response-01861	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Ewan Snowdon	Response-00766	The density of housing is a real concern. Having so many houses crammed in so close to each other will lead to overcrowding and a poor quality of life and poor living standards.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Fay Cresswell	Response-00701	There would be far too many houses in a small area at the moment the estate is Semi detached and detached properties with some bungalows so the new properties would have to be small close to each other and not in keeping with the area
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Gail Berry	Response-01644	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Geoff Tindsley	Response-00755	I wish to object to the proposed development on the grounds that it does not appear to be in accordance with the local Neighbourhood Plan, particularly in terms of housing scale, type, and density. 1. A proposal for 180 dwellings on this site would represent a significant increase in density compared to the surrounding area. It would result in a development that appears out of scale and out of keeping with the established residential character. Such a large number of homes in a single location also risks undermining the carefully considered planning policies agreed through the Neighbourhood Plan process. 2. Restricting the number of ?affordable? houses to just 10% appears to conflict with the Neighbourhood Plan, which recommends (para. 145) that ?the Parish diversify its housing mix, increasing the number of 1-2 bedroom dwellings to balance out the high proportion of 3+bedroom dwellings on offer and ensure that both younger households and downsizing older people have a broader range of options than they do at present?. I suspect that to include a higher percentage of affordable housing would make this a much less viable and lucrative development for the developer.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Georgia C	Response-01296	New builds on developments such as these are renowned for not meeting standards and will not be standing in a hundred years. We have perfectly good buildings in existence as is, which if require work/investment will continue to stand the test of time as they have done for many years.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Georgia Marvin	Response-00261	Sandiacre is a relatively quiet town. I'll be interested to know what kind of families this housing scheme will bring.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Gill West	Response-01725	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Glyn Holner	Response-01697	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Gordon Bruce	Response-01455	It would not matter how many houses were planned here, the green space should not be removed for local people and wildlife.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Gordon Daris	Response-01639	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Greg Cox	Response-01702	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Gregg Bartrum	Response-01591	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Helen Gillain	Response-00964	High density housing is out of character in this area
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Helen whiteman	Response-00447	The type of housing is not at all going to enhance the area they will be slums within years and the new houses will not be fit for purpose
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Ian	Response-00493	Probably tasteless.....
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Ian herbert	Response-00939	180 house is just way too dense. perhaps a very limited number of presige family homes might be viable
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	IAN TAYLOR	Response-00972	The numbers and density of the proposed housing units are inconsistent with the density of the existing residential area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Ian Ward	Response-01628	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Irina Anthony	Response-01867	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Isabelle Love	Response-00529	180 houses in that stretch of home is an appealing proposal. We have all seen the state of new builds - no gardens to even TRY and relieve the issue of removing further greenbelt. New builds are often ugly, uniform copies of each other with the only objective for greedy developers being how many they can stuff into and already overstuffed area!! People cannot afford these atrocious houses either, meaning they will likely attract people from outside the area, resulting in the local population looking to buy in the same situation, except now the area is worse with too many people in it. There?s also the issue of devaluing the existing homes in this area, when people no longer want to buy them with the area being so congested.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	J. E. Lord	Response-01601	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Jack Greateorex	Response-01731	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Jacob Whitt	Response-01748	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Jade Smith	Response-01783	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	James Meadwell	Response-01653	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	James Roberts	Response-01708	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	James Seward	Response-01683	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	James White	Response-01883	Poor quality plots, no doubt houses will be stacked on top of each other.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Jane Dennett	Response-00965	Don't agree to any
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Jane Elizabeth Tindsley	Response-00669	I wish to object to the proposed development on the grounds that it does not appear to be in accordance with the local Neighbourhood Plan, particularly in terms of housing scale, type, and density. The Sandiacre Neighbourhood Plan 2022 -2037, developed in consultation with the local community to guide appropriate and sustainable development. This plan sets clear expectations that new development should reflect the character of the area, including the type and density of housing, and should be proportionate to the existing built environment. A proposal for 180 dwellings on this site would represent a significant increase in density compared to the surrounding area. It would result in a development that appears out of scale and out of keeping with the established residential character. Such a large number of homes in a single location also risks undermining the carefully considered planning policies agreed through the Neighbourhood Plan process. This conflicts with Paragraph 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which recognises the legal status of Neighbourhood Plans and supports giving local communities the power to shape development in their area. It also contradicts Paragraph 127, which states that developments should be sympathetic to local character and align with the expectations set out in local design guides or codes. Restricting the number of ?affordable? houses to just 10% appears to conflict with the Sandiacre Neighbourhood Plan, which recommends (para. 145) that ?the Parish diversify its housing mix, increasing the number of 1-2 bedroom dwellings to balance out the high proportion of 3+bedroom dwellings on offer and ensure that both younger households and downsizing older people have a broader range of options than they do at present?. I suspect that to include a higher percentage of affordable housing would make this a much less viable and lucrative development for the developer.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Janet Whildes	Response-01869	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Janice Taylor	Response-01743	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Janice West	Response-00989	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Janine Holmes	Response-01595	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Jason Deepprose	Response-00818	Dont need more houses. Make it affordable to put solar on houses
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Jason Harwood	Response-01667	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Jason Webb	Response-01637	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Jayne Rowley	Response-01279	High density housing is not in keeping with the current housing in this area, it would be more densely populated than the existing estate, and would impact the existing community, especially those in close proximity, reducing privacy to neighbouring properties, light and would also increase noise pollution in the area. This is already at a high due to the areas proximity to the M1 and A52, the additional traffic to the area would also impact this.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	J Cates	Response-01750	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Jeanette O Connor	Response-01640	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Jennifer Bailey	Response-01857	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Jennifer Tindley	Response-00751	I wish to object to the proposed development on the grounds that it does not appear to be in accordance with the local Neighbourhood Plan, particularly in terms of housing scale, type, and density. 1. A proposal for 180 dwellings on this site would represent a significant increase in density compared to the surrounding area. It would result in a development that appears out of scale and out of keeping with the established residential character. Such a large number of homes in a single location also risks undermining the carefully considered planning policies agreed through the Neighbourhood Plan process. 2. Restricting the number of ?affordable? houses to just 10% appears to conflict with the Neighbourhood Plan, which recommends (para. 145) that ?the Parish diversify its housing mix, increasing the number of 1-2 bedroom dwellings to balance out the high proportion of 3+bedroom dwellings on offer and ensure that both younger households and downsizing older people have a broader range of options than they do at present?. I suspect that to include a higher percentage of affordable housing would make this a much less viable and lucrative development for the developer.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Jenny Stephens	Response-01723	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Joanna hardy	Response-01304	As with many new build sites the type and layout of new homes is often limited with little thought for community or comfort. Having small gardens, limited parking and no space of kids to play.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Joanne Guyatt	Response-01784	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Joanne Johnson	Response-00765	According to Rightmove there are currently 80 properties for sale in this area and 5 for rent, we don't need more housing. IF this development takes place ALL of the houses should be affordable not a percentage.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Jodie Owen	Response-01688	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Jodie Shrive	Response-00601	The type of housing in which you are proposing is utterly ridiculous. A large estate style development will fail to integrate with the surrounding character of the Cloudside estate. The type of housing you are wanting to build is not sustainable.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Jo Gerhardt	Response-01286	I'm not sure on who would buy these houses. I know 10% would be social housing but the rest would be private sales, at what price? Overlooking the M1, pollution etc wouldn't really appeal to me.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	John Gardner	Response-01694	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	John G Brown	Response-01752	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	John Hibbitt	Response-01855	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	John Ledger	Response-01605	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	John Payne	Response-01785	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	John whiteman	Response-00450	The type of house does not lend itself to nice housing
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Jon Burn	Response-01722	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Josh Williams	Response-01632	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	J Pearson	Response-01772	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Judith A Pulfer	Response-01863	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Julie Hill	Response-01643	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Karen Alldread	Response-01868	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Karen Blain	Response-01732	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Karen Harwood	Response-01668	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Kathryn Martin	Response-00527	180 houses too dense, it should reflect character of surrounding area
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Katie Robinson	Response-00943	On the report it is listed as being high density housing. It doesn't match what currently is built or anything else on the estate. It would dramatically change the look and feel to the whole estate. The estate is currently a local, quiet friendly place to live but building such a large amount or properties will change this - it will no longer be quiet and will become much busier just down to the sheer volume of closely built houses. I also have concerns about how close they would come to my property as my property backs onto the proposed site - how overlooked my property would suddenly become?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Kelly Randall	Response-00591	With no detailed plans available, the housing mix remains unknown. The proposed density of 38 dwellings per hectare is significantly higher than the local average (22 per hectare) and would result in an isolated, high-density development with inadequate access.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Kelsey Green	Response-01666	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Kenneth Cooper	Response-01720	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Kern-Paul Lewis	Response-01715	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Kerry Meadwell	Response-01655	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Kerry Smith	Response-01271	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	KH Taylor	Response-01663	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Kimberley Selby	Response-00478	It's probably going to be for people on benefits or immigrants which could possibly bring the crime rate up in the area and making the area feel unsafe for those that live there already.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Kim Helm	Response-00632	The houses that are proposed will be unaffordable for most
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Kirk Moss	Response-00439	The proposal appears to serve a profit-driven agenda rather than meet genuine local housing needs. There is no clear evidence that the type and volume of housing planned align with what the local community requires.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Kirsty Handa	Response-00445	This development will destroy the view both from the nearby properties and from the nature reserve
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Kristie Rugers	Response-01864	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Kyle Jones	Response-01764	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	L A Keen	Response-01659	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Laura Hallam	Response-01711	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Laurence Luck	Response-01727	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Lauren Rose	Response-01446	New housing is characterless, soul-less and simply would not fit with the current local area aesthetic. High-density housing is also often built quickly, poorly and not to a high standard.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Lee Wilcock	Response-01670	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.6a	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Lesley Bruce	Response-01397	I see in the plan that affordable housing is needed, but that the council note that if the developer can not build affordable houses, a payment can be made to the council in lieu. This sounds underhand, and highly irregular to me. Either a chosen developer builds what is needed, or they do not get the job in my opinion, otherwise they are building for their own profit, not for the good of the community. No housing of any sort would be good for this overstretched community with inadequate roads and infrastructure.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Lia Thims	Response-01766	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Linda Castledine-Davies	Response-00850	High density style housing is not in keeping with the existing properties or character of the area, It will have a severe detrimental effect of wildlife as previously stated, It will impact the skyline and views. Residents of high density areas rely more on public transit and walking for transportation but will find it difficult because of the terrain. This is high density housing small cramped boxes crammed together with no thought or innovation on design build to reduce number required or aesthetically pleasing to the existing landscape and skyline. Higher density living raises concerns about existing residents quality of life. It will impact on their environment with issues like noise pollution, overcrowding, lack of green spaces, and limited privacy. Over subscribed schools, doctors and public services, environmental degradation, perhaps social issues such as increased crime rates and reduced quality of life. At present this is a low density mix of properties. More people will require more food, water, energy, and other resources all of which will be sourced either by external travel or couriers so yet more vehicles and pollution.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Lindsey Rawlinson	Response-01624	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	LISA ANNE GILLIGAN-LEE	Response-00710	In many developments, affordable housing is poorly integrated or separated from the rest of the estate, creating divisions and undermining community cohesion. Any inclusion should be balanced, well-designed, and equitable?ensuring it blends seamlessly with the rest of the neighbourhood in both appearance and access to facilities.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Lisa J Pearson	Response-01762	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Liz Woodhouse	Response-01584	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	L Mee	Response-01777	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Logan Fox	Response-00746	not sure what housing is being built
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Lorraine Daly	Response-00495	"Affordable housing" is highly unlikely to be affordable for those on minimum or living wage.
	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Lorraine Hands	Response-00534	Why can't money be better spent on restoring some now empty properties in the area!!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Louise Felfoldl	Response-01733	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Louise Harper	Response-01571	The type of housing will need to be quite multi story to get 180 houses on the site, this will impact me greatly with excess noise, dust and the sheer expense of housing at the moment, our children have little or no hope of buying there our homes, how many types of housing will there be, the plot seems to be not capable of 180 houses ?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Louise Harrison	Response-01719	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Louise Jacks	Response-01767	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Louise Libberton	Response-01693	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Lucy Johnson	Response-01369	Adding 180 houses to a very small area of land, is just plain stupid! New build houses are getting worse and worse as it is! It's not worth destroying our land!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	lucy victoria garner	Response-00949	currently 77 houses for sale in sandiacre ranging from £80-700K to suit a range of options. Also 397 within a 1 mile radius as per Rightmove website. No indication there is no options for housing in the local area and no indication that another 180 houses are required.
1.6a	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Luke Chein	Response-01779	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Lynda Morton	Response-01606	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Macie Brothwell	Response-01633	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Malcolm Dillon	Response-00722	Currently there is very little information on the type of housing proposed for this development. High density housing has been linked to this proposal. This would be totally inappropriate for the location of this proposed development. The social benefits of the proposed development is very niggardly and this is a worry. Profit and speed are possibly the overriding considerations for both the developer and the council. This concern needs to be addressed.
1.6a	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Malcolm Fox	Response-00215	I can only assume the housing would be similar to other estates being built outside the immediate area. But to be honest, the lack of information provided by the council has been nothing but unsupportive. I cannot comment as I have not seen, been provided or had the opportunity to review the proposed plans.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Malcolm Riggs	Response-01680	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.6a	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Malc Orbiston	Response-01673	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Mandy Rait	Response-01587	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with the surrounding neighbourhood!

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Mark Gough	Response-00888	Any type of housing is going to be horrendous on this proposed site . For a start , right next to the motorway ? who?s going to want to live there , the noise , pollution . Three storey houses all crammed together , with no gardens , overlooking residents in Sycamore cres, Chestnut Grove, Larch, Cloudside Road , that?s not going to go down well , people have a right to privacy. It will devalue the price of the houses of people that have bought their homes after years of working hard . If they wanted to sell and move on it will be harder . The 180 houses will be crammed together , too many houses in that space , this will cause tension and noise , which in return will probably cause anti social behaviour, causing more problems and added work load for the police . Even if the houses are terraced , small ones, there will be problems for car parking , and of course access.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Mark Leek	Response-01740	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	mark skelton	Response-01341	Not too sure on the homes or how they are going to be heated. Not sure on how to removed drainage away either.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Martin Driver	Response-01387	Ridiculous trying to squeeze 180 house on a field. Whoever suggested this site should be ashamed!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Martyn Locker	Response-00903	Of course, the type of housing will determine the types of residents that will be moving into them. Is there a chance that these houses will be bought by landlords and rented to tenants? Is there a chance that they'll be council houses provided to low income / unemployed families that may be susceptible to increasing crime and drug usage in the community? Given that 180 houses are planned for such a small area, it?s clearly not going to be lovely detached properties that are likely to attract wealth and growth to the area. Without knowing the type of housing that?s planned, it?s hard to know what to expect, and you have to consider all possibilities and the long-term impact this will have on the area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Matt Bancroft	Response-00916	The density and number of houses is not in keeping with the local surrounding areas
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Matthew Buckland	Response-00615	If I had any confidence that the vast majority of the proposed houses wouldn't immediately be sold as rental properties then I'd probably be more supportive, however the likelihood is, is that they will be bought and rented out at ridiculous prices. There are currently allegedly 1500 properties empty in the region - and 700000 in the UK as a whole - make use of them rather than building more poorly built properities in areas where the infrastructure is struggling.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Maurice Mason	Response-01617	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Maxine Sutton	Response-00471	The site would have to have a range of housing in keeping with the village. There would need to be affordable housing, starter homes,, family homes and plenty of bungalows for the aging population.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	M Dougle	Response-01749	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	M Eastwood	Response-01757	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Melanie	Response-00586	No detailed plans have been provided on the proposed types of housing. Without this information, it is impossible to assess the suitability or need for the development in relation to the local housing strategy.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Melanie Caumont	Response-01272	The plan proposes only 10% affordable homes on-site, with a vague commitment to off-site affordable housing. This fails to address local needs meaningfully and raises concerns that the development is profit-driven rather than community-focused. A more balanced housing mix, should be considered.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Melanie Howarth	Response-01621	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Michell Birkin	Response-01657	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Michelle Alsop	Response-01645	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Michelle Cox	Response-01724	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Michelle Wenham	Response-01650	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Mick Hughes	Response-01701	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Mike Darnell	Response-00698	Large estates type buildings are so out of character for this area where traditional type housing are. Wrong place to cram estates up here on the edge of a nature reserve. Getting building trucks and amenities up here to build would be dangerous and totally devastating to the nature reserve
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Miss Garratt	Response-00905	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Miss R Cordon	Response-01648	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Mollie Snow	Response-01729	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Mr & Mrs Turton	Response-01660	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Mr and Mrs R Skelton	Response-01274	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Mr and Mrs Wright	Response-01275	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Mr K Turton	Response-01706	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Mr Luke	Response-01703	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Mr P J Tanner	Response-01728	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Mr R M Draper	Response-01856	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Mr R Widdowson	Response-01734	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Mr S. Haywood	Response-01585	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Mrs Christina Pope	Response-00732	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Mrs Donna C. Ball	Response-01594	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Mrs Froggatt	Response-00449	Too much social housing already in Sandiacre. One area off Stanton Road is like a war zone. No more of this housing is wanted in Sandiacre
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Mrs Griffin	Response-01698	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Mrs J. Cooper	Response-01596	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Mrs Joanne Thompson	Response-01690	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Mrs Linda Cox	Response-01753	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Mrs Luke	Response-01704	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Mrs M. Rose	Response-01583	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Mrs Marie Draper	Response-01755	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Mrs M Jones	Response-01884	And who's going to be put in those houses. We don't agree with this build and we all say NO we don't agree or want it in our area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Mrs Rachel Coats	Response-01623	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Mrs R Cordon	Response-01647	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Mrs Rigby	Response-00641	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Mrs Shani Wainwright	Response-00754	High density housing is preposterous and not in keeping with the current housing already in place in the area. It is the highest density of all the Erewash proposals and will give rise for concern for further phases in the future.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Mrs Shirley Victoria Riggs	Response-01685	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Mrs Susan Bantle	Response-01612	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Mrs Turton	Response-01707	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Natalie Bentley	Response-01646	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Nicole Cooper	Response-01597	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Normn McCrea	Response-01754	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Oliver Marriott	Response-00679	Type of Housing Type of Housing - Much of the houses within sandiacre are period properties, how do you intend to comply with the look and feel of the houses so they blend in? It is the highest density of housing of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for future phases. Have you not considered other more suitable sites for this housing? Ones that aren't on a nature reserve.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Paige Walker	Response-01669	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Pat Hardy	Response-01739	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Paula Darnell	Response-00665	By the looks of it 180 houses will be crammed into this area probably 3 stories high These houses aren't even for Erewash residents!!! This will be absolute appalling next to our lovely nature reserve on our greenbelt There are far more suitable sites than this
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Paula Luck	Response-01710	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Paula Sims	Response-01687	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Paul Randall	Response-00131	There are no plans available so cannot comment.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Paul Vleeton	Response-01770	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	paul wheeldon	Response-00582	The type of housing would have to be small and very cramped
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Peter Anthony	Response-01866	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Peter Nicholls	Response-01622	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Pete West	Response-01700	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	P Sandes	Response-01682	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Rachel Crossley	Response-01661	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	R Barratt	Response-01664	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Rcahel Sharp	Response-00652	The density of the housing compared with the density of estates already in the area is a worry. This would have an impact on adding to the population considerably in turn affecting traffic, pollution, access to services. I think people deserve housing that is not crammed in to maximise profit. I strongly believe that sizeable gardens are essential for mental well being, nature and drainage. High density housing has a detrimental affect on the surrounding area. Typically this sort of build is not to the standard of previous housing built - ie the ex council house I live in which was built in the 1950's which has good size rooms and gardens and was built to a high standard.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Rebecca Longmuir	Response-00253	NO HOUSE IS A GOOD HOUSE! NO SOCIAL HOUSING!!!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Rhiannon Lowater	Response-01592	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	R Hibbitt	Response-01862	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Richard Broughton	Response-01352	What percentage of these dwellings are proposed to be "affordable"?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Richard Haines	Response-01674	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Richard Marriott	Response-00675	Type of Housing Type of Housing - Much of the houses within sandiacre are period properties, how do you intend to comply with the look and feel of the houses so they blend in? It is the highest density of housing of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for future phases. Have you not considered other more suitable sites for this housing? Ones that aren't on a nature reserve.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Richard Shrimpton	Response-01301	high density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Rob Lowe	Response-01768	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Rosemarie Gough	Response-00997	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Roy Drew	Response-01614	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Ruby Sharp	Response-00886	The density of the housing compared with the density of estates already in the area is a worry. There has already been a new housing development built off of Longmoor Lane. This would have an impact on adding to the population considerably in turn affecting traffic, pollution, access to services. I think people deserve housing that is not crammed in to maximise profit. I strongly believe that sizeable gardens are essential for mental well being, nature and drainage. High density housing has a detrimental affect on the surrounding area.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	S. Jones	Response-01615	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Sally Davies	Response-01294	This housing is not needed. There are lots of empty homes in the area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Samantha Anne Whitney	Response-00757	This land isn't suitable for any type of housing due to access and where it's situated. There are better places to build if you're adamant you're going to build extra housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Samantha Whildes	Response-01270	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Sam Fleck	Response-00821	Housing type: I wish to object to the proposed development on the grounds that it does not appear to be in accordance with the local Neighbourhood Plan, particularly in terms of housing scale, type, and density. The area currently benefits from a Neighbourhood Plan, developed in consultation with the local community to guide appropriate and sustainable development. This plan sets clear expectations that new development should reflect the character of the area, including the type and density of housing, and should be proportionate to the existing built environment. A proposal for 180 dwellings on this site would represent a significant increase in density compared to the surrounding area. It would result in a development that appears out of scale and out of keeping with the established residential character. Such a large number of homes in a single location also risks undermining the carefully considered planning policies agreed through the Neighbourhood Plan process. This conflicts with Paragraph 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which recognises the legal status of Neighbourhood Plans and supports giving local communities the power to shape development in their area. It also contradicts Paragraph 127, which states that developments should be sympathetic to local character and align with the expectations set out in local design guides or codes. In light of the above, I believe the proposal in its current form fails to comply with the Neighbourhood Plan and should be reconsidered. A reduced number of homes, designed in a way that respects the established form and layout of the community, would be far more appropriate for this site.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Sam Greatorex	Response-01695	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Sandra Cooke	Response-01613	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Sarah Harrison	Response-01658	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	S Bryne	Response-01677	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Sebastian Roberts	Response-01675	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Shanead Ligton	Response-01689	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Shannon moss	Response-00454	There has been mutuple residents wanting to extend or swap out builting to properties which have time and time again been told it doesn't fit with the scenery or other architecture so how does 180 new builds fit with what's already here?
	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Shannon Robinson	Response-01635	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Shaun Green	Response-01773	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Sheila	Response-00587	No detailed plans have been provided on the proposed types of housing. Without this information, it is impossible to assess the suitability or need for the development in relation to the local housing strategy. We already have new homes that were built off Longmoor Road - low cost, affordable homes. This proposal of a new development is just a box-ticking exercise to hit government targets. No consideration to the current residents and the negative impact it will hold.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Sheila Payne	Response-01782	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Sian Knox	Response-01679	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	S Leek	Response-01737	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Sonya Birkin	Response-01656	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Sophie Bennett	Response-01631	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Stephen Davies	Response-00214	180 additional properties in this location entirely inappropriate. Even EBC claim 5,000 affordable homes in are required but set only 10% requirement for this development? A proposal for 180 dwellings on this site would represent a significant increase in density compared to the surrounding area. It would result in a development that appears out of scale and out of keeping with the established residential character. Such a large number of homes in a single location also risks undermining the carefully considered planning policies agreed through the Neighbourhood Plan process. This conflicts with Paragraph 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which recognises the legal status of Neighbourhood Plans and supports giving local communities the power to shape development in their area. It also contradicts Paragraph 127, which states that developments should be sympathetic to local character and align with the expectations set out in local design guides or codes
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Stephen Sacker	Response-01598	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Steve Bilbie	Response-00285	House are not suitable here at all.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Steve Whittaker	Response-01781	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Stuart Pensom	Response-00049	Any going to be social housing
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Sue Harrison	Response-01629	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Susanne Beaven	Response-01618	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Sylvia Plampin	Response-00624	To fit 180 houses on the site, these will have to be small, cramped and I doubt will have adequate parking.
			Tamara Partridge	Response-01780	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Tarnya Hinman	Response-01786	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Thomas Ilett	Response-01088	The housing allocation is at the top of an incline, comparative to Sandiacre. This would also make the housing allocation inappropriate as the Sandiacre Neighbourhood Plan highlights the need for housing for the elderly and sheltered housing (Chapter 17, paragraph 142, 144, 145 and 146). A proposed housing allocation 20 ? 60m higher than much of the rest of Sandiacre would be inappropriate for sheltered housing or housing for the elderly due to access difficulties.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Tim Derbyshire	Response-01681	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Tim Gough	Response-00996	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Toby Moran	Response-01769	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Tom Ball	Response-01672	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Tony Weston	Response-00990	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing. The proposed housing lacks plans for sustainable infrastructure, such as green roofs or solar energy, which goes against the increasing demand for eco-friendly living options. Building large estates can lead to social fragmentation, as new arrivals may not integrate into the existing community, reducing neighbourhood cohesion and identity.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Tracey Howe	Response-01860	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Tracey Hughes	Response-01699	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Trevor Rowston	Response-01678	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Try church	Response-00033	The housing will not be affordable to the people who need it.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Tyler Hobbs	Response-00879	The project is likely to consist largely of standard, market-rate housing?typically three- or four-bedroom family homes?which raises several concerns. Firstly, this type of housing may not meet the actual needs of the local community, such as affordable homes for young people, first-time buyers, or downsizing options for older residents. If the development prioritizes profit over genuine housing need, it risks pricing out local people and doing little to address real housing shortages. Additionally, large-scale family housing brings with it a high demand for schools, healthcare, parking, and transport?services that are already stretched in the area. Without a balanced mix of property types and tenures, including genuinely affordable and social housing, the development could exacerbate existing inequalities and fail to serve the long-term interests of the community.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Vicky	Response-00485	Why destroy more green belt when there are houses empty!! We already have the local hotels filled with immigrants where does it end
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Victoria Abraham	Response-01652	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Victoria Galpin-shrimpton	Response-01009	high density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Victoria Greatorex	Response-01730	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Victoria Marriott	Response-00674	Type of Housing - Much of the houses within sandiacre are period properties, how do you intend to comply with the look and feel of the houses so they blend in? It is the highest density of housing of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for future phases. Have you not considered other more suitable sites for this housing? Ones that aren't on a nature reserve.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Vivien Davis	Response-01582	High density housing is preposterous not in keeping with current housing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	Wayne Major	Response-00408	I wish to object to the proposed development on the grounds that it does not appear to be in accordance with the local Neighbourhood Plan, particularly in terms of housing scale, type, and density. The area currently benefits from a Neighbourhood Plan, developed in consultation with the local community to guide appropriate and sustainable development. This plan sets clear expectations that new development should reflect the character of the area, including the type and density of housing, and should be proportionate to the existing built environment. A proposal for 180 dwellings on this site would represent a significant increase in density compared to the surrounding area. It would result in a development that appears out of scale and out of keeping with the established residential character. Such a large number of homes in a single location also risks undermining the carefully considered planning policies agreed through the Neighbourhood Plan process. This conflicts with Paragraph 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which recognises the legal status of Neighbourhood Plans and supports giving local communities the power to shape development in their area. It also contradicts Paragraph 127, which states that developments should be sympathetic to local character and align with the expectations set out in local design guides or codes. In light of the above, I believe the proposal in its current form fails to comply with the Neighbourhood Plan and should be reconsidered. A reduced number of homes, designed in a way that respects the established form and layout of the community, would be far more appropriate for this site.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Type of Housing	William Marriott	Response-00676	Type of Housing Type of Housing - Much of the houses within sandiacre are period properties, how do you intend to comply with the look and feel of the houses so they blend in? It is the highest density of housing of all the proposals and will give rise for concern for future phases. Have you not considered other more suitable sites for this housing? Ones that aren't on a nature reserve.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Aaron Locksley	Response-00711	There is no doubt wildlife of the neighboring Stoney Clouds nature reserve will be affected. I personally am pragmatic and see the dire need for new houses, but what are the mitigating factors? Will there be a large green space left between the housing plots and nature reserve? What noise restrictions could be put in place?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Adam Shooter	Response-01925	Existing green belt land is critical to maintaining biodiversity which has been suffering across the UK for decades. The land also serves as a corridor connecting green areas that support biodiversity. The M1 has limited crossing points between green spaces, I expect removal of just one as this proposes would cause lasting impact to healthy biodiversity of the area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Adrian Randall	Response-00463	The site is existing green belt next to a local beauty spot, higher density housing than already exists in the area. We need to protect and cherish our green belt, not build on it!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	A Harby	Response-01684	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Aimee	Response-00952	There's not many green belt areas left in this area and if planning is approved here it will open the gates to further destruction of green belt land. We need to protect the green belt as it homes thousands of plants, animals and insects. Once it is lost to housing, it's lost forever. There's birds of prey and bats in this area that need green areas to roost and to find food.
	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Alexander Love	Response-00626	Wildlife will be destroyed
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Alex Corns	Response-01151	The built environment is described as a major contributor to biodiversity loss and climate change due to the large volume of resources consumed by the construction industry. The built environment presents a serious threat to the protection of biodiversity if an urgent action towards a more sustainable built environment across the globe is not implemented. The Built Environment rarely considers the connection between the biodiversity and human wellbeing when delivering infrastructure and housing projects; little attention is paid to the integration of the relevant biodiversity strategies for sustainable urban development.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Alex Lord	Response-00946	I would like to protect the wildlife that still lives here, as that wildlife reserve is the main livable area for a lot of birds/ hedgehogs & otters. It is lovely walk and an important part of our community, especially for dog walkers
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Alice Cooper	Response-01721	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Alice Ilett	Response-00571	The greenbelt and stoney clouds in general is home to so much wildlife. Once it's gone we've lost it forever, I have beautiful memories of walking on stoney clouds to see the horses and wildlife as a child and it upsets me that my daughter won't have the same experience. There's so many alternative places to build but please please leave our beloved greenbelt alone. It means a lot to a lot of people.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Ali Harrison	Response-00947	Stoney Clouds is a beautiful nature reserve with a multitude of biodiversity and wildlife that needs protecting, not disturbed or destroyed by a huge building development!!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Amanda Leech	Response-01625	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Amelia Loosemore	Response-00537	Building here will mean less green land. The nature needs protecting. Children need somewhere to play. This is a little bit of green area where I walk my dogs.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Amy Cray	Response-01223	This is a nature reserve!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Amy Skinner	Response-01447	The green belt land and the adjacent Stoney Clouds nature reserve is home to a plethora of native flora and fauna. It is a sanctuary for many species of birds and mammals such as buzzards, kestrels, foxes, badgers, moles, shrews and rabbits not to mention the countless, vital, pollinators that thrive there. Even if the proposed plans didn't directly impinge upon Stoney Clouds itself, there is no way that the works wouldn't have a hugely negative impact on the wildlife and biodiversity in Stoney Clouds and the green belt area. The noise, disruption and destruction of natural habitats would be catastrophic for the many animals that call the land their home. There are far too few green spaces left as it is. Furthermore, it would be detrimental to the people that regularly visit in order to be around nature. It is good for our mental health and well-being.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Anastasia Anthony	Response-01865	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat. Presence of bluebells in the wood warrants a classification of 'ancient' (Gloves et al 2009). Would probably frighten Stoney Clouds wildlife away.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Andrew Davies	Response-01295	This could be easily effected as it is an area of wildlife
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Andrew Marvin	Response-00255	Stoneyclouds is lovely 180 houses and people will have a massive impact on the area and wildlife !!!!!!! Again disgusting
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Andrew Meadwell	Response-01654	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Andria Nyilasi	Response-00672	The wildlife in the immediate and the surrounding area of Stoney clouds would be directly impacted by the building, the longevity of the project, the noise and air pollution, not to mention the new population living on the site and all that brings with it. The land could never be returned to what it was and species using the Stoney cloud nature reserve may leave or be wiped out.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Andy Martin	Response-01761	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Angela Roberts	Response-00681	Stones clouds nature reserve is a very special place. I visit regularly to enjoy the environment and nature. I believe there are bats there. I used to see bats in my garden before the Longmoor lane development but not any more. Please don't destroy more habitat .
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Angela Whitehead	Response-00544	Inevitably it will destroy the birds and fauna
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Anne Butler	Response-00385	Any impingement on to the stoney clouds site, including the children in these 300 houses using it as a playground will be detrimental to the wildlife there.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Anne Castledine	Response-00499	The variety of wild life is amazing, I've watched foxes playing and the different types of birds, including buzzards and sparrow hawks, blue tits and coal tits, robins to name just afew.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Anne Jenkins	Response-00350	Stoney clouds is a wonderful facility which supports many types of wildlife and offers a natural environment for us to enjoy
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Annette Jones	Response-00961	We should protect the existing wildlife and continue to encourage old and new species. Having lived in the same area all my life and seeing what happened when the new housing was built previously it has taken many years to correct or never be able to replace. Do we not learn what impact this can have.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Ann Foxall	Response-00748	spoiling a nature reserve/ beauty spot
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Ann Harrison	Response-01602	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Anthony Ford	Response-01921	It is a lovely walk through & round the horse field to get to the golf course. An escape of natural beauty & biodiversity.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Anthony Pearson	Response-01760	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
			Anthony Smedlewick	Response-01877	We go up there to see all the different animals up there, it's lovely.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Antony M Ingram	Response-01626	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
			A R Gregory	Response-01918	
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Arleen Corns	Response-01146	If you take away the green belt up near Larch drive the wildlife will suffer, there are many creatures living up there, foxes, badgers, snakes, bats, owls and numerous birds. I have identified over 30 different types using an app, of which some are rare such as an Eurasian Siskin.
			Ashley Cartlidge	Response-01423	Wildlife is being squeezed and we cannot simply say that it can just all live in the nature reserves.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Awson Wheldon	Response-01649	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Barbara and John Morrell	Response-00509	The area proposed for this new development of houses is a haven for wildlife and any development on this site would have a profound impact on those animals and birds. The area is very much used by local people to enjoy the wildlife it has and there are very few places left in this locality to enjoy such pleasures.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Barbara Michell	Response-01787	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
			Barbara Warton	Response-01886	Where will they go?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Barry Partridge	Response-01778	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Ben Hollins	Response-01651	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	ben riley	Response-00607	We cherish the area. It's why we moved here so we could take walks with out children on the green belt. Please don't remove any of it. Once you begin to remove it, you'll carry on building on the green belt
			Ben Snowdon	Response-00428	This is an area of natural beauty and has many different types of plants, animals and birds that would all be affected.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Bethany Oakes	Response-00960	The area being built on is currently a haven for wildlife, including foxes, badgers and squirrels.
			Beverley Gardner	Response-01692	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Beverley Green	Response-01686	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Bill Hartley	Response-01696	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	B T Duke	Response-01900	Very concerned.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	B T Keen	Response-01735	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	c/o The Equalised Club	Response-01603	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
			Callum binnall	Response-00460	Sandiacre has countless beautiful areas and you'll be destroying a massive part of the animals habitat, plus moving all the horses from there home!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	C A Partridge	Response-01903	There is a lot of wildlife on the site including bats, horses, birds of prey.
			Caroline Blackmore	Response-00451	Obvious one you're trying to build on green belt it'll have a knock on effect to Stony Clouds. Why do you want to take away green belt land. That parcel of land also buffers the motorway
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Caroline Driver	Response-00618	Stoney Clouds nature reserve is not big enough already. We walk there regularly and see the diverse habitat that the proposed area of building protects from immediate impact. In the last month I have seen 3 dead hedgehogs on the road. I have seen owls (one owl decapitated my pet rabbit). My next door neighbour has fox den in their garden with cubs every spring (have them all on camera). Likely in gardens due to loss of habitat already. This loss should not be exacerbated further.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Caroline Roy	Response-00945	This area is a fantastic space for wildlife, from birds of prey to bees. We should be encouraging more spaces like these - not destroying them
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Carol Marshall	Response-00736	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat. Disruption from heavy dusty construction vehicles, their noise, vibration and dirt would be detrimental to wildlife for many years
			Carolyn Hallam	Response-00489	Building on greenbelt will definitely affect wildlife and biodiversity. Once it has been destroyed, it can't be put back. Animals live there because it's good habitat. Once they are displaced they will probably die. Putting up bird and bat boxes several years later, if at all, is useless
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Catherine Richardson	Response-00531	I have personally seen kestrels,buzzards,owls,badgers,hedgehog,foxes and many butterflies and other insects. Also many small birds would be affected by this site going ahead
			Charlie Marvin	Response-00256	Our wildlife and nature should be protected as it has for many years without obstruction
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Charlotte Fry	Response-00583	We should be protecting our wildlife and not building homes on their homes that were there to begin with.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Charlotte Hunter	Response-01376	Hedgehogs, an endangered species will be impacted by this in a GREEN BELT area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	C Holmes	Response-01620	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Chris Hume	Response-01373	I live on Chestnut Grove, we have Bats, hedgehogs, Robbins, Bluetits, Sparrow Halks, Peregrine Falcon visiting as the food source is wood pigeon. We would lose all of the visiting wildlife in our garden if the building went ahead
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Chris Jones	Response-01718	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Chris O Connor	Response-01641	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Christian Rearson	Response-01763	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Christine Anderson	Response-00484	A lot of endangered species live on this site - the community gains a lot of pleasure from this - using green space like this is, therefore, wrong.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Christine Gough	Response-00578	Stoney Clouds is a well known for its abundance of wildlife . I've seen bats, goldfinches , foxes , hedgehogs and insects that have thrived there . Why at this time when we all know that bees , birds and other wildlife are in serious decline does anyone want to tear away their habitat , never to be replaced ? Replaced with a sprawl of houses built with no hedges, trees and hardly any gardens is beyond belief! Not good for biodiversity .Not even considering the wellbeing of people cramped together with no green space .
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Claire binnall	Response-00459	Stoney clouds had a diverse and beautiful range of wildlife and biodiversity the bats are very prevalent I would suggest a full study to see what wildlife you have up there as frogs and newts have been spotted in the area
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Clair Ellis	Response-00475	The wildlife affected will be huge!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Clare franks	Response-00498	This area has been part of stoney clouds for the last 15 years as long as we have lived here. There are many brownfield sites in the local area, I'm not sure why using green space where there are many species of wildlife is necessary.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Clare Green	Response-01751	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Cole Hawkins	Response-01714	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Colin Cox	Response-01716	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Colin Marriott	Response-00686	This proposed site is an area of wide biodiversity, a green space full of wildlife, including over 30 species of birds, foxes, rabbits and bats. The adjoining nature reserve of Stoney Clouds would suffer greatly if this was to go ahead. Developers do not care about wild life only profit.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Connor Murfin	Response-00926	We need to protect the rest of the nature we have left, it is very important to preserve this area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Corrina loosemore	Response-00589	Badgers ,voles, shrew, slow worms Birds Trees Native bluebells
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Courtney Bennett	Response-00593	Sandiacre is one of the very last few towns in the area that has so much beautiful green spaces for natural wildlife, exploration, walks, children so why destroy that? Wildlife population such as birds, badgers, foxes, insects (including bees) are already depleting. We should be doing everything we can to protect them and the world around us by planting more trees, plants and encouraging wildlife to populate as well as providing a green open space environment for children to explore, play in and learn about.
			C Owen	Response-01917	The area is full of our local wildlife that will be lost & it will never return.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Craig Freeman	Response-01561	There is evidence of badgers and my wife has often seen deer in the conservation area, often in the woods backing on to the horse fields. Filling this space with housing will likely drive this wildlife away or destroy the habitat they rely on.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Craig Richards	Response-01638	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Craig Thims	Response-01765	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Cristina Jenkins	Response-01588	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	C Thompson	Response-01634	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
			DAllen	Response-00525	Spoiling the green belt land as we walk in this area
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Dana	Response-01173	Need to preserve green spaces not destroy them
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Daniel	Response-00545	The proposed development borders a nature reserve and mature green space, which currently supports a range of local wildlife including birds, bats, foxes, and potentially protected species. Increased human presence, noise, lighting, and domestic pets will disrupt these ecosystems irreparably. Once natural habitats are lost, they are almost impossible to recover. This development directly threatens local biodiversity and undermines efforts to preserve green corridors for wildlife.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Daniel Downes	Response-01630	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Daniel Hands	Response-00057	With dwindling areas left to wilderness, to further decrease any green space in any shape and form can only negatively impact wildlife, flora and fauna. Not to mention the impact decreased open spaces and increased development will have on people's mental and social wellbeing.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Danielle Harrison	Response-00568	This is a green belt corridor for foxes, badgers and hedgehogs. I have seen families of foxes at twilight traversing this field the reach the woodland connected to stoney cloud. The foxes use the woodland corridor right along the motorway edge. This land would make a beautiful rewilding project for the local community. The amount of butterflies and moths viewed in the hedgerow grasses is testament to its biodiversity potential. A study must be done.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Daniel Naylor	Response-00680	180 new homes would also have a direct effect on the rare and beautiful wildlife that exists in the proposed area. People local and afar use this area for walks that they claim helps with their mental health when wanting to escape the hustle and bustle of everyday life, as they walk amongst all the flora and fauna.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Darran and Emma Rea	Response-00597	There are a lot of protected species of wildlife in the area, the development will drive wildlife away which will have a detrimental effect to the area especially when Stoney Clouds is a nature reserve, it will have a huge impact on the wildlife
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	David Casey	Response-01608	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	David Cater	Response-01756	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	David Fry	Response-00596	The stoney cloud nature reserve is used daily by the local residents and visitors alike. To destroy and reduce the local wildlife is totally unacceptable. There are Peregrine Falcons on the proposed site. Are these not protected species?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	David Ruddock	Response-01776	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	David Thompson	Response-01324	Wildlife forced into gardens
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	David Tindsley	Response-00515	The proposed site is adjoining Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve. The latest available report on the reserve (Stoney Clouds LNR Management Plan 2013-2022) appears to have been commissioned by the Council in 2012?, and the report, produced by the Derbyshire Wildlife Trust was updated 29/4/20. This provides a substantial and detailed description of the site's flora and fauna. There is much anecdotal evidence of foxes, badgers, rabbits and moles, and I know from personal experience that there are field mice and brown rats. Bats are regularly seen in the summer months in the Larch Drive area, where they roost in the woods. In terms of reptiles, common frog and common toad are believed to be resident, together with grass snakes and, we are advised, adders. Resident bird species are many and varied. Our garden backs on to the wood at Stoney Clouds (Compartment 6 Cloud House Plantation). I have personally seen or heard 29 different bird species over the last 12 months, either as visitors to our garden or on walks in the woods themselves. These include over-wintering migrants such as chiffchaff and blackcap, sparrowhawk, greater spotted and green woodpeckers. Also included in this list are birds identified in the report as being priority species in the UK and Lowland Derbyshire Local Biodiversity Action Plan - bullfinch, song thrush, house sparrow and dunnock. All the species are associated with the hedgerow and woodland habitats. The report highlights that here is a legal obligation not to damage or disturb protected species or breeding birds during the breeding season. In my view, despite a requirement to provide a suitable green buffer?, any construction and development work on the site will inevitably have a significant and detrimental effect on the flora and fauna of the site. For these reasons, I strongly object to the proposed development and urge the planning authority to carefully consider the detrimental impact the development will have on the area's wildlife.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	David Yeo	Response-01705	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Dawn Glennis Smith	Response-00510	This area has already been damaged by house building. What remains should be protected for the animals, birds, insects and plant life.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Dean Bosworth	Response-01665	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Dean Lavelle	Response-01774	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Dean Michell	Response-01343	There is a good variety of wildlife and this should get better in time. Building new home will put wildlife in danger.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Debra Michell	Response-01346	There are great number of birds and wildlife around Stoney Clouds. Building more house harm there habitats.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Debra Scully	Response-00288	The area is adjacent to a nature reserve and the urbanisation will have a dramatic affect on the areas bio diversity as a direct result of the build
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Debs Washer	Response-00487	It's a nature reserve , the heavy plant used to build the houses will cause untold damage to the wildlife and nature
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Denise Creasey	Response-00786	This site has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. It is in close proximity to the Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve and would impact badly on all wildlife in the area. Wild life is already struggling against loss of habitat. Animals and wildlife would be greatly adversely affected by noise, light and air pollution affecting their natural behaviours.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Denise Lingard	Response-01759	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Dennis Watts	Response-01726	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Derek Morton	Response-01607	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Derrick Hunt	Response-00437	We need natural open spaces you can't just keep concreting over the green belt just because you have 5000 people on a housing waiting list who already have somewhere to live.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Destiny Jade-Blake	Response-01636	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Diane Jones	Response-00852	There is a diversity of wildlife in the stoney clouds area and the proposed development will encroach on the whole area. We are privileged to see Buzzards , Kestrels and Red Kites regularly.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Diane Mcmorrow	Response-00433	Having walked up Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve for many years with my 2 border collies I've seen all walks of life from foxes rabbits squirrels numerous birds nesting owls and woodpecker alike not to mention the beautiful plants the bluebells wild garlic and mushrooms to name a few. It would be such a shame to loose this wild habitat progress isn't always a good thing
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Diane Meadwell	Response-00807	The vast amount of flora and fauna that inhabit the Stoney Clouds nature reserve is clearly noted in the management plan compiled by Derbyshire Wildlife Trust and commissioned by Erewash Borough Council. The proposed site immediately adjoins this area. In the short term, the construction and all associated traffic will undoubtedly affect the area in a significant way. This damage could very well be irreversible. We are already witnessing a decline in the number of birds, mammals and invertebrates in our area, and this development can only add to this decline, whether this be short or long term. The RSPB reports a serious decline in wildlife due to habitat loss resulting in the UK being one of the most nature depleted countries on Earth. The destruction of Green Belt land will add significantly to this catastrophic situation. We should be protecting these spaces for the future generations
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Diane Turner	Response-01744	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Donna Steele	Response-00781	Stoney clouds is a beautiful place. There?s lots of wildlife in the area which will disappear if this build goes a head. There will not be anywhere for the wildlife to go and this will slowly disappear, it?s a very sad situation.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Dorothy Deeprise	Response-00817	You will wipe out the wildlife
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	D Pallett	Response-01627	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	D Simpson	Response-01712	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	E Cooper	Response-01923	No doubt over spill from nature reserve living here. This needs investigating.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Elaine Pickering	Response-00811	Taking more land away from green space
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Eleanor Moseley	Response-00799	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Eleanor Newman	Response-00718	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Emily	Response-01880	More loss of wildlife, trees etc.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Emma	Response-00492	New houses can't be built in our area because birds of prey have been spotted, and their presence indicates the land is an important habitat. Protecting these species means development is restricted to preserve the local ecosystem.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Emma Peterson	Response-00491	Save our beauty spot
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Emma Ryan	Response-00503	Taking green land and turning it into more (somewhat unnecessary) housing will be detrimental to the wildlife, there is no way to avoid that. You can't lay down 180 houses and expect there not to be a knock on effect to the local wildlife that was there before.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Emma Wall	Response-00319	I walk my dogs regularly around this area and there are huge amounts of wildlife just on my phone alone on the Merlin app counted more than 20 species of different birds. The raptors hunt on these fields. There?s a lot of wildlife that will be lost damaged displaced or gone forever of that area. It?s unacceptable to build on this piece of land.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Emma Wilson	Response-01222	We should not be building on our green spaces. There will be none left soon
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Esme Moss	Response-00592	Will destroy locally important habitat for a range of species, including a range of protected species (bats, reptiles, badger, shrews) and locally important species. This area of land contributes and increases habitat connectivity in the area, allowing for safe dispersal of a range of species (invertebrates, small mammals, badger) and therefore promotes the success of local species populations. With the changes being made, biodiversity will decrease in the local area which in turn will contribute to the national and international biodiversity crisis.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Esther Cook	Response-01861	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Ewan Snowdon	Response-00766	By building these homes it will disrupt the wildlife and as an avid wildlife photographer it will mean that I?m losing out on witnessing the wildlife in its natural habitat and capturing those moments.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Fay Cresswell	Response-00701	There is a wide range of wildlife on the fields presently we have Foxes,Badgers.hedgehogs, frogs return annually. There is an abundance of bird life we have buzzards, Sparrow Hawks. Kestrel s and various garden birds from tits robins wrens blackbirds Jays Doves Sparrows Magpies Goldfinches and more.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Finlay Moss	Response-00588	Building on horse fields and grey belt that supports the local biodiversity in the area
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Gail Berry	Response-01644	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Geoff Tindsley	Response-00755	1. I?m aware that there is much anecdotal evidence of foxes, badgers, rabbits and moles, and I know from my parents? experience that there are field mice and brown rats. They do see bats regularly during the summer, where they roost in the woods. In terms of reptiles, common frog and common toad are believed to be resident, together with grass snakes and, I understand, adders. 2. Resident bird species are many and varied. My parents house backs on to the wood at Stoney Clouds (Compartment 6 Cloud House Plantation). They tell me that they have personally seen or heard 29 different bird species over the last 12 months, either as visitors to their garden or on walks in the woods themselves. These include over-wintering migrants such as chiffchaff and blackcap, sparrowhawk, greater spotted and green woodpeckers. Also included in this list are birds identified in the report as being priority species in the UK and Lowland Derbyshire Local Biodiversity Action Plan - bullfinch, song thrush, house sparrow and dunnoek. All the species are associated with the hedgerow and woodland habitats.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Georgia C	Response-01296	Noise and disturbances to local nature reserve (which is already a small area) and the animals living there.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Georgia Marvin	Response-00261	I am so angry and passionate about this subject because building 180 homes will destruct so many more habitats, it will destroy breeding cycles. It will cause so many more deaths which will means all animals will flee towards the motorway. Stoney clouds is a nature reserve. Not really reserving nature when you want to destroy all their habitats.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Gill West	Response-01725	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Glyn Holner	Response-01697	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Gordon Bruce	Response-01455	Stoney Clouds is a much loved local amenity where children can learn about nature and see it in action with a huge variety of birds and mammals living there. The conurbation that is Sandiacre, Stapleford and Long Eaton is sadly lacking in wild life space, so this area of nature reserve should not be removed.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Gordon Daris	Response-01639	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Greg Cox	Response-01702	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Gregg Bartrum	Response-01591	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Greg Watts	Response-00733	Access across or near the Stoney Clouds escarpment could be environmentally damaging
	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Hannah	Response-00657	Huge area for biodiversity and enjoyable walks
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Harriet Farnsworth	Response-01914	Even less habitat for our fast declining wildlife.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Helen Gillain	Response-00964	There is a wild variety of wildlife on the proposed site .. it has been reported that over 50 different bird species have been noted including rare birds of prey including and sparrowhawks and buzzards! .. building on this site would affect the natural habitat and may lead to extinction
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Helen Richardson	Response-00432	Stoney Cloud is a significant site with many threatened native plants. The building works alone will threaten the diversity, may well disturb the bats and other wildlife that inhabit the area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Helen Thompson	Response-01356	This site is part of an important wildlife corridor linking to Stoney Clouds Nature reserve, the Erewash canal and across to Stanton by Dale. The area provides a range of habitats for wildlife. It should be preserved not built on. Have the views of Derbyshire Wildlife Trust been sought?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Helen whiteman	Response-00447	Stoney clouds has lots of mammals insects reptiles and amphibians on the site the poor animals have been squeezed enough as it is without more of it. Where are all the animals going to go. Leave well alone
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Ian	Response-00493	Building on these meadows will impact invertebrate breeding and therefore have a knock on effect up the food chain. The nature reserve supports species such as sparrowhawk, kestrel and barn owl which will suffer as a result.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Ian Bailey	Response-00505	This is an area off the Stoney Clouds nature reserve and this will affect the wildlife living in the area in the short term while building and long term with additional people and pet animals
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	IAN TAYLOR	Response-00972	The proposed site forms part of an important wildlife corridor adjoining the M1. The open space currently used for grazing is just as important for biodiversity as the wooded areas. The site adjoins the Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve and is essentially part of the same ecosystem. The destruction of the open spaces representing the development site and increased footfall on the Nature Reserve in the future will have an irreversible impact on the wildlife in the local area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Ian Ward	Response-01628	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Irina Anthony	Response-01867	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Isabelle Love	Response-00529	The area is home to a wide range of wild life, we frequently spot birds of prey up there, not to mention badgers, bats and hedgehogs - all of which should be protected and have had the land they should be living on squeezed further and further. The surrounding areas were once green and are now concrete.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Isobel Ball	Response-01092	Building housing in an area so large and so eco diverse will no doubt have various implications on the wildlife in this zone. As someone passionate about ecosystems and habitats i simply cannot endorse it. Many animals will die as a result of building this many houses here.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	J. E. Lord	Response-01601	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jack Greatorex	Response-01731	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jacob Whitt	Response-01748	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jacqueline Marshall	Response-01436	Stones Clouds
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jade Smith	Response-01783	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jake Simpson	Response-00667	A loss of plants and trees would negatively impact local wildlife
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	James Meadwell	Response-01653	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	James Roberts	Response-01708	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	James Seward	Response-01683	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	James White	Response-01883	The build will disturb wildlife at Stoney Clouds.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jane Dennett	Response-00965	The area is established with trees and lots birds will ruin the area and their habitat if destroy it.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jane Elizabeth Tindsley	Response-00669	The proposed site is adjoining Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve. The latest available report on the reserve (Stoney Clouds LNR Management Plan 2013-2022) appears to have been commissioned by the Council in 2012?, and the report, produced by the Derbyshire Wildlife Trust was updated 29/4/20. This provides a substantial and detailed description of the site's flora and fauna. There is much anecdotal evidence of foxes, badgers, rabbits and moles, and I know from personal experience that there are field mice and brown rats. Bats are regularly seen in the summer months in the Larch Drive area, where they roost in the woods. In terms of reptiles, common frog and common toad are believed to be resident, together with grass snakes and, we are advised, adders. Resident bird species are many and varied. Our garden backs on to the wood at Stoney Clouds (Compartment 6 Cloud House Plantation). My husband and I have personally seen or heard 29 different bird species over the last 12 months, either as visitors to our garden or on walks in the woods themselves. These include over-wintering migrants such as chiffchaff and blackcap, sparrowhawk, greater spotted and green woodpeckers. Also included in this list are birds identified in the report as being priority species in the UK and Lowland Derbyshire Local Biodiversity Action Plan - bullfinch, song thrush, house sparrow and dunno. All the species are associated with the hedgerow and woodland habitats. The report highlights that here is a legal obligation not to damage or disturb protected species or breeding birds during the breeding season. In my view, despite a requirement to provide 'a suitable green buffer', any construction and development work on the site will inevitably have a significant and detrimental effect on the flora and fauna of the site. For these reasons, I strongly object to the proposed development and urge the planning authority to carefully consider the detrimental impact the development will have on the area's wildlife.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Janet Whildes	Response-01869	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Janice Taylor	Response-01743	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Janice West	Response-00989	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Janine Holmes	Response-01595	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jason Deepprose	Response-00818	Stop destroying the nature.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jason Harwood	Response-01667	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jason Webb	Response-01637	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jayne Rowley	Response-01279	This area is home to a variety of wildlife including sparrow hawks, bats, foxes, hedgehogs, woodpeckers, owls, squirrels and a variety of birds which also use this as a hunting ground. Some of these due to increasing development of areas are becoming endangered, this has already been impacted by the nearby Stanton Park development. Not only would a lot of these animals lose their habitat through this land being ripped up but also their lives with the increased human presence and additional traffic.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	J Cates	Response-01750	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jeanette O Connor	Response-01640	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jeffrey Whittaker	Response-00594	Should be kept as a boundary between M1 and the present houses for the natural wildlife to grow not enough green space in Sandiacre as it is
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jenna Mitchell	Response-01407	Our wildlife is in crisis and this would make it worse

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jennie Handley	Response-00723	This is an area for wildlife. It is next to a nature reserve. The building of this new estate will disturb the wildlife and their habitat. It should not be permitted, this is happening to often.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jennifer Bailey	Response-01857	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jennifer Saville	Response-00516	would affect biodiversity of Stoney Clouds
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jennifer Tindsley	Response-00751	1. I'm aware that there is much anecdotal evidence of foxes, badgers, rabbits and moles, and I know from my parents' experience that there are field mice and brown rats. They do see bats regularly during the summer, where they roost in the woods. In terms of reptiles, common frog and common toad are believed to be resident, together with grass snakes and, I understand, adders. 2. Resident bird species are many and varied. My parents house backs on to the wood at Stoney Clouds (Compartment 6 Cloud House Plantation). They tell me that they have personally seen or heard 29 different bird species over the last 12 months, either as visitors to their garden or on walks in the woods themselves. These include over-wintering migrants such as chiffchaff and blackcap, sparrowhawk, greater spotted and green woodpeckers. Also included in this list are birds identified in the report as being priority species in the UK and Lowland Derbyshire Local Biodiversity Action Plan - bullfinch, song thrush, house sparrow and dunnoek. All the species are associated with the hedgerow and woodland habitats.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jenny Stephens	Response-01723	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Joanna hardy	Response-01304	In sandiacre we are luck enough to be close to the countryside. To start removing our greenbelt would damage the local wildlife and harm the ecosystems we have. The proposed site is next to stony clouds nature reserve and acts as an extension, as wildlife does not follow human boundaries. The area also helps protect the biodiversity by acting as a buffer. Any large construction so close to a nature reserve would adversely effect the plants and animals living there and potentially irrevocably damage the biodiversity of the area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Joanne Guyatt	Response-01784	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Joanne Johnson	Response-00765	Butterflies, Bees as well as Foxes, Badgers, Weasels, Owls, Buzzards and other birds all frequent this area. The habitat loss of this field and trees would be very harmful to them. Our local biodiversity is has sadly been depleted over the few decades, this development would cause further habitat loss and be detrimental to what wildlife is left, please destroy it.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Joanne Lambert	Response-00494	Construction so close to the nature reserve is going to impact on the wildlife there, through disturbance of habitats and through the disruption of the natural food chain. I have recently seen kestrels and buzzards in the reserve.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jodie Owen	Response-01688	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jodie Shrive	Response-00601	The land in which you are proposing these 180 houses to be built on is home to endangered, protected species that are native to that area. Once you destroy that, the ecosystem can NEVER be replaced, you will be murdering animals and ending entire species, why? To house people that don't belong here? You're all willing to destroy our planet to make a few extra £ and you should all be ashamed. THERE IS NO PLANET B.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jo Gerhardt	Response-01286	I have Multiple Sclerosis and former military veteran, and use Stoney Clouds, which is an area next door to the proposed building site, as a therapy both mentally and physically as I walk my dog. Its a privilege to see wildlife in all shapes and sizes. Birds of prey are often seen, kites, buzzards as well as seeing bats and hearing owls. Just hearing nature is a recipe for the soul. I feel the proposed development would have a detrimental effect on the existing wildlife and ultimately spoil the essence of the place. Green spaces are important for mental health, it seems like it was a good idea during Covid. We were all practically told to by the Government and health charities to use nature as a way of dealing with emotional stress. Building on Green Belt land would be counter-intuitive in this case.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	John Gardner	Response-01694	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	John G Brown	Response-01752	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	John Hibbitt	Response-01855	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	John Ledger	Response-01605	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	John Payne	Response-01785	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	John whiteman	Response-00450	Please leave the wild life alone they have enough hardship without making it worse by a king the animals homeless
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jon Burn	Response-01722	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Josh Williams	Response-01632	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	J Pearson	Response-01772	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	J Telfer	Response-01876	Not sure
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Judith A Pulfer	Response-01863	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Julie Hill	Response-01643	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Julie Taylor	Response-01503	The planning of these new houses on green belt land is terrible for our wildlife we're the ones that's supposed to be protecting it not bulldozing them down, we have butterflies, bees, bats, squirrels just to name a few.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Karen Alldread	Response-01868	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Karen Blain	Response-01732	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Karen Evans	Response-00523	We need to preserve the wildlife in this area. Building will push it out to roads etc where it will not survive.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Karen Harwood	Response-01668	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Karen Pitts	Response-00643	Stoney Clouds is a beautiful green space for all to enjoy and should stay as such. Lockdown taught us the importance of access to nature for good mental health not just for dog walkers but for all. There is a great variety of flora and fauna that will be severely disrupted or destroyed as a result of this development. There a several variety of bats present, trees adjacent to the site (that I helped to plant over 30 years ago with British Trust for Conservation Volunteers) a beautiful array of bluebells in Spring, hundreds of birds (who along with the bats rely on a good supply of insects) all of these plus more would be put at risk from this development.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Kathryn Martin	Response-00527	Stoney Clouds nature reserve will be negatively impacted.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Katie Morrice	Response-00664	This site has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and forna. It is in close proximity to the Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve and would impact badly on all wildlife in the area. Wild life is already struggling against loss of habitat. Animals and wildlife would be greatly adversely affected by noise, light and air pollution affecting their natural behaviours.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Katie Robinson	Response-00943	In the last year (since I have lived here) I have seen so much wildlife in Stoney Clouds but also in the land that you would like to build on. The sheer volume of birds of prey that use this area and now seeing in a new year that they return every year for nesting. I have seen and photographed Kestrels, buzzards and also seen Red Kites as well. I live on Chestnut Grove so my house backs onto the proposed site and I have photographed the BOP always using this rea and using particular trees to perch on during the day also. I recently photographed a kestrel in Stoney Clouds also. While you claim to protect the nature reserve, building this amount of housing does not. Yes you might not be building on that land but the disruption and relocation of wildlife will have a huge effect on the area. Wildlife does not work on boarders and lines drawn on maps sadly. In addition to this have you thought about the effect the housing will have on the wildlife? Most people these days have pets whether that be a dog or cat - Stoney Clouds can be busy with dog walkers however its not impactful however what will 180 houses bring to this small nature reserve? potentially a further 100+ dog walkers that will disrupt the wildlife and then in addition to this if the new residents have cats? - What effect will this have on the wildlife in the nature reserve also. On a summers evening you can also see bats flying over the garden as well - they are obviously nesting near by as well. The wildlife that uses that area will be pushed off that land and potentially into the reserve which is not a big reserve so will effect wildlife settled there or they could relocate completely - this would be at such a detriment to everyone.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Kelly Randall	Response-00591	Development on green belt land would result in significant habitat loss. Viable brownfield alternatives exist and should be prioritized.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Kelsey Green	Response-01666	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Kenneth Cooper	Response-01720	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Kern-Paul Lewis	Response-01715	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Kerry Meadwell	Response-01655	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Kerry Smith	Response-01271	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Kerry stokes	Response-00769	We have so much wild life in the area for the proposed build that will die if the build goes ahead. We have birds, owls, bats, foxes, frogs, grass snakes, field mice, insects just to name a few. How will all of these species be protected from dying.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Kevin Brookes	Response-00716	I object to building houses on stoney clouds
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	KH Taylor	Response-01663	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Kim	Response-00473	Too close to the nature reserve to not have an affect on the wildlife and biodiversity
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Kimberley Selby	Response-00478	It's going to mean more people walking through the nature reserve effecting the wild life's peaceful environment. A housing estate being built so close will also mean some loss of wildlife and noise disturbance during its construction.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Kim Helm	Response-00632	The building of 180 houses will disturb the wildlife and biodiversity

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Kirk Moss	Response-00439	The development threatens the adjacent Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve, a crucial habitat for local wildlife. Increased pollution, noise, and human activity will disrupt ecosystems and drive away native species. Destruction of tree lines will degrade air quality and biodiversity, going against national conservation efforts.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Kirsty	Response-00970	Hundreds of wildlife will lose their habitat
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Kirsty Handa	Response-00445	The proposed site is green belt land. This area is full of all kinds of wildlife that are detrimental to the area. Building on this land will not only destroy the wildlife in that area but this will have a larger impact on the surrounding areas. Wildlife will not want to nor feel safe in the homes, and will leave or be destroyed. There are plenty of brownfield sites that could be use that does not risk the wildlife that this world desperately needs to protect
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Kirsty Meredith	Response-01462	There is a beautiful reserve right next to the plot of land proposed for building, the wildlife on the reserve and this land will be massively affected by the loss of this greenbelt. I regularly have protected birds in my garden which backs on to the greenbelt and bats are seen on a regular basis too.
			K Reynolds	Response-01916	The decline in our wildlife has already decreased dramatically!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Kristie Rugers	Response-01864	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Kyle Jones	Response-01764	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	L A Keen	Response-01659	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Laura Hallam	Response-01711	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Laura Thompson	Response-00702	Will impact on local wildlife travel route, homes and spaces for them to live. Negative impact.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Laurence Luck	Response-01727	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Lauren Freeman	Response-01562	We walk our dog up stoney clouds every single day and are regularly met with deer, foxes, bats, many different kinds of birds aswell as identifying badger faeces indicating that they are resident up there aswell. Ripping up their beautiful home is truly devastating.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Lauren Rose	Response-01446	The proposed area is around 13 acres, a large area for biodiversity. Development of the area will destroy habitats and the surrounding areas for bats, birds, amphibians, waterfowl and other species of flora and fauna. The proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve will also be affected by the proposed development - meaning it will be impacted negatively. People walk and use this space - myself and my dog walker included! - to get out into nature. If this development goes ahead, this space will be removed, species will be displaced and yet more green space will be removed. Foxes, birds of prey, water voles and bats have been observed in the area of the proposed development and, in a time where biodiversity is being damaged across the country, this area should be preserved, seeing as there are plenty of other brownfield sites that could be developed instead.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Leah morral	Response-00712	Stoney clouds is well known to house many birds, protected badgers, bats, snakes and many more
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Lee Wilcock	Response-01670	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Lesley Bruce	Response-01397	Stoney Clods is home to a variety of birds and animals, important green belt and local amenity. The area of Sandiacre, Stapleford and Long Eaton is a conurbation which has few local amenities like Stoney Clouds. Each one is precious and should not be considered as potential housing development.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Lesley Carter	Response-00536	The wildlife on the proposed site and the neighbouring bird/nature reserve will be badly affected. There are a wide variety of mammals, snakes and birds that live on the proposed site and will have their habitat destroyed. The reserve adjacent will also have disruption from the construction and from the close proximity of the finished houses. This will lead to diminished numbers of birds and varieties in what is supposed to be a protected environment. A lot of the birds feed on the mammals that are living on the proposed site. The owls and birds of prey will suffer particularly.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Lesley Morral	Response-01920	Impact on local wildlife will be affected.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Lia Thims	Response-01766	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	lilly stokes	Response-00767	I always come up to this location as it keeps me calm and helps my mind relax. This place means a lot to me as it holds a lot of memories that i have had when in the nature. I also regularly come up here to study and look at the scenery this helps me with my education and to keep me at peace. If this gets destroyed it takes away my place to come and be at peace with myself, i will have no where else to go and it makes me very stressed.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Linda Allen	Response-01904	

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Linda Castledine-Davies	Response-00850	This proposed site lies next to a nature reserve that has a wonderful diverse mix of flora, fauna, mammals, insects, amphibians, lizards etc. these all spill over onto this site. A high density housing project in such close proximity will have a devastating effect on all of these from the noise, land and water pollution, ground disturbance and light pollution that a development like this will create. There will be a huge loss of habitat to species that are already struggling and the introduction of narrow wildlife corridors and such like is insufficient to stop this decline and destruction. it is widely known that Industrial processes, agriculture, transportation, and waste disposal contribute significantly to pollution and have huge impacts on wildlife. Air pollution can also create significant behavioural changes in animals, migration patterns, birds sing less often, and bees that are already desperately in danger are forced to abandon their hives. There are many different species of birds living in this area and the dawn chorus is a wonderful thing. Kestrel are currently using this site for feeding an possible nesting. It is well known and recorded that High-density housing negatively impacts wildlife by reducing habitat , fragments remaining habitats, and increasing human-wildlife interactions. An adv extra 2.7 per household (ONS data) will see an estimated extra 500 people using this area. This can lead to decreased species diversity, altered community structures, and potential increases in disease prevalence in urban or suburban areas. Developers promise lots to get the planning passed but delivery little as born out by the following Wildlife Between June and August 2024, researchers from the University of Sheffield's School of Geography and Planning visited 42 new housing estates across five Local Planning Authorities in England, covering over 291 hectares of land. The aim of the research was to look at what was on the ground and compare it to what developers had promised to do as a condition of getting permission to build. The findings in their "Lost Nature" report, published by Wild Justice, reveal that only 53% of the ecological features mentioned in planning conditions were present in reality. Looking at enhancements for specific species, large proportions of ecological features were missing. In total, 83% of hedgehog highways, 75% of bird and bat boxes and 85% of reptile refuges were not present on the ground. When they looked for promised bug boxes, not a single one had been installed. The survey also revealed that 39% of trees were either dead or missing, and 82% of woodland edge seed mixes had failed to materialize. Even the features that had been planted weren't always properly installed, making them effectively useless; 59% of wildflower grasslands were found to be sown incorrectly or otherwise damaged. New developments and their associated lighting can negatively impact wildlife through light pollution, disrupting natural behaviours, habitats, and ecosystems. This can lead to disorientation in migrating birds, reduced insect populations, and interference with nocturnal animals' foraging and mating patterns Excess light can lead to ?fragmentation of the useable habitat for animals, birds, insects and even plants, affecting their physiology or behaviour and is a contributing factor in the gradual decline of insect and bird populations worldwide
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Lindsey Rawlinson	Response-01624	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	LISA ANNE GILLIGAN-LEE	Response-00710	The land targeted for development is one of the few remaining green spaces in this community. These areas are vital not only for local biodiversity?providing essential habitat for birds, insects, and small mammals?but also for our mental and physical wellbeing. In an increasingly urban environment, the ability to walk, relax, or exercise in nature is essential for the mental health and wellbeing of our community. Each patch of undeveloped land plays a critical role in preserving biodiversity. Once these habitats are gone, they are gone for good and with them the plants, birds, and animals that rely on them to survive the ecosystems cannot be recovered. Stoney Cloud is vital for local biodiversity?providing essential habitat for the birds, insects, and small mammals and contributes to the rural or semi-rural character of Sandiacre area. This area of land helps with drainage, carbon absorption and provides wildlife habitats, especially in the many hedgerows, bushes; trees and uncultivated areas. The proposed development would destroy the high density of established hedgerows which are vital habitats for many bird species, including native and migratory birds. They also support insects, mammals, bats, and amphibians, forming essential wildlife corridors that connect fragmented habitats. Removing these hedgerows will lead to loss of nesting sites, shelter, navigational landmarks and food sources for a wide variety of species. The loss of trees that help filter pollution will be lost and losing the green space and trees undermines air quality for the community.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Lisa Heppell	Response-00878	Stony clouds is full of wildlife,it is a conservation area and should remain so for future generations.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Lisa J Pearson	Response-01762	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Liz Woodhouse	Response-01584	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	L Mee	Response-01777	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Logan Fox	Response-00746	We are taught in school to preserve nature and wildlife, yet now we are being told that we 'have to' build on green open spaces. I have seen hedgehogs, foxes, even a badger on the green open spaces but also in the roads. Taking away the open space will simply push these animals into the roads and will result in us losing more wildlife. Also, the council makes 'bee-friendly' spaces by not cutting grass to support bees.... then why take away and entire open space. Just does not make sense when we should be embracing nature, not taking it away.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Lorraine Daly	Response-00495	This development is in direct contravention of the growing awareness of the importance of untouched green spaces.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Lorraine Hands	Response-00534	The land in question is lovely for wild birds, wild flowers it would be a crime to take it away!!!!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Louise dix	Response-00975	The effect on the wildlife that lives there and destroying our green area we so love to go for walks and enjoy the views if we start taking one bit of green belt where does it end in 10 years my kids could not be enjoying the walks they now enjoy .

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Louise Felfoldt	Response-01733	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Louise Harper	Response-01571	I see bat's go past at dusk through the side of my house, I've had a pheasant in my garden, foxes, I have a wheelbarrow top filled like a pond since I moved in 25 years ago, I thought I would have frogs which I did to start with but now we have newts , I keep my hedging so birds can nest in them
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Louise Harrison	Response-01719	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Louise Jacks	Response-01767	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Louise Libberton	Response-01693	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Louise Robinson	Response-00647	Building on green belt in this area will result in a decrease in wildlife in the area which is undesirable given the current climate situation. And an increase in traffic will also affect wildlife negatively.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Lucy johnson	Response-01369	I've lived in Sandiacre all my life and I am so passionate about wildlife and biodiversity! I love to see it thrive! In lockdown, I turned half of my garden into a wildflower patch and it was absolutely amazing! Watching the bees, butterflies and the birds bought me and my family so much joy! I've done it every year since! I even did it for my granny in Toton I love it that much! We need to help nature come back! We need green spaces! As you know it's a massive help for the ongoing struggle with mental health!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	lucy victoria garner	Response-00949	wildlife needs open space. already been restricted with destruction of habits at stanton. Covering vast swaves of open space in tarmac isnt caring for our wildlife and biodiversity. Wildlife needs somewhere to be and somewhere to go. Already being squeezed in all directions.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Luke Chein	Response-01779	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Luke Hinchley	Response-00699	A treasured piece of land by all residents who do not want to see it be converted. Regularly see wildlife utilising the fields.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Lynda Morton	Response-01606	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Lynsey Blackburn	Response-01227	This is a beautiful and much used beauty spot, shameful you are yet again disregarding the importance of these sites, stop stealing our green spaces for greed. Redevelop unused properties instead.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Macie Brothwell	Response-01633	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Malcolm Dillon	Response-00722	The Sandiacre township area has already been identified as having low levels of tree cover. The loss of greenbelt will only reduce this tree cover and with it habitat for plants, animals and birds. The UK already has one of the lowest levels of biodiversity in Europe . The loss of this greenbelt area would be a backwards step in the nations aim to improve, not destroy, biodiversity.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Malcolm Fox	Response-00215	Remove open space, remove wildlife! These spaces are used for domestic and wild animals. Again, why gain criticism and issues by the removal of open spaces which are essential for all wildlife. There is simply no argument that can justify the destruction of open spaces, parting directly linked to a nature reserve.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Malcolm Riedlinger	Response-00743	We see a significant amount of varied wildlife in the area, particularly in the back gardens of the house of Stanton Road. It is clear that much of this has a home on the green belt land, and this will surely disappear if this build was to go ahead.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Malcolm Riggs	Response-01680	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Malc Orbiston	Response-01673	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mandy Rait	Response-01587	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Marcel Janovsky	Response-00481	Wildlife killed
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mark Gough	Response-00888	There is a tremendous amount of wildlife on this part of Stoney Clouds, it's recognised as a nature reserve . And Greenbelt . Bats who are supposed to be protected are seen most nights , over 30 types of birds , insects , pollinators. We are supposed to be saving our wildlife not destroying their habitat. There are far better sites to build on that's not a nature reserve .
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mark Leek	Response-01740	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	mark skelton	Response-01341	Will have a negative impact on and around the site. Stoney clouds will suffer losing the ground around it.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Marta McManus	Response-00646	Development is too close to stoney clouds nature reserve.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Martin Driver	Response-01387	Ive seen badgers, foxes, birds of prey, adders up on the borders of the proposed site. Don't destroy their habitat. Getting an ecologist in to put a barrier around a site whilst the works take place doesn't make it ok. DONT DESTROY THEIR HABITAT!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Martin Ford	Response-01908	Being lost due to new housing on green belt.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Martin Hardy	Response-01413	The current land use of the area improves our local biodiversity as it acts not only as open grassland for nature but also acts as a buffer for the local stoney cloud nature reserve. Removing the land for use as housing would decrease the land available for wildlife and the construction works would negatively impact the biodiversity of the nature reserve due to their close proximity.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Martyn Locker	Response-00903	This one really saddens me. Especially as the local councillor responded to my email with a snarky comment that the nature reserve isn't actually serving its purpose as a nature reserve. What about the displaced rabbits, badgers, foxes whose homes will be destroyed by the work? Do they not matter because the number doesn't meet a council's arbitrary requirements to be considered 'useful'? They're still living animals facing destruction and demolition of their homes.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Martyn Maxted	Response-00435	Building on this land will adversely impact the wildlife and biodiversity of this site and will also be to the detriment of the adjacent Stoney Clouds LNR.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	M A Smith	Response-01889	You should not build on green belt.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Matt Bancroft	Response-00916	The disruption and encroachment of the green belt is unwelcome and irreversible once done. This is not sustainable development. Please reconsider. Choose brown field sites first such as between Lidl and the canal
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Matt Hallam	Response-00476	There are 2 birds of prey that nest in the trees behind us which building houses would effect them and all the foxes and badges that are there. Say goodbye to the horses that have been there longer than you have lived. I know this area has been a horsing paddocks for atleast 55 years
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Matthew Buckland	Response-00615	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. I have seen bats there in the summer months in the early evening. I've also regularly see two Buzzards on the site.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Maurice Mason	Response-01617	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Maxine Sutton	Response-00471	Using green belt land instead of other available land will destroy the natural habitat of countless flora and fauna.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	M Dougle	Response-01749	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	M Eastwood	Response-01757	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Melanie	Response-00586	The proposed site currently supports local wildlife and forms part of a continuous green corridor. Development would destroy this habitat, negatively impacting local biodiversity. Alternative brownfield sites exist and should be prioritised in line with national and local planning guidance. You've already built new homes off Longmoor Road destroying habitat for wildlife.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Melanie Caumont	Response-01272	The site is a vital corridor for local wildlife, including protected species such as bats and badgers. Development here would destroy habitats and threaten biodiversity. The area also borders Stony Clouds Local Nature Reserve and Wildlife Site, which would be at risk from light, noise, and air pollution, as well as encroachment. The proposed 'green buffer' is insufficient to mitigate these ecological impacts. Government guidance, including the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), places high importance on conserving and enhancing the natural environment. Building on this greenbelt land would violate these principles.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Melanie Howarth	Response-01621	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Michael Anderson	Response-00461	Wildlife must be at risk as this suggested green field site has boundaries not only to Stoney Clouds nature reserve but also to the Erewash Valley Golf Course.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Michael Darnell	Response-00648	This area provides a wildlife corridor for foxes, badgers, rabbits from the golf course through to Sandiacre. Lots of other smaller creatures will also be affected .
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Michell Birkin	Response-01657	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Michelle Alsop	Response-01645	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Michelle Cox	Response-01724	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Michelle Ledger	Response-00815	Wildlife ? This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat. I have lived here for 21 years, the animals that i have noted in the fields proposed for site are Foxes, badges, owls, bats buzzards,hedgehogs and an abundance of birds who nest. alot of us local residence feed nature in our gardens, for eg i feed wood pigeons, squirrels, and various birds inc great and blue tits (who nest in my boxes), sparrows, robins etc - this surely would disappear/decline if you carry out building works and thereafter? alot of these i see flying in and out the site area. i understand that sparrowhawks are protected? i have had these come into my garden on occasion i have seen these fly in from over the site area
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Michelle Wenham	Response-01650	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mick Hughes	Response-01701	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mike Darnell	Response-00698	This site so at risk of damaging biodiversity. on the neighbouring nature reserve. This is a GREENBELT site not brownbelt, it is totally the wrong site for large estate like buildings. I go here walking and so need this greenspace
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Miss Garratt	Response-00905	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Miss R Cordon	Response-01648	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Misty McGrath	Response-01556	Granted the grassed land is not currently benefiting the environment much, but could be improved with the expansion of the Stoney Clouds nature reserve. However, even in its current state it does act as a green border and barrier between the residential areas, the nature reserve, and the M1.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mollie Snow	Response-01729	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Molly Hall	Response-01873	
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Molly Newbold	Response-00486	Your cutting down Greenland, of course you will affect the wildlife around the area
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mr. Mark Lovatt	Response-00956	Wildlife would be adversely affected by the proposed development, as habitats would be destroyed/compromised. Birds of prey have been spotted over the proposed site. How would they adapt/survive the negative consequences of the proposed building site.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mr & Mrs Turton	Response-01660	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	MR ADAM F RIGBY	Response-00638	Stoney is a site where wildlife runs free, more and more of these areas a being built on. I use Stoney everyday, its a wonderful small site which will more or less be halved by this development. The area where the intended is a mature wooded area , the only wooded area on there. Please do not develop on any of the wooded area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mr and Mrs R Skelton	Response-01274	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mr and Mrs Wright	Response-01275	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
			Mr Colin Key	Response-01841	There will be substantial impact, in every possible way, on the existing wildlife and the adjacent nature reserve.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mr David Ainsworth	Response-00621	We have woodpeckers, Jays, Owls, Buzzards, Badgers, Foxes, and various other wildlife. These animals will be directly affected as the Buzzards live in the trees lining the horse field where this development will rip right through the centre of. Not least the increased number of people living there will scare away the wildlife. This is traditional green belt land and is assigned as such because we need to protect our countryside. There are also bats, and I understand that there are laws about disturbing and building where bats dwell. Please don't break the laws that are set to protect wildlife.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mr John Hickingbotham	Response-01431	The proximity of the proposed development to the Sandiacre Cloudside Conservation Area and the Stoney Clouds Local Nature Reserve are a cause for concern regarding the impact on wildlife and the loss of habitat. Such development will also have a detrimental impact on the views into and out of the Conservation Area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mr K Gubb	Response-01838	There will be substantial impact, in every possible way, on the existing wildlife and the adjacent nature reserve.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mr K Turton	Response-01706	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mr Luke	Response-01703	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mr P J Tanner	Response-01728	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mr R M Draper	Response-01856	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mr R Widdowson	Response-01734	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mr S. Haywood	Response-01585	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mrs Christina Pope	Response-00732	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mrs Donna C. Ball	Response-01594	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mrs Froggatt	Response-00449	The proposed area is a haven for wildlife. This will disappear if houses are built there
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mrs Griffin	Response-01698	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mrs J. Cooper	Response-01596	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat. Green space supporting native species will be endangered.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mrs Jennifer Fry	Response-00581	This is a beautiful area for walking with lots of wildlife habitats which should be protected
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mrs Joanne Thompson	Response-01690	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mrs J Reeder	Response-01909	This will be destroyed on one of our beautiful green spaces.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mrs Lee Farabella	Response-01899	The nature reserve is a critical habitat for both wildlife & biodiversity.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mrs Linda Cox	Response-01753	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mrs Luke	Response-01704	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mrs M. Rose	Response-01583	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mrs Marie Draper	Response-01755	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat. I visit the area where the houses are proposed and I love to see the birds and other wildlife - this is good for my mental health.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mrs M Burke	Response-01887	The nature reserve is a critical habitat for both wildlife and biodiversity.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mrs N Taylor	Response-01896	The nature reserve is a critical habitat for wildlife and biodiversity.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mrs Rachel Coats	Response-01623	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mrs R Cordon	Response-01647	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mrs Rigby	Response-00641	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mrs Shani Wainwright	Response-00754	This site of approx 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, floral and fauna...with bats, red kites etc etc using/living in this proposed area.Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds nature reserve would have a massively negative impact on all the wildlife in the area.....many of whom are already struggling with loss of habitat. These precious creatures need protecting for the future abd for our children to ve able to see.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mrs Sheila Hickingbotham	Response-01338	Developing this site will lead to a loss of biodiversity, wildlife and the natural environment.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mrs Shirley Victoria Riggs	Response-01685	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mrs Susan Bantle	Response-01612	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mrs Turton	Response-01707	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mrs Whittaker	Response-00595	The area has a significant diverse number of wildlife, including birds of prey, which will all be impacted by the loss of the habitat
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Natalie Bentley	Response-01646	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Nicole Cooper	Response-01597	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Normn McCrea	Response-01754	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Oliver Marriott	Response-00679	Wildlife / Biodiversity Wildlife/ Bio diversity The site of approximately 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney clouds nature reserve will impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with a loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Olivia Allen	Response-00520	Please do not take anymore of our wildlife to build houses in an already built up area. Stoney is above place to visit and you are slowly taking that away
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Paige Walker	Response-01669	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Pamela Bassett	Response-00608	It will destroy the wildlife.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Pam shepherd	Response-00453	I've lived in Sandiacre for 41 years residing near stoney clouds for 23 years, this is a beautiful area used daily by dog walkers, horse rider and nature lovers, there are badger sets in the sea water voles and I'm sure other protected species. This will cause a huge amount of damage to the environment
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Pat Hardy	Response-01739	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Paula Darnell	Response-00665	I visit this area almost every day, it is essential to my mental health. On my walks I have seen badgers foxes bats in the evening and several different birds of pray to name but a few, not to mention bees insects, voles, and owls. This is site is so important to sandiacre residents and of course the home to so much wildlife
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Paula Luck	Response-01710	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Paula Sims	Response-01687	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Paul Randall	Response-00131	Building on greenbelt? Not a good sign for wildlife / biodiversity. Alternatives exist. Stoney Clouds is a valued nature reserve. Further encroaching on this space would set a dangerous precedent and further undermine the protection of our green spaces.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Paul Vleeton	Response-01770	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	paul wheeldon	Response-00582	Many wild plants in the fiel affected somew of which may well be protected or endangered species plus a vast amount of varied fauna some of which ARE protected species
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Paul Wilkes	Response-00599	This could destroy the wild life in the area, we have buzzards / kestrels / wood peckers / great tits / blue tits / gold finches/ brown owls / bats. Which all the insects and nests area in the edge rows fields on the site
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Peter Anthony	Response-01866	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Peter Nicholls	Response-01622	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Pete West	Response-01700	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Phil Creasey	Response-01342	This site has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and forna. It is in close proximity to the Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve and would impact badly on all wildlife in the area. Wild life is already struggling against loss of habitat. Animals and wildlife would be greatly adversely affected by noise, light and air pollution affecting their natural behaviours.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Philip Reed	Response-01449	I object to the proposed development of 180 houses on greenbelt land adjoining the nature reserve. This area provides vital habitat for numerous species and supports local biodiversity. Construction would destroy ecosystems, fragment wildlife corridors, and irreversibly damage a crucial buffer zone safeguarding the natural environment and the reserve's ecological integrity.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	P Sandes	Response-01682	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Rachel Crossley	Response-01661	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Rachel Skelton	Response-01241	Building in green belt land will have a detrimental effect on the wildlife in the area
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	R Barratt	Response-01664	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Rcahel Sharp	Response-00652	I have lived in Coronation Avenue for 28 years. We have the green on our avenue, two parks that my children regularly used. We have a dog and I access Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve everyday to exercise him. I am sitting in my garden now and can hear multiple birds. I have had a sparrow hawk, a heron and bats in my garden. I regularly see hedgehogs and foxes. For the first time in my life I saw two badgers last year crossing Stanton Road to the farmers field. Stoney Clouds is a wonderful asset to the area and people not just from Sandiacre use it. It is great to witness the change of the seasons with blossom, bluebells and all the other wild flowers. Also the wooded areas are beautiful. I cannot understand why any council would want to develop on beautiful land which is and should remain protected.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Rebecca Longmuir	Response-00253	Absolutely appalling disgusting idea ! Of course you will destroy the existing nature and biodiversity. You plan to remove green area and disrupt the already established nature there, in favour of housing!! Hasn't enough nature and green belt been destroyed to make way for houses/buildings.ect this is clear labour are unconcerned with the environment they are about to destroy in order for houses. Very sad and shameful.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Rhiannon Lowater	Response-01592	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	R Hibbitt	Response-01862	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Richard Broughton	Response-01352	This quiet patch of land has been a haven for flora and fauna - as well as a buffer between existing house and the motorway, this will cease to be should this development come to pass
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Richard Chambers	Response-00745	Even though it won't impinge on the Stoney Clouds nature reserve, traffic and the resulting pollution will. Even more human activity will exacerbate the biodiversity crisis we're in.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Richard Deeprise	Response-00816	New developments will destroy existing nature
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Richard Haines	Response-01674	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Richard Jenkins	Response-00264	The site adjoins ancient woodland, and falls within the Erewash Valley Living Landscape. Derbyshire Wildlife Trust have identified the Erewash Valley as a strategic landscape area for the protection, restoration and management of natural resources including habitats, flora and fauna, soils and water together with the health and wellbeing of people. On 18th October 2015 a Fungal Foray was carried out by Beverley Rhodes BSc MCIEEM on Stoney Clouds Nature reserve. Her report (copy available) includes the following: ?Our finds included both meadow and woodland species, both of which are ancient in character. The key find was Date Waxcap (Hygrocybe spadicea) a National Diversity Species of importance?? Member BMS and Fungus Conservation Records are sent to ?.the land owner and DWT? My concern is that this major building work is guaranteed to be disruptive to local flora and fauna. The supporting biosphere has contributed to these ancient species because of its inherent stability ? such varieties are simply not found anywhere but ancient woodland. Once gone, it will be lost forever. Stoney Clouds (adjacent to the proposed site) and the pathway across the proposed site to the Golf Course are the only local areas where we can go for a walk to enjoy some nature and freedom of space. These green spaces were a major factor in us moving here from Long Eaton some 14 years ago and have been regular dog-walking destinations for us twice per day. The housing development may not actually be on Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve but a major construction project so close is guaranteed to have a huge negative impact on anyone walking in the area over the next several years and a permanent impact on the habitat of the reserve. The public pathway to the Golf Course runs across the development site. How will this be impacted other than disrupting or closing the path? There are proven health benefits, both physical and mental, to going for a walk regularly and to have this denied or curtailed through a housing project is guaranteed to have a detrimental effect on our health and well-being. Stoney Clouds has rare Ancient Woodland with a unique and irreplaceable biodiversity. This ecosystem is fragile and any disturbance risks major disruption to it, and the likelihood that it cannot be revitalised. Apart from Buzzards, Sparrow Hawks, Great Spotted and Green Woodpeckers, Sandpipers, Willow Tits, European Linnets and Owls being spotted there I have many times seen bats as I walked my dog evening/nighttime. I have also seen many butterflies, moths and occasionally reptiles such as snakes and newts. Derbyshire Wildlife Trust Stoney Clouds LNR Management Plan which discusses the biodiversity and highlights many of the rare species at risk from this plan. Interesting quotes such as ?3.1.5.2 Biodiversity Action Plans The site supports habitats that are considered to be of value for biodiversity at a national and local level as defined by the UK Biodiversity Action Plan (2007) and the Lowland Derbyshire Biodiversity Action Plan, 2012. Policy 28 of the East Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS8) sets out priorities for enhancing the region?s biodiversity including achievement of the East Midlands?s regional contribution to the UK BAP targets.? Beverley Rhodes? report from a Fungal Foray which, amongst other things, discovered a rare fungus ?Date Waxcap (Hygrocybe spadicea) a National Biodiversity Species of importance?. What Ecological Appraisal has EBC carried out for Stone
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Richard Jenkins	Response-00264	y Clouds Derbyshire? What steps is EBC taking in respect of European Protected Species? and What are EBC?s specific plans to ensure that its Strengthened Biodiversity duty (Environment Act 2021) is fulfilled?
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Richard Marriott	Response-00675	Wildlife / Biodiversity Wildlife/ Bio diversity The site of approximately 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney clouds nature reserve will impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with a loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Richard Naylor	Response-00066	This is a green area and you're destroying it. Not that you'll care about that! You don't care about anything.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Richard Shrimpton	Response-01301	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Rob Lowe	Response-01768	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Roger Farnsworth	Response-01910	Even less habitat for our fast declining wildlife.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Rosemarie Gough	Response-00997	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Roy Drew	Response-01614	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Ruby Sharp	Response-00886	I have lived in Coronation Avenue for all my life . We have a dog and I access Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve everyday to exercise him. He loves it on there but the housing development will destroy it. I am sitting in my garden now and can hear multiple birds. I regularly see hedgehogs and foxes. Animals will not want to make Sandiacre their home if they are being poisoned by pollution. Stoney Clouds is a wonderful asset to the area and people not just from Sandiacre use it. It is great to witness the change of the seasons with blossom, bluebells and all the other wild flowers. I have seen families of ducks crossing the roads in Sandiacre, especially Kings Road, but they will be in danger doing this with the added traffic that will be present around all of Sandiacre. Seeing wildlife like this while walking really helps my mental health on a bad day and I dread to think what happens if they all relocate elsewhere to greener areas.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Ryan Selby	Response-00479	It?s a given that the wildlife will be effected as would be building next to a nature reserve and grass land, will negatively effect the local wildlife tremendously
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	S. Brailsford	Response-00598	There are bird species that are at risk which have chosen the undisturbed area as their home such as falcons. Many British birds frequent this site such as woodpeckers & buzzards Many bat species are also present here and can be listened to with a detector Various other wildlife inhabitants in this area and as such should not be disturbed. This area and surrounding Stapleford is already massively built up and wildlife needs these pockets of land
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	S. Jones	Response-01615	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Sally Davies	Response-01294	The loss of the woodland would cause many problems. Building on this area will affect the wildlife and limit our access to countryside.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Samantha Anne Whitney	Response-00757	Stoney Clouds has been there since before Sandiacre was a village. There are many animals and plants that call it home. Foxes, barn owls, many species of birds, bats and many small mammals live there. Part of Stoney Clouds was built on years ago and their home is getting smaller and smaller. Where do you propose they all live? It's a thriving nature reserve and should stay that way. It's too special to be build on.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Samantha Whildes	Response-01270	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Sam Buckland	Response-00600	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. I have seen bats there in the summer months in the early evening. I've also regularly see two Buzzards on the site.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Sam Fleck	Response-00821	Wildlife: I wish to object to the proposed development on the grounds of its likely harmful impact on biodiversity. The site lies directly adjacent to a designated nature reserve, and currently consists of pasture land containing a significant number of mature trees. This area provides valuable habitat for wildlife and contributes to the wider ecological network of the locality. It is likely used for foraging, nesting, and movement by a variety of species, some potentially protected. The development would result in the loss of much of this green space, and I expect that a significant number of mature trees would need to be removed to enable access and construction. This would not only disrupt existing ecosystems but also reduce habitat connectivity, threatening local biodiversity. It is well-established that mature trees are irreplaceable in terms of the ecological value they offer. The loss of pasture land and tree cover will also place additional pressure on the adjacent nature reserve, potentially disturbing sensitive species and undermining conservation efforts in that area. This proposal directly conflicts with Paragraph 180 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which states that planning decisions should ensure that developments do not result in significant harm to biodiversity and that opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be integrated as part of their design.? It also runs counter to Paragraph 179, which requires planning authorities to protect and enhance sites of biodiversity value and promote the preservation, restoration, and re-creation of priority habitats. Furthermore, the removal of mature trees could breach Paragraph 131, which states that trees should be retained wherever possible, especially where they make a significant contribution to the character and quality of urban environments. Given the proximity to a nature reserve, the loss of pasture and mature trees, and the lack of clarity on biodiversity net gain, I strongly object to this application. The environmental cost of this development would be high and irreversible, with long-term impacts on wildlife and the natural landscape. I urge the planning authority to refuse the application on ecological grounds and seek alternatives that respect and enhance the biodiversity of this important green space.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Sam Greatorex	Response-01695	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Sandra Cooke	Response-01613	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Sarah Harrison	Response-01658	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	S Bryne	Response-01677	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Sebastian Roberts	Response-01675	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Shanead Ligton	Response-01689	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Shannon moss	Response-00454	This development poses a direct threat to the adjacent Stoney Clouds nature reserve, which serves as a crucial habitat for local wildlife. Increased pollution, noise, and human encroachment will disrupt ecosystems and drive away native species. Additionally, the destruction of existing tree lines will further degrade air quality and biodiversity, contradicting the UK's commitment to conservation and carbon reduction.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Shannon Robinson	Response-01635	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Sharon Grant	Response-00219	There is much wildlife up near larch drive. i have identified 26 different types of birds: including some rare ones; Linnet, Willow Tit, Sandpiper, Treecreeper. We also have Buzzards. We have owls, badgers and foxes. I have newts in my pond also.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	sharon thornhill	Response-00448	wildlife on our beautiful nature reserve parallel to the site is definitely going to suffer both with more buildings and with the general upheaval and noise etc whilst building work goes on
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Sharon weston	Response-00440	😔😔 a nature reserve on our door step,foxes,bats,birds,hares,adders,it will effect all there habitat absolutely shocking,don't shit on our door step when you wouldn't have it on yours
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Shaun Green	Response-01773	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Sheila	Response-00587	The proposed site currently supports local wildlife and forms part of a continuous green corridor. Development would destroy this habitat, negatively impacting local biodiversity. Alternative brownfield sites exist and should be prioritised in line with national and local planning guidance. Stoney Clouds is a Nature reserve and it would be shameful to build on it for future generations when alternatives exist.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Sheila Payne	Response-01782	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Sian Knox	Response-01679	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Simon Chambers	Response-00668	This area should not be built on due to the wildlife in the area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	S Leek	Response-01737	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Sonny Bestwick	Response-00901	Stoney clouds is one of the few green spaces left in sandiacre that actually feels natural squeezing houses in and around this site will come to the detriment of all locals who chose the location to relax walk dogs and get back into nature. wildlife WILL be disrupted and diminished by the proposed construction as the area is home to several species of local wildlife such as badgers, rabbits, foxes, moles etc. Along with countless birds and fruit bats that would all have their habitats greatly impacted by the proposed construction!
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Sonya Birkin	Response-01656	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Sophie	Response-00472	This is a local nature spot with an avid and thriving wildlife. This would be devastating to them.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Sophie Bennett	Response-01631	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Sophie Farnsworth	Response-01913	Even less habitat for our fast declining wildlife.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Stephen Davies	Response-00214	Area to rear of Larch Drive currently supports snakes, foxes, badgers and abundant bird life. I understood any development had to increase not worsen biodiversity. The site lies adjacent to a designated nature reserve and contains a significant number of mature trees. The development would result in the loss of both green space and trees and place additional pressure on the adjacent nature reserve. This conflicts with paragraph 180 which states that planning decisions should ensure that developments do not result in significant harm to biodiversity. Paragraph 179 requires planning authorities to protect and enhance sites of biodiversity value. Paragraph 131 further states that trees should be retained wherever possible. Given the proximity to the nature reserve the environmental cost of the proposed development would be high and irreversible
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Stephen Sacker	Response-01598	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Steve Bilbie	Response-00285	This development will directly affect the nature reserve driving out long established species. Wild life will be driven out by this development which has matured over many years.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Steven Wiseman	Response-00452	As an avid bird watcher I find the proposed planning area concerning as many different species of birds could be put at risk as nesting sites would be disrupted
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Steve Whittaker	Response-01781	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Stuart Pensom	Response-00049	Nature area are going to be affected and may have long lasting damage
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Sue Harrison	Response-01629	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Susan Heinke	Response-00468	There isn't enough green space in Sandiacre anymore and there certainly isn't the justification to eradicate even more
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Susanne Beaven	Response-01618	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Sylvia Plampin	Response-00624	So much wildlife around cloudside road/stoney clouds nature reserve and although the proposal is not to build on the nature reserve, wildlife doesn't recognise the boundary of the nature reserve, venturing across the open fields.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Tamara Partridge	Response-01780	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Tara Marshall	Response-01890	
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Tarnya Hinman	Response-01786	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Thomas Ilett	Response-01088	The wildlife that currently utilises the area will be eradicated forever should this go ahead. Once gone, this can never be retrieved. Building on this site will also affect nature in adjacent and wider areas. I have highlighted the increased flooding risk, which also affects the wildlife and biodiversity of the area and adjacent areas. In short, building here will significant impact the wildlife and biodiversity of the area and that of the local area, including the adjacent nature reserve.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Tim Derbyshire	Response-01681	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Tim Gough	Response-00996	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Tim Nichols	Response-00504	Building on land that provides a buffer for wildlife between motorway and housing
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Tina McInerney	Response-00954	We need to keep some green spaces
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Toby Moran	Response-01769	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Tom Ball	Response-01672	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Tony Price	Response-00977	This is a beautiful part of our countryside, I think building on here would devastate the biodiversity in the area.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Tony Weston	Response-00990	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Tracey Howe	Response-01860	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Tracey Hughes	Response-01699	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Trevor Rowston	Response-01678	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Try church	Response-00033	Currently on the land and surrounding it there are Owls, bats, returning birds on a yearly basis. There are also at least 2 pairs of snakes on the land itself, not the nature reserve and due to the land flooding as it is on a clay seam, there have been 2 instances of newts witnessed. Bats are around the stable area. A vast number of bird species have also been encouraged and have taken part in the national bird counts.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Tyler Hobbs	Response-00879	Building on the greenbelt in Sandiacre would have a profoundly negative impact on the nearby Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve, threatening its delicate ecosystems and the rich biodiversity it supports. The greenbelt acts as a vital buffer zone that protects the reserve from urban sprawl, pollution, and noise, and its removal would fragment natural habitats essential for local wildlife. Species that rely on continuous green corridors?such as birds, bats, and small mammals?would face habitat loss, disruption of breeding grounds, and increased human disturbance. Additionally, construction would lead to soil erosion, water runoff, and light and sound pollution, all of which can degrade the reserve's ecological integrity. Protecting the greenbelt is crucial not just for the survival of individual species, but for maintaining the interconnected web of life that defines the biodiversity of Stoney Clouds.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Vanessa Asbach	Response-00700	Taking more away from wildlife is a terrible idea. We must protect nature and the creatures that live in it.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Verity Lamb	Response-01298	This green belt also happens to be a site of wildlife and scientific interest. The disturbance of this development can only be detrimental
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Vickie Wright	Response-01552	The nature reserve is a critical habitat for local wildlife and biodiversity. Building on it will destroy green space that supports native species, some of which may be protected or endangered. Once lost the ecosystem cannot be replaced.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Victoria Abraham	Response-01652	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Victoria Galpin-shrimpton	Response-01009	Wildlife ? This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Victoria Greatorex	Response-01730	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Victoria Marriott	Response-00674	Wildlife/ Bio diversity The site of approximately 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney clouds nature reserve will impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with a loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Vivien Davis	Response-01582	This site of approx. 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all of our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney Clouds Nature Reserve would impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with loss of habitat.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Wayne Major	Response-00408	I wish to object to the proposed development on the grounds of its likely harmful impact on biodiversity. The site is only accessible via Stoney Cloud Nature Reserve, which is a legally designated Local Nature Reserve (LNR). This makes the proposal fundamentally unsound due to the unacceptable environmental harm it would cause and the lack of alternative access. The map from Erewash Map on EBC website, confirms that the access route lies within the boundary of the designated Local Nature Reserve. This further demonstrates that any development relying on this route would be incompatible with national planning policy (NPPF Paragraphs 179/182) and the Council's duty under the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949 to safeguard designated nature sites. The site lies directly adjacent to a designated nature reserve, and currently consists of pasture land containing a significant number of mature trees. This area provides valuable habitat for wildlife and contributes to the wider ecological network of the locality. It is likely used for foraging, nesting, and movement by a variety of species, some potentially protected. The development would result in the loss of much of this green space, and I expect that a significant number of mature trees would need to be removed to enable access and construction. This would not only disrupt existing ecosystems but also reduce habitat connectivity, threatening local biodiversity. It is well-established that mature trees are irreplaceable in terms of the ecological value they offer. The loss of pasture land and tree cover will also place additional pressure on the adjacent nature reserve, potentially disturbing sensitive species and undermining conservation efforts in that area. This proposal directly conflicts with Paragraph 180 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which states that planning decisions should ensure that developments do not result in significant harm to biodiversity and that 'opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be integrated as part of their design.' It also runs counter to Paragraph 179, which requires planning authorities to protect and enhance sites of biodiversity value and promote the preservation, restoration, and re-creation of priority habitats. Furthermore, the removal of mature trees could breach Paragraph 131, which states that trees should be retained wherever possible, especially where they make a significant contribution to the character and quality of urban environments. Given the proximity to a nature reserve, the loss of pasture and mature trees, and the lack of clarity on biodiversity net gain, I strongly object to this application. The environmental cost of this development would be high and irreversible, with long-term impacts on wildlife and the natural landscape. I urge the planning authority to refuse the application on ecological grounds and seek alternatives that respect and enhance the biodiversity of this important green space.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	William Marriott	Response-00676	Wildlife / Biodiversity Wildlife/ Bio diversity The site of approximately 13 acres has a diverse habitat for all our native species, flora and fauna. Its close proximity to Stoney clouds nature reserve will impact dramatically on all wildlife many of which are already struggling with a loss of habitat.
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Zack Snowdon	Response-00764	It's being built over a pasture with wildlife living in it and will damage nature. It will also displace the cycle of nature and remove a peaceful area which helps me feel calm
1.7	West of Sandiacre	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Zoe Hughes	Response-01919	Habitats destroyed & also impacted upon by more pollution.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Adam Millward	Response-00418	Currently people walk the trail to get away from homes and roads and seek better air quality. Building more housing and roads near this literally undo all the effort and money spent into making this trail / old railway line attractive again.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Andrew David Williams	Response-00796	Increased traffic will further degrade the air quality especially with increased traffic queuing at Croft lane and through Breadsall village. As more children now walk to school along Brookside road the increased levels of pollution is not acceptable or conducive to improved health.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Andy Madeley	Response-00381	Will be impacted by additional traffic, but also building work. You also need to consider the numerous developments being proposed around oakwood, and the fact that this building work will have on residents.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Angela Clarke	Response-01400	A worsening of air quality in particular with increased traffic and construction work
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Angela Smyth	Response-00296	Increased housing means increased air pollution due to cars and construction.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Ann Sherlock	Response-00410	The map used is out of date and there is a lack of green space and air quality associated already, due to the Alport Heights estate and Durose estate (both estates and established roads connected to them are conveniently missing off the map used, and perhaps intentionally misleading). Adding the current proposal will be extremely detrimental to the air quality, and it is disappointing that the public have been intentionally lied to in relation to how the current proposal will affect the area.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Anya andrews	Response-00605	Air Quality is going to be further ruined and pollution increased causing affects to health.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Ben Martin	Response-00787	The proposed development will destroy greenbelt land and replace it with tarmac, concrete, brick and 160 houses worth of cars. How can this not have a severe impact on air quality?
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Bethan Eddy	Response-00976	Standing traffic will increase with the amount of traffic
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Beverly Jordan	Response-01330	Increase in traffic and congestion will lead to increased air pollution
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Brendan Hargreaves	Response-00629	the air quality will be reduced, we are looking into air conditioning units for the roof of our property to reduce the pollution the same as the premises in the heathrow area due to the expansion there
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Carol Westcott	Response-00973	Moor traffic and standing traffic this site will cause will add to pollution, the trees and bushes that will be destroyed will add to the carbon dioxide levels



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Carys Whomsley	Response-01438	I am writing to register my strong objection to the above-mentioned planning application, both in its original and revised form. Despite the removal of the area adjacent to the A61 in the amended proposal, I believe that the proposed development remains deeply inappropriate and harmful for the following reasons: 1. Contravention of Policy CP18 and Loss of Green Wedge The proposed site lies just outside the designated Green Belt, but crucially directly abuts existing woodland and open countryside, forming part of the vital green corridor along the Great Northern Greenway. This area functions as a green buffer, enhancing ecological connectivity, supporting biodiversity, and providing visual and recreational amenity to local residents, walkers, and cyclists. Despite claims of woodland retention, the development threatens the integrity of this space. Proximity to new housing would increase human pressure on the natural environment, likely leading to degradation of woodland, fragmentation of habitats, and a reduction in wildlife corridors. No Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) assessment appears in the application documents, raising concerns about whether the legally mandated 10% net gain can or will be achieved. Biodiversity enhancements delivered off-site would do nothing to mitigate local ecological loss, thereby undermining environmental sustainability in the area. Moreover, the site lies adjacent to land recently released from the Green Belt and under consideration for housing allocation by Erewash Borough Council. The cumulative impact of developing both sites would be devastating: a continuous sprawl from Derby through to Breadsall, resulting in the elimination of the settlement gap and permanent damage to the character of the Great Northern Greenway. 2. Environmental, Infrastructural, and Policy Concerns The proposal directly contradicts the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Paragraph 143, particularly the goals of preventing urban sprawl and protecting the openness of Green Belt land. It also ignores the findings of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA 359), which previously deemed the site unsuitable for residential development due to accessibility and environmental limitations. The development is completely incompatible with the objectives of the Breadsall Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2019?2029, particularly the aims to: Preserve the rural character and prevent urbanisation; Avoid coalescence with the Derby conurbation; Safeguard wildlife and ecological features; Control flood risk and infrastructure strain; Protect valued green spaces and visual vistas.
1.6	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Carys Whomsley	Response-01438	Breadsall has already experienced increased flooding, attributed to upstream developments like Persimmon Estate and Breadsall Hilltop, which lie within the same water catchment area. Any additional development would worsen this issue, placing homes and infrastructure at risk. Furthermore, the proposal relies on access through two existing public footpaths within the Redrow estate and offers no concrete infrastructure improvements. The A608 is already over-congested, and no plans are presented to handle increased traffic or to safeguard children commuting to local schools. 3. Loss of Community and Ecological Value This land offers more than just open space?it is a much-loved and well-used amenity for the local community. It serves as a peaceful escape for informal recreation and nature engagement, and its visual and environmental contributions to the neighbourhood are significant. Its destruction would represent a major loss in local character and quality of life. The proposal underestimates the pressure on existing services, lacks detailed mitigation plans, and fails to explain how proposed footpaths will link meaningfully into existing routes. Nearby Local Wildlife Sites will be impacted
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Chris Lunn	Response-01410	Derby is an industrial city which cause high levels of local air pollution. Having hundreds of more cars will just exacerbate the problems. My two children both have asthma and I strongly believe the local pollution is a strong link as to why.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Clare Roters	Response-01553	More houses, more emmissions and less trees
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Colin Brewster	Response-00576	I have no supporting data, but the air quality must have significantly increased with the vast increase of traffic through Breadsall Village.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Darren adams	Response-00874	With the increase of traffic already going through the village during rush-hour, the air quality in my opinion has changed dramatically. Has there been an air monitoring station setup to see what the effects are.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Diane Bakhda	Response-01411	Please see my above comment
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Edward James Gregory	Response-00728	The area already suffers from traffic congestion, and safety issues due to speed and number of vehicles, so any increase will impact air quality
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Elaine hodgkinson	Response-00854	The increased traffic will undoubtedly reduce the air quality for the adjacent housing and walkers and cyclists using the greenway. t will badly increase the number of cars travelling through the residential area of Oakwood. t will badly increase the number of cars travelling through the residential area of Oakwood which will reduce the air quality significantly.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Emma Binns	Response-00843	Air quality must be effected by the extra cars and homes.
			Emma Daniels	Response-00346	Air quality is very poor at the moment with the amount of traffic
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Emma Hawkins	Response-00813	Adding a further 160 dwellings could potentially create 300 plus cars using a small road to pass through an existing small estate reducing the air quality further. Building on green belt will reduce the amount of open space which natuarly provides better air quality.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Gary Murfin	Response-00374	Again with all the new houses having approx two vehicles which is common nowadays air quality is bound to suffer
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Gaynor Pawley	Response-00627	It goes without saying air quality would suffer not only from the increase in traffic but because the roads are already gridlocked, standing traffic would exacerbate the situation.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Gillian Pearson	Response-00303	Unable to quantify as no information available but increasing volumes of traffic will have a deleterious effect on air quality on already very busy routes t through the village of Breadsall, used as a short cut from Hilltop to A61/A38.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Harry Mee	Response-00882	Draycott is a quiet and clean area, noise and air pollution would increase with 190 new homes.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Helen Walker	Response-00325	Our air quality have been greatly reduced when the additional houses were built and we do not have the green open spaces anymore this will only get worse with even more houses, more cars, less trees and less open green spaces
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Hulland. Bdverley	Response-00496	Definitely air quality will be not healthy with more traffuc

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Ian Lockwood	Response-01491	See comments re: Traffic Congestion and also more generally the increase in traffic on the A608 that is already congested at rush hour.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Jack Bointon	Response-00969	The air quality will be worse. More traffic will mean that the air will be severely worsened, making it an even worse place to live in. Health will be made worse because of this: especially with those with severe lung diseases.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Jake Moore	Response-01202	The anticipated rise in vehicle numbers ? potentially over 300 additional cars ? will contribute significantly to local air pollution. This is particularly concerning for: Children and vulnerable residents exposed to increased nitrogen dioxide (NO?) and particulate matter (PM2.5), especially along narrow, congested streets. Local schools and walking routes where increased emissions and idling vehicles will have a direct health impact. A broader environmental cost, as the proposed development would remove greenfield land that currently contributes to local air purification and biodiversity. At a time when local authorities are under pressure to improve air quality and reduce car dependency, this development appears to move in the opposite direction.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	James Bellaby	Response-00337	More vehicles, more air pollution,
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	James Roberts	Response-00673	Per the Traffic Congestion comments, a doubling of vehicles and increase in congestion will inevitably reduce air quality in the area, as demonstrated by any highly populated area in the UK. Also reducing the amount of green land surrounding the current housing estate and inevitably impacting the greenway and surrounding greenland is also going to reduce the air quality for the local area
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Jamie Branagan	Response-00335	Taking away the natural landscape to concrete over with 160 more houses and increased traffic will undoubtedly impact air quality.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Janet Brewster	Response-00577	Air quality appears to be considerably increased with the current growth in through traffic. This is made worse by stationary/crawling traffic at busy times.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Janette Booth	Response-00295	See traffic congestion
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Jessica Softley	Response-01408	The increase in road traffic travelling through the Durose Country Park estate, and queueing at the roundabout exit of the estate will negatively impact the air quality.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	John Harlow	Response-00619	Additional traffic will only add to the already poor air quality. This would impact on people who suffer from asthma and other chronic breathing attacks.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Julie Bates	Response-01326	The congestion is going to affect the air quality in this area if the planned amendment goes ahead. It?s already causing pollution with the amount of cars so having even more cars per house in this area is just going to put a terrible strain on the already terrible traffic congestion and air quality. I as a asthma sufferer means it will severely affect my breathing . I already got pneumonia from living so close to all the traffic it will definitely affect everyone living here . The removal of all the free green space which obviously helps in prevent air pollution will be destroyed this will be catastrophic to all the people living in this area
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Justine Dean	Response-00844	Increased congestion on an already busy road will make air quality in the existing area and the new houses worse.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Karen Read	Response-00923	the site currently sits as an area of openness between city of derby and the nearby village of breadsall i am concerned that this development will remove this separation with the city. Due to increased numbers air quality and noise pollution will increase dramatically can you please advise how this will be addressed within the currently proposed policy changes
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Karen Smith	Response-00635	The congestion this will produce will significantly impact on the health and well being of those already living nearby
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Kev Rodgers	Response-00897	Additional housing always brings with it additional vehicles, adding to the emission of exhaust gases, this will be particularly evident as traffic queues up Mansfield Road as vehicles return home.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Kimberley Woodward	Response-01445	More cars equals more emissions. We don?t want it. Also when the development would be constructed this would result in dirt and dust being released into the air and staining the white render on our house which happened in the Redrow estate construction phase.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Kirstin Woodward	Response-01043	As this is a main A road, Mansfield Road is frequently used by large vehicles and lorries. During the morning and evening rush hours, there is regular queueing traffic along the road. Air quality during these times is a significant concern, particularly as many children travel to school by bus or bicycle. They are directly exposed to emissions from idling and slow-moving vehicles, which raises health and environmental concerns.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	K Munson	Response-00631	Increased traffic especially when there are hold ups increased emissions
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Laura Louca	Response-01266	Goes without saying this will be significantly reduced. Concrete and bricks don?t help the environment or promote fresh air - trees and greenery do.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Lee Wheatley	Response-01492	1. Increased Vehicle Emissions: o As previously discussed, increased development will likely lead to a significant rise in the volume of vehicular traffic in and around Breadsall and Breadsall Hilltop. This inevitably means higher levels of harmful pollutants being emitted into the air, including Nitrogen Dioxide (NO2), Particulate Matter (PM2.5 and PM10), and Carbon Monoxide (CO). o The types of journeys associated with new development: commuting to Derby and other areas, school runs, local trips to shops and amenities, and potential increases in delivery vehicles. All contribute to increased emissions. 2. Impact of Traffic Congestion on Emissions: o Increased traffic congestion, a likely consequence of the proposed development, exacerbates air pollution. Idling vehicles and stop-start traffic produce higher levels of pollutants compared to vehicles moving at a steady speed. Areas within Breadsall and Breadsall Hilltop that are prone to congestion (e.g., near the school, main road junctions) will experience a disproportionate impact on air quality. 3. Proximity to Existing Pollution Sources: o While Derby's 2024 Air Quality report notes a general decrease in NO2, the potential for increased traffic from the proposed development in Breadsall and Breadsall Hilltop threatens to reverse this positive trend. The report itself anticipates increased vehicle trips from upcoming developments in Derby, and given the villages' proximity, this will likely worsen local air quality. Also, the lack of recent PM10 monitoring in Derby underscores the urgent need for a specific Air Quality Assessment for Breadsall and Breadsall Hilltop to fully understand and mitigate the impact of increased emissions on residents' health. 4. Impact on Sensitive Receptors: o Breadsall and Breadsall Hilltop contain sensitive receptors such as Breadsall Community Primary School, nurseries, care homes, and residential areas with young children and older people. Increased air pollution in these areas is a particular concern. 5. Lack of Air Quality Assessment: o The Core Strategy Review Amendment should be supported by a detailed Air Quality Assessment that specifically models the potential impact of increased development and traffic on air quality in Breadsall and Breadsall Hilltop. This assessment should consider existing air quality levels, projected increases in emissions, local topography, and prevailing weather conditions. The current proposals appear to lack this crucial analysis. 6. Mitigation Measures and Green Infrastructure: o The amendment should outline specific measures to mitigate the potential negative impacts on air quality. This could include promoting sustainable transport options, investing in electric vehicle charging infrastructure, incorporating green infrastructure (trees, hedges, green spaces) that can help absorb pollutants, and ensuring adequate ventilation in new developments. The current proposals lack sufficient detail on these aspects.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Linda Morris	Response-00867	More traffic - more pollution
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Lisa Stone	Response-01018	There already isn't any air quality, it's already just fumes on Mansfield road, add more cars and we all reduce even more in life expectancy. Mind you I'll kill us all younger from carbon monoxide poisoning and there won't be a need to build more houses in the first place
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Mandy Cooling	Response-00312	The air quality is already pretty poor with the traffic and removing more of the natural habitat will only make this worse
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Martin Harrison	Response-01395	I object to the proposed development due to its likely negative impact on local air quality. The area already experiences high traffic volumes, especially along the A38, Mansfield Road, and through Breadsall and Oakwood. Increased vehicle emissions from added traffic will worsen pollution levels, affecting the health and wellbeing of residents, particularly children and the elderly.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Masheda Chowdhury	Response-01339	1. Increased Vehicle Emissions from 160 New Homes: ? The development will lead to a substantial increase in vehicular traffic using Dale Acre Way, Hungerhill Crescent, and the A609 Hill Top. ? This will contribute to higher levels of air pollutants such as NO? (nitrogen dioxide) and particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5), especially during peak travel times. 2. Proximity to Existing Residential Areas and Schools: ? Existing residents in Oakwood, Breadsall, and surrounding streets will be directly exposed to worsened air quality, especially children walking to school and vulnerable groups (e.g., elderly or those with asthma or respiratory illnesses). ? There is no mitigation strategy included in the policy overview to manage the inevitable rise in vehicle-generated air pollution. 3. Contradiction with Public Health and Climate Goals: ? Derbyshire County Council and Derby City Council have made public commitments to improving public health and reducing carbon emissions. ? Approving this development without a thorough air quality impact assessment runs contrary to those commitments and may result in long-term public health implications. 4. Threat to Local Ecology from Deteriorated Air Quality: ? The site is directly adjacent to the Great Northern Greenway and Local Wildlife Site ER 005, a sensitive ecological corridor. ? Increased pollution, including fine particulates and vehicle-derived pollutants, will harm local flora and fauna and degrade air quality along this important green space. 5. No Published Air Quality Assessment: ? There appears to be no public Air Quality Impact Assessment included with the proposal. ? Without this, it's impossible to gauge how air pollution will affect both local residents and environmental assets, and therefore the development should not proceed. 6. Cumulative Impact of Safeguarded Land: ? The policy mentions a safeguarded area of 14.6 hectares for potential future development. ? The cumulative air quality impact from both the proposed 160 homes and any future expansion has not been assessed, potentially leading to long-term air quality degradation in a currently semi-rural buffer zone.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Michael Albinson	Response-00790	Increase in fumes, road usage and dust will heavily impact residents and what's left of habitats
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Michael Grignon	Response-01335	In an area which is supposed to be green belt, air quality should be an priority, adding more housing and more cars will add quality to our already polluted air
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Michael Poplar	Response-00565	Increased traffic, particularly where congestion causes stop start queuing obviously has an impact on air quality. The reduction of green "lungs" also has an impact.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Mollie	Response-01549	The proposed development will significantly worsen local air quality due to increased traffic and the loss of open green space. Breadsall Hill Top and surrounding routes already suffer from vehicle-related pollution, and additional car movements from hundreds of new homes will increase harmful emissions, including NO? and particulate matter. This poses particular health risks to children, the elderly, and those with respiratory conditions. At a time when councils are encouraged to improve air quality and reduce carbon emissions, approving this development would move Erewash in the wrong direction.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Monique Johnson	Response-00663	With increased traffic coming from the new development pollution will increase substantially. This is obviously bad for everyone's health.
			Mrs. Dorothy Monkhouse.	Response-01371	More traffic will bring more pollution. This proposal involves the felling of trees that make a significant contribution to air quality.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Mrs Francoise Poplar	Response-00602	Increased traffic, irregular flow and congestion obviously has a detrimental effect on air quality.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Mr SJ Read and Mrs S E Read	Response-01225	Air quality would obviously be adversely affected by the additional traffic generated by the proposed new development. This applies particularly to additional traffic passing through Breadsall village as referred to under "Traffic Congestion"
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Mr Softley	Response-00344	Less green space and more houses on top of one another, air quality is a concern, especially with the added traffic to the nearby busy stretch. Lots of cars idling, again, doesn't seem to have been thought about. Why are these developments by Erewash council not in Erewash? Completely disregards the green buffer zone in other areas!
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Mrs Sarah Morley	Response-01515	The extreme volume of traffic is already horrendous, the pollution to the air will become significantly worse with 160 homes adding to this. Most houses have a minimum of one car, normally more
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Nathan Latymer	Response-00361	The traffic in this area is awful as it is, with no need for it to be made any worse by adding loads of houses.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Nicholas Lloyd	Response-00356	I object to this planning application on the grounds that the proposed development will lead to a significant increase in traffic on Acorn Way, a route already experiencing high congestion. This surge in vehicular activity is likely to elevate levels of nitrogen dioxide (NO <sub>2</sub> ) and particulate matter (PM), both of which are harmful to respiratory health and contribute to cardiovascular diseases. The World Health Organization has emphasized that no level of exposure to these pollutants is considered safe, and the UK's own guidelines still permit concentrations above these recommendations in some areas. Furthermore, the Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs has noted that poor air quality is linked to approximately 28,000 to 36,000 deaths annually in the UK. Given that Acorn Way is in proximity to residential areas and schools, the development's impact on air quality could adversely affect the health and well-being of local residents, particularly vulnerable groups such as children and the elderly. Therefore, I urge the planning authority to consider these health implications and reject the application to prevent further deterioration of air quality in an already burdened area.?
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Oakwood Ward Councillors Eyre, Mulhall and Trehwella	Response-01359	With increased Traffic Congestion will naturally come increased Air Pollution and a lessened Air Quality, what is currently a quite estate will become a thoroughfare to a hugely expanded estate, bringing additional vehicles and additional pollution.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Paige Skivington	Response-00366	For the people living nearby, me being one of them will be subjected to so much building work and noise and poor air quality whilst the building work goes on.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Pamela Walker	Response-00649	Increased traffic and pollution
			Philip Booth	Response-00683	The volume of traffic in this area is often crawling creating poor air quality, this would only get worse.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Prathap Paulson Junjuri	Response-01393	Yes air quality for residents and children
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Rachael	Response-00332	During the building phase of the Redrow estate air quality was poor and sediment was constantly on our homes and vehicles, this will further increase due to the proposed builds. Our children, animals and ourselves deserve some clean green space.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Richard Johnson	Response-00697	Increasing traffic will bring with it an increase in air pollution.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Richard Kingham	Response-00849	Air pollution has worsened at peak times to to so many vehicles idling.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Richard Stone	Response-01029	Adding potentially 300 cars to this while destroying grass and wood land it clearly going to make the air quality worse.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Richard Straw	Response-01412	The quality of air will greatly decrease
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Roy Ling	Response-01243	Air quality particularly at peak times is concerning an increase in traffic would make this much worse.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Ruth Duxbury	Response-00301	Allocating green belt to housing will increase traffic and cause greater pollution in the area. Tress and plants are removed and no new trees are planted to offset the increase in pollution. As traffic is already heavy in the area this will cause further air pollution.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Sally	Response-00873	Extra pollution
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Samantha Watts	Response-00869	The air quality in Breadsall Village is already under strain due to high traffic volumes, particularly along Croft Lane and the A61. Increased congestion from additional housing will further contribute to pollution levels, exacerbating health risks for residents. Vehicle emissions, particularly nitrogen dioxide (NO <sub>2</sub> ) and particulate matter (PM), are known to have serious health impacts, including respiratory issues and cardiovascular diseases. With Breadsall Village frequently used as a cut-through route, the rise in traffic will intensify exposure to these pollutants, reducing air quality and harming public health.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Sam Saunders	Response-01557	The proposed development at North of Breadsall Hilltop presents serious concerns regarding air quality, both during the construction phase and once the new homes are occupied. During construction, activities such as excavation, earth moving, and the use of heavy machinery are likely to generate significant dust and particulate matter. This dust can have detrimental effects on local residents' respiratory health, especially for vulnerable groups such as children, the elderly, and those with pre-existing conditions like asthma. Without strict mitigation measures and effective dust control strategies, the construction phase could lead to unacceptable levels of air pollution in the immediate area. After the development is completed, the increase in traffic volumes resulting from 160 additional homes will likely lead to elevated emissions of nitrogen dioxide (NO2), particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5), and other pollutants associated with vehicle exhaust. Hungerhill Close, along with Dale Acre Way and the nearby A609 Hill Top, are residential roads where such pollution could negatively impact local air quality. The rise in traffic could exacerbate existing air pollution levels, creating long-term health risks for residents. Increased pollution exposure is linked to respiratory and cardiovascular problems, and it may particularly affect children walking to school or playing outdoors in the neighbourhood. Given the proximity to local schools and green spaces, protecting air quality should be a priority. The development proposal lacks clear plans for monitoring and mitigating air pollution impacts. Without adequate controls, both the construction and operational phases of the development could significantly diminish the quality of life for current and future residents. Therefore, concerns about air quality must be addressed thoroughly before the development proceeds.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Sandra Perry	Response-00307	More cars = worse air quality
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Scarlett Hamblin	Response-00398	Climate change is already in effect. By adding more properties and vehicles this will decrease the air quality which will have a knock on effect to wildlife.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Scott Watson	Response-01284	Air quality in Breadsall Village is already under pressure due to heavy traffic, especially along Croft Lane and the A61. Increased congestion from further residential development will inevitably add to pollution levels, worsening health risks for the community. Vehicle emissions, particularly nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and particulate matter (PM), are well-documented contributors to respiratory and cardiovascular conditions. As Breadsall Village continues to serve as a busy cut-through route, rising traffic volumes will further elevate exposure to these harmful pollutants, diminishing air quality and threatening public health.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Sharon Coward	Response-00348	Increased traffic will impact the air quality.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	simon morris	Response-00866	More traffic more pollution
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Stephen and Janet Allis	Response-01221	pollution from a61 is bad enough
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Stuart Brown	Response-00771	Increased traffic using dale acre way will have an impact on the air quality of the area if it is used as a through road for all traffic. Exhaust fumes and dust from cars and construction vehicles will have direct impact on the current residents
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Susan Dundon	Response-00396	It will affect pollution
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Thomas Monkhouse.	Response-01318	The number of new houses proposed will create a considerable increase in traffic congestion and pollution. The proposals also appear to involve the felling of trees that make a significant contribution to air quality.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Tom Parker	Response-01398	During the building phase of this current development air quality was very poor and sediment was constantly on our homes and vehicles. This will get far worse with the proposed building potentially inflicting harm to our children with poor air quality.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Tony Hawkins	Response-01532	Adding a further 160 dwellings could potentially create 300 plus cars using a small road to pass through an existing small estate reducing the air quality further. Building on green belt will reduce the amount of open space which naturally provides better air quality.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Air Quality	Tracey Turner	Response-00334	Increased traffic = increased pollution The green areas around the site should be maintained for this reason.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Bus Services	Adam Millward	Response-00418	Plenty of bus services, but come on, no body that affords to live in these areas will use public transport much. They will still drive to work in their electric car.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Bus Services	Angela Smyth	Response-00296	There is only one bus service running in that area. It's already busy.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Bus Services	Ann Sherlock	Response-00410	Bus services will undoubtedly be negatively impacted due to the increase in traffic volume
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Bus Services	Beverly Jordan	Response-01330	Additional bus services needed will increase traffic congestion pollution
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Bus Services	Brendan Hargreaves	Response-00629	there wont be available spaces on the buses with a new housing estate, its bad enough already at certian times
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Bus Services	Carol Westcott	Response-00973	Bus services will be interrupted by traffic queues which will impact on people getting to their destination on time

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Bus Services	Carys Whomsley	Response-01438	I am writing to register my strong objection to the above-mentioned planning application, both in its original and revised form. Despite the removal of the area adjacent to the A61 in the amended proposal, I believe that the proposed development remains deeply inappropriate and harmful for the following reasons: 1. Contravention of Policy CP18 and Loss of Green Wedge The proposed site lies just outside the designated Green Belt, but crucially directly abuts existing woodland and open countryside, forming part of the vital green corridor along the Great Northern Greenway. This area functions as a green buffer, enhancing ecological connectivity, supporting biodiversity, and providing visual and recreational amenity to local residents, walkers, and cyclists. Despite claims of woodland retention, the development threatens the integrity of this space. Proximity to new housing would increase human pressure on the natural environment, likely leading to degradation of woodland, fragmentation of habitats, and a reduction in wildlife corridors. No Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) assessment appears in the application documents, raising concerns about whether the legally mandated 10% net gain can or will be achieved. Biodiversity enhancements delivered off-site would do nothing to mitigate local ecological loss, thereby undermining environmental sustainability in the area. Moreover, the site lies adjacent to land recently released from the Green Belt and under consideration for housing allocation by Erewash Borough Council. The cumulative impact of developing both sites would be devastating: a continuous sprawl from Derby through to Breadsall, resulting in the elimination of the settlement gap and permanent damage to the character of the Great Northern Greenway. 2. Environmental, Infrastructural, and Policy Concerns The proposal directly contradicts the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Paragraph 143, particularly the goals of preventing urban sprawl and protecting the openness of Green Belt land. It also ignores the findings of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA 359), which previously deemed the site unsuitable for residential development due to accessibility and environmental limitations. The development is completely incompatible with the objectives of the Breadsall Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2019?2029, particularly the aims to: Preserve the rural character and prevent urbanisation; Avoid coalescence with the Derby conurbation; Safeguard wildlife and ecological features; Control flood risk and infrastructure strain; Protect valued green spaces and visual vistas.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Bus Services	Carys Whomsley	Response-01438	Breadsall has already experienced increased flooding, attributed to upstream developments like Persimmon Estate and Breadsall Hilltop, which lie within the same water catchment area. Any additional development would worsen this issue, placing homes and infrastructure at risk. Furthermore, the proposal relies on access through two existing public footpaths within the Redrow estate and offers no concrete infrastructure improvements. The A608 is already over-congested, and no plans are presented to handle increased traffic or to safeguard children commuting to local schools. 3. Loss of Community and Ecological Value This land offers more than just open space?it is a much-loved and well-used amenity for the local community. It serves as a peaceful escape for informal recreation and nature engagement, and its visual and environmental contributions to the neighbourhood are significant. Its destruction would represent a major loss in local character and quality of life. The proposal underestimates the pressure on existing services, lacks detailed mitigation plans, and fails to explain how proposed footpaths will link meaningfully into existing routes. Nearby Local Wildlife Sites will be impacted
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Bus Services	Chris Lunn	Response-01410	We have the H1 bus route which is so pointless, making it an unviable alternative to private car use, making it impractical for essential daily activities such as commuting to work or school, accessing healthcare and vital services, or traveling to other parts of Derby. Consequently, the proposed development would intensify reliance on cars, directly opposing Derby City Council?s objectives for sustainable travel, improved air quality, and carbon reduction.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Bus Services	Clare Roters	Response-01553	Services that go through Oakwood and chaddesden are already overcrowded and these pass through breadsall.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Bus Services	Edward James Gregory	Response-00728	Limited buses and danger for cycling on fast roads, will only encourage individual car journeys
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Bus Services	Emma Hawkins	Response-00813	Buses pass close by although not reliable.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Bus Services	Gary Murfin	Response-00374	There will have to be plans in place to have new bus routes in the area also increasing traffic in the area and pollution
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Bus Services	Gemma Cotter	Response-01374	The H1 offers a frequent service limited to accessing Derby at the Council House or northwards to Heanor. Services beyond Heanor are more limited. It does not connect at the bus station and is remote from the train station. Public travel connections around Derby are time-consuming and expensive pushing car use as the most practical option for most destinations, especially for multiple-person journeys. This poor provision will increase the number of car journeys.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Bus Services	Gillian Pearson	Response-00303	The bus services are so infrequent as to be of no practical use to most people.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Bus Services	Helen Walker	Response-00325	I use the H1 when I don?t want to take my car into town so this is going to get busier than it already is with additional houses around
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Bus Services	Hulland. Bdverley	Response-00496	Will spoil estate if put buses through here
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Bus Services	Jake Moore	Response-01202	While the H1 bus route technically serves the area, it is widely regarded by local residents as infrequent, unreliable, and poorly timed. It does not provide a realistic alternative to private car use, particularly for: Commuting to work or school, Accessing healthcare and essential services, or Connecting to other parts of Derby or the wider region. As such, the development would lead to greater car dependency, undermining Derby City Council?s goals for sustainable travel, air quality improvement, and carbon reduction.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Bus Services	James Roberts	Response-00673	The far end of the housing estate will be a reasonable walk for children or the elderly given the hill they'd have to climb to get to the A608 to the nearest bus stop, and Dale Acre Way & Hungerhill Close are unsuitable for a bus service to run through without causing significant congestion at peak times given the current parking situation on these roads
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Bus Services	Jamie Branagan	Response-00335	Adding 160 homes will clear add more strain in the current bus services offered. 160 homes equates to c350-500 people. Even if only a small percentage of these people use busses it's the services in and around Oakwood that will be put under strain NOT Erewash.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Bus Services	Janette Glenn	Response-00422	The site is only served by the H1 bus between Heanor and the city centre. Residents are therefore likely to add to pollution and congestion by using their cars.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Bus Services	Julie Bates	Response-01326	The pressure on the bus services are going to have a big impact on yet more properties in this area , let alone trying to get children to and from school . There?s bus service is already struggling at times with its demands !
			Karen Read	Response-00923	at present there is an adequate bus service will this alter due to increased demand
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Bus Services	Kirstin Woodward	Response-01043	This is a very populate bus route, with many people travelling to school, colleges and work. My son travels daily to college in the centre of Derby. Often, the buses are too full to board, and he has to wait up to 20 minutes for the next one. On several occasions, after two full buses passed without stopping, he and a group of other students had no choice but to order an Uber instead.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Bus Services	Laura Louca	Response-01266	As much as the council/government like to try and entice us to use public transport, for the most of us it is utterly impractical. No family with working parents can possibly get primary school aged children to school and get off to work on time using a bus service. They are only good if you don?t need to be somewhere at a specific time.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Bus Services	Lee Wheatley	Response-01492	? With the planned development, both the Arriva 22 and Trentbarton H1 routes would face increased demand, leading to overcrowding, especially during peak hours. The current capacity of these services will be insufficient to comfortably accommodate a significant influx of new residents. It is already difficult to get on these services at busy times and I?ve had to walk back from town on a number of occasions.
			Lisa Stone	Response-01018	More houses would make more buses needed to cover the footfall and again add to the already busy roads.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Bus Services	Lucy Lewis	Response-01459	Unsuitable for use of buses
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Bus Services	Mandy Cooling	Response-00312	There is a very good bus service (trent Barton H1) which could service such a development - although think the greater risk is around cars on the road rather than bus service
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Bus Services	Martin Harrison	Response-01395	I object to the proposed development due to its strain on already limited local bus services. Public transport in the area, particularly through Oakwood, Breadsall, and Mansfield Road, is infrequent and often overcrowded. Adding more residents without improving infrastructure will make commuting more difficult and reduce reliability for existing users.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Bus Services	Masheda Chowdhury	Response-01339	1. Inadequate Existing Public Transport Provision: ? The current public transport services in and around the Breadsall Hilltop and Oakwood area are limited in frequency and coverage, particularly outside peak times and at weekends. ? There is no guarantee that additional bus routes or services will be provided to meet the needs of 160 new households, which could result in increased car dependency. 2. No Firm Commitment to New or Improved Bus Services: ? The planning policy references no concrete proposals or guarantees to improve or expand bus services in conjunction with the development. ? Without binding agreements or developer contributions toward public transport, new residents are unlikely to have viable alternatives to driving. 3. Increased Car Use and Reduced Sustainability: ? Without enhanced bus services, the development is unlikely to support modal shift from private cars to public transport. ? This runs counter to Derbyshire County Council and national planning policy goals, which aim to reduce car use and support sustainable travel. 4. Walking Distance to Existing Bus Stops is a Barrier: ? The closest existing bus stops (if any) may be over the generally accepted 400-metre walking threshold ? particularly problematic for older residents, those with mobility issues, and families with young children. ? Lack of safe, well-lit, and continuous pedestrian links to these stops further reduces accessibility. 5. No Integrated Travel Plan: ? There is no mention of a Travel Plan that includes bus service coordination, subsidies, or infrastructure like real-time information at bus stops. ? Any new housing development should include a sustainable transport plan that integrates reliable public transport from day one ? not as a vague future possibility. 6. Cumulative Strain on Services: ? With additional housing earmarked for the safeguarded 14.6 hectares east of this site, the future pressure on already stretched bus services will only worsen unless comprehensive improvements are secured now.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Bus Services	Michael Grignon	Response-01335	The bus service in this area is already under strain due to the road traffic, adding more housing would only add more problems to already strained service
			Michael Poplar	Response-00565	Bus services, particularly through Breadsall village are not sufficient to act as a viable alternative to private transport.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Bus Services	Monique Johnson	Response-00663	We need more frequent buses in order to encourage people not to use their cars.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Bus Services	Mrs Francoise Poplar	Response-00602	There is essentially one bus route along the A608 linking Derby to towns/villages to the north of the city. No other directions of travel are catered for, so car traffic predominates.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Bus Services	Richard Johnson	Response-00697	Bus services are minimal and give no encouragement to minimize the use of a car as an alternative means of transport.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Bus Services	Richard Kingham	Response-00849	Luckily doesn't appear to be impacted to badly as H1 runs every 10-15 mins
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Bus Services	Richard Straw	Response-01412	There's ample bus routes already, we don't want more bus routes adding increasing traffic and higher crime rates

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Bus Services	Sam Saunders	Response-01557	The proposed development at North of Breadsall Hilltop also raises concerns regarding local public transport, particularly the adequacy of bus services to support the increased population. Currently, bus routes serving Hungerhill Close, Dale Acre Way, and surrounding areas provide limited frequency and coverage, with few direct connections to major employment, education, and healthcare hubs. This limited service reduces the attractiveness of public transport for residents, increasing reliance on private vehicles. With the addition of approximately 160 homes, there will be a significant rise in demand for local bus services. However, there is no clear commitment or plan within the development proposals to enhance or expand these services to meet future needs. Without improvements, the existing bus network is unlikely to cope with the increased passenger numbers, leading to overcrowding, reduced reliability, and longer waiting times. This may discourage sustainable travel and contribute to higher car usage, further exacerbating traffic congestion and air quality issues in the area. Moreover, poor accessibility to efficient public transport options limits the opportunities for low-income or car-free households to access essential services, employment, and education. This issue is particularly pressing given the development's affordable housing commitments. The absence of effective bus service provision risks isolating new residents and contradicts broader local and national goals for sustainable development and carbon reduction. To mitigate these concerns, any approval of the development should be contingent on a clear and funded plan to enhance bus service frequency, routes, and accessibility, ensuring that public transport is a viable alternative to private car use for future residents.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Bus Services	Stuart Brown	Response-00771	Will current bus services be extended down dale acre? The road is not currently suitable for this type of traffic
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Bus Services	Tom King	Response-00734	Reduced bus service is already busy and overused.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Abbie quinn	Response-00616	One purchasing our house we were told there couldn't be any building behind us due to it being a flood/ drainage area. This will impact on all houses around if built on.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Adam Millward	Response-00418	Again all trees will be cut down for attenuation ponds getting rid of all natural drainage and ground stability provided by the trees. Probably cause more mass flooding downhill into Breadsall village.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Adelle Cavanagh	Response-00392	The flooding that occurred in Breadsall in 2023 was exceptional, but was clearly exasperated by the Durose development and the fact that water is not being drained away as efficiently as prior to the building of the new homes
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Alexander lee	Response-01439	Breadsall already floods. Adding two developments on top of a hill above Breadsall, which will massively increase water run off, will certainly exacerbate the flooding issues
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Alex Cargill	Response-01834	*Water and potentially sewage overload
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Amber Hubbard	Response-00845	Increased development will increase the flooding risk/ severity/ frequency on Breadsall village without providing any solution or support. The people in existing houses will be disproportionately affected while the newcomers are unlikely to see much impact
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Andrea R Rowley	Response-01230	Flood Risk & Sewage - The proposed development will increase the water surface drainage coming down into the Breadsall Village. The village already suffers from flooding and the devastating effects on households when this occurs. The ancient culverts are not able to take the strain of excess water coming down Brookside Road hill now, let alone when an extra houses are added. above the village. Breadsall village will be directly downstream from this housing development. There is already a considerable constant water flow from the up hill fields of this area down on to Croft Lane Road and has been getting worse as more houses are added. This water flow is all year round not just in heavy rainfall times. The sewage pipes that run under the road are ancient and have little capacity to take an increase in volume. This fact was established a few years ago during Breadsall Village Flood Defences investigations and discussions.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Andrea wightman	Response-00354	Breadsall village is already prone to flooding, these properties will make the flooding worse
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Andrew David Williams	Response-00796	Breadsall village has seen increased flooding over the last few years mainly as a result of increased run off from developments at lime land and between the A609 and the greenway. Further development to the north of the A609 and south of the greenway will exacerbate this issue with increased run off and increased seepage through the land strata.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Andy Madeley	Response-00381	Oakwood is regularly flooding, building more houses will just worsen the problems
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Angela Clarke	Response-01400	Impact of increased local flooding to nearby village already know to flood.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Angela Smyth	Response-00296	Breadsall village is already subject to more flooding due to the building of Redrow and lime court estates. An additional housing estate would make this worse.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Ann Sherlock	Response-00410	The map used in this proposal is out of date. Adding the current proposal will be extremely detrimental to the drainage of the area. Breadsall village has flooded most years since the Durose estate has been built, and it is disappointing that the public have been intentionally lied to in relation to how the current proposal will affect the area, missing two extremely large housing estates and falsely portraying a smaller population and impact the housing proposal will have, especially on the local drainage and flooding issues.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	A O Smith	Response-01798	Existing developments at Breadsall Hilltop have adversely affected Brookside Road , the main unclassified road through Breadsall which takes the increased traffic, by flooding. Torrents of water have cascaded down the jitty bringing it with associated debris and blocking the road. The Victorian pipework and sewerage network that runs through the village is insufficient to handle increased load. Climate change increases this risk. There is no provision in the proposals to support the infrastructure needed , such as drainage systems.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Ashley syll	Response-00397	Draingae concerns building on farmland, needs assurance as prone to risk of flooding and drainage concerns. Water aspects to north and east of development and inbetween this and protected area



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Ben Martin	Response-00787	Breadsall village has seen a vast increase in flooding since the development of the Persimmon estate and Breadsall Hilltop which are situated within the water catchment area. Further urbanisation of the water catchment area will undoubtedly lead to an increase of flooding events within Breadsall Village.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Bethan Eddy	Response-00976	There are huge issues already with flooding in Breadsall Village, this will also increase the flow of water to the bottom of the hill in to the village
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Beverly Jordan	Response-01330	As a result of further removal of the landscape I feel this will result in the potential for flooding and drainage problems
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Brendan Hargreaves	Response-00629	the systems in place will not be able to cope unless they are seriously renewed or upgrdated
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Cameron Coope	Response-00369	Flooding in Breadsall is already a major problem following building works.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Carl Hill	Response-00670	Already existing flooding risks to Breadsall village and this will continue to creat further risks to the village and beyond
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Carol Westcott	Response-00973	As I understand the land being used does not have great drainage with field land being destroyed where will all the water go.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Carys Whomsley	Response-01438	I am writing to register my strong objection to the above-mentioned planning application, both in its original and revised form. Despite the removal of the area adjacent to the A61 in the amended proposal, I believe that the proposed development remains deeply inappropriate and harmful for the following reasons: 1. Contravention of Policy CP18 and Loss of Green Wedge The proposed site lies just outside the designated Green Belt, but crucially directly abuts existing woodland and open countryside, forming part of the vital green corridor along the Great Northern Greenway. This area functions as a green buffer, enhancing ecological connectivity, supporting biodiversity, and providing visual and recreational amenity to local residents, walkers, and cyclists. Despite claims of woodland retention, the development threatens the integrity of this space. Proximity to new housing would increase human pressure on the natural environment, likely leading to degradation of woodland, fragmentation of habitats, and a reduction in wildlife corridors. No Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) assessment appears in the application documents, raising concerns about whether the legally mandated 10% net gain can or will be achieved. Biodiversity enhancements delivered off-site would do nothing to mitigate local ecological loss, thereby undermining environmental sustainability in the area. Moreover, the site lies adjacent to land recently released from the Green Belt and under consideration for housing allocation by Erewash Borough Council. The cumulative impact of developing both sites would be devastating: a continuous sprawl from Derby through to Breadsall, resulting in the elimination of the settlement gap and permanent damage to the character of the Great Northern Greenway. 2. Environmental, Infrastructural, and Policy Concerns The proposal directly contradicts the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Paragraph 143, particularly the goals of preventing urban sprawl and protecting the openness of Green Belt land. It also ignores the findings of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA 359), which previously deemed the site unsuitable for residential development due to accessibility and environmental limitations. The development is completely incompatible with the objectives of the Breadsall Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2019?2029, particularly the aims to: Preserve the rural character and prevent urbanisation; Avoid coalescence with the Derby conurbation; Safeguard wildlife and ecological features; Control flood risk and infrastructure strain; Protect valued green spaces and visual vistas.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Carys Whomsley	Response-01438	Breadsall has already experienced increased flooding, attributed to upstream developments like Persimmon Estate and Breadsall Hilltop, which lie within the same water catchment area. Any additional development would worsen this issue, placing homes and infrastructure at risk. Furthermore, the proposal relies on access through two existing public footpaths within the Redrow estate and offers no concrete infrastructure improvements. The A608 is already over-congested, and no plans are presented to handle increased traffic or to safeguard children commuting to local schools. 3. Loss of Community and Ecological Value This land offers more than just open space?it is a much-loved and well-used amenity for the local community. It serves as a peaceful escape for informal recreation and nature engagement, and its visual and environmental contributions to the neighbourhood are significant. Its destruction would represent a major loss in local character and quality of life. The proposal underestimates the pressure on existing services, lacks detailed mitigation plans, and fails to explain how proposed footpaths will link meaningfully into existing routes. Nearby Local Wildlife Sites will be impacted
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Chris Beaumont	Response-00841	Breadsall will suffer yet again as a result of this development which will further increase the pressure on drainage within the village. I understand the village is served by 9 inch pipes which are 100 years old and this will add to the flooding overload. Discussions with all parties i.e the relevant councils and STW has expressed the concerns of villagers and parish councillors on this long running problem.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Chris Lunn	Response-01410	The topography of the proposed site has already been identified as unsuitable for development given the steep slope of the land. The drainage around the Windmill Place housing development is already prone to flooding and blockages and has had significant problems with inadequate or poor sewage systems installed. 160 additional houses, all requiring adequate water and sewage systems, will put an immense strain on an already struggling drainage system. The area is already prone to flooding and building on already waterlogged land and taking away the natural soakaway, is absolutely foolhardy. The increase in surface water is likely to flood not only the nearby areas of Oakwood and Breadsall but cause additional strain on all local drainage systems. Given the more and more frequent extreme weather events, flooding is only set to increase. Flooding increases the risk of additional health issues and damage caused to property.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Christopher Chambers	Response-00175	The Great Northern Greenway has seen water spill damage following the most recent developments in the adjacent areas, and the proposal is likely to exacerbate the drainage issues without substantial and potentially damaging (environmentally, aesthetically) works to the infrastructure necessary to support the application. Serious consideration and data collection / analysis needs to take place on the potential impacts of the removal of fauna and flora from the proposed development area (on the low-lying properties towards Breadsall village).

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Clare Roters	Response-01553	Drainage is already a problem, in homes on the durose estate and gardens. Many houses have struggled with blocked drains
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Colin Brewster	Response-00576	Breadsall Village is already suffering from the water which is being discharged from both the Persimmon and Durose attenuation systems. Both the attenuation ponds may discharge at an acceptable rate but neither points of discharge are connected directly or indirectly to a water course. This causes significant flooding and damage at several points in the village. This development simply cannot be allowed to do the same as Persimmon has done, and simply let the discharged water flow down to the village. During wet weather we suffer terrible flooding episodes and both EBC and DCC appear to completely ignore our awful predicament. I am really concerned that this development will simply make the situation worse
	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Dana Demidoff	Response-00634	Where is the drainage infrastructure
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	David Duxbury	Response-00305	The land in question already contributes to yearly flooding and uncontrolled run off onto church lane. Attenuation ponds will not solve this problem as observed in breadsall village and continuing problems with runoff water, which has been made worse by developments adjacent to the a608 in recent years
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Diane Bakhda	Response-01411	We have had the driest spring for at least 100 years and yet water is still flowing onto Croft Lane in Breadsall. We are assuming this is due to all the new building that has taken place without adequate provision for the loss of water being able to soak naturally into the ground. Is this development only going to add to the problem?
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Edward James Gregory	Response-00728	Area suffers from flooding and run-off onto the highways. There for further development will increase this and reduce safety
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Elaine hodgkinson	Response-00854	It must not increase flooding for Breadsall or drain much needed water from further up the hill.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Emma Binns	Response-00843	The village already has flooding issues because of fields and rough tracks being built on, the water has to go somewhere and will end up devastating properties in the village at the bottom of the hill.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Emma Hawkins	Response-00813	The land currently provides natural flood defences to the Village and Durose Estate as it has drainage ditch's running around the perimeter. If this land was built on the defences will be removed causing flooding to the Durose Estate and the Breadsall Village. The village suffers serious flooding and further building on this land will increase this further.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Gaynor Pawley	Response-00627	60 houses on such a small piece of land would put stress on the area for flooding of Breadsall village, who are already suffering the consequences of recent developments. The more houses built the less pervious land is left, therefore moving the natural rain water down to Breadsall village and the inadequate brook which has flooded on numerous occasions in recent years. Drainage and sewers in this area are already under major stress and more houses would only feed into this . This would become an area of high surface run off and have a knock on effect to Breadsall and surrounding areas.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Ged Doherty	Response-01822	Although the high levels of rainfall that we have had over the past couple of years were exceptional, climate changes seems to indicate that this will be a more regular occurrence, and the area simply couldn't cope with the water running off the higher ground, primarily due to the 2 developments on the A608 mentioned earlier. The northern area of the currently ?safeguarded? area has been segregated (under government grants) from cattle grazing land to provide a nature reserve and also an area to soak away some of the water to prevent flooding in Breadsall. Even if this area itself is not built upon, the burden it would face from even more development would simply overwhelm it, leaving Breadsall even more vulnerable to flooding.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Gemma Cotter	Response-01374	The heavy clay soils at the site waterlog each winter and after periods of sustained heavy rain which are predicted to increase due to climate change. The frequency of significant flooding downhill in Breadsall has been increasing in recent years since new developments at Durose and Allport Heights. This causes damage to homes in the valley, closes access through Breadsall and causes damage to amenities such as the Greenway. The density of these recent additions to the housing stock have little natural drainage through small gardens not conducive to beneficial measures like tree planting and healthy lawns, and paved frontages dedicated to maximising car parking. There is also the risk of an additional 150 homes being build behind Chaddesden Woods putting additional drainage issues upstream and along Lime Lane aggravating these issues.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Gillian Pearson	Response-00303	As residents of Breadsall Village whose property has been flooded or threatened with flooding many times in the last 10 years, we have found that Derbyshire County Council and Severn Trent Water plc are unwilling to accept responsibility for the already overburdened and inadequate drainage systems that these new properties would seek to join into. Until major infrastructure improvements are made mandatory for these new developments they should not be granted planning permission.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Harvey Pearson	Response-01307	Flooding is a main concern as this has increased and caused considerable problems in the village affecting householders since previous developments
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Helen Foster	Response-00650	Breadsall village already suffers from heavy flooding during periods of heavy rain. This proposal must be rejected, and alternative sites should be sought that do not put existing homes in such obvious and predictable danger. On page 2 of P&DG's Green Wedge Review, it states: 4. ?The Green Wedge provides vital flood storage and provides space to allow water to soak away naturally, reducing the need for engineered drainage? Paragraph 159 of the NPPF (Planning and flood risk) states that: Inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future). Where development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Helen Walker	Response-00325	Without the green belt area and trees there will be more flooding we have experienced flooding over the years in Oakwood and this will only get worse in a concrete jungle this is a known fact
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Hulland, Bdverley	Response-00496	Flooding and drainage is bound to impact homes

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Ian Lockwood	Response-01491	Breadsall village already experiences significant flooding during periods of heavy rainfall. Approving this proposal would place existing homes at further, entirely foreseeable risk with mitigations such as those in place at the recent Lime Lane development already proven to be inadequate. It must therefore be rejected in favour of alternative sites that do not carry such inherent danger. The importance of this area in mitigating flood risk is acknowledged in P&DG's Green Wedge Review (Page 2), which states: 'The Green Wedge provides vital flood storage and provides space to allow water to soak away naturally, reducing the need for engineered drainage.' Additionally, Paragraph 159 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), under Planning and Flood Risk, states: 'Inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future). Where development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere.' This proposal directly conflicts with both local and national policy guidance regarding flood risk and the responsible siting of development.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Jackie Lewis	Response-00955	Flooding is already an issue with the building of two housing developments so, even though these have had flooding prevention items in planning and some afterwards, the footpaths and roads now form a gully taking water into what is an at risk village. More housing and less green spaces/trees to absorb this is only going to flood the village more often.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Jake Moore	Response-01202	The proposed development of 160 homes raises significant concerns regarding flooding and drainage, particularly given Derby's ongoing struggles to manage flood risks in recent years. There is a clear potential for this development to exacerbate existing drainage issues and increase the risk of flooding for both the new residents and neighbouring areas, including Oakwood, Breadsall, and Darley Abbey. Increased Surface Water Runoff: The introduction of impermeable surfaces from 160 new homes, roads, and infrastructure would result in significantly more surface water runoff. This would overwhelm existing drainage systems, particularly during heavy rainfall. The increased runoff could lead to flooding not just on the development site, but also in nearby areas, as water would be redirected into already-stretched drainage networks. Strain on Existing Drainage Infrastructure: Derby has experienced significant flooding incidents in recent years, most notably in November 2019, when heavy rains caused widespread flooding in parts of the city. Areas such as Breadsall and Oakwood have been vulnerable to flooding in the past, and the proposed development would place additional pressure on the local drainage systems, which have struggled to cope with extreme weather events. Impact on Local Watercourses: The proposed site is near critical watercourses, including the River Derwent and Breadsall Brook, both of which play key roles in local drainage and flood risk management. Increased surface water runoff could overwhelm these watercourses, leading to higher water levels and potential flooding downstream, particularly in Breadsall and Darley Abbey. The resulting erosion and damage to local habitats could also harm the area's natural ecosystem. Cumulative Impact of Multiple Developments: The proposed development is part of a wider trend of urban expansion in Derby, with multiple housing projects in the pipeline. When combined, these developments will place unsustainable pressure on local drainage systems. This cumulative impact has not been adequately assessed, and the risk of flooding across a larger area?especially during extreme weather events?needs to be considered in the planning process. Legal and Planning Precedents: National and local planning policies require developers to ensure that new projects do not increase flood risk to surrounding communities. Under the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the development must demonstrate that it will not contribute to the worsening of local flooding issues. Given Derby's vulnerability to flooding, the proposal should be subject to rigorous flood risk assessments and mitigation plans to avoid exacerbating existing risks. Public Health Risks: Flooding brings significant public health risks, including the spread of waterborne diseases, contamination of water supplies, and the disruption of essential services like sewage and waste management. The potential for increased flooding in surrounding areas could undermine efforts to protect local public health, particularly in areas like Breadsall and Oakwood, which are already at risk. Cost of Future Flood Mitigation: As climate change brings more frequent and intense rainfall, the cost of maintaining and upgrading flood defences is likely to increase. The proposed development could place further strain on local government resources, potentially diverting funds from other critical infrastructure projects or flood prevention measures, leaving existing communities at even greater risk. Floodplain Considerations: Even if the development is not directly situated in a designated floodplain, it is in close proximity to flood-prone areas. The construction of impermeable surfaces could increase runoff into nearby watercourses, raising water levels and increasing the likelihood of flooding in the surrounding areas. This disruption to the natural water flow could have long-term consequences for both the local environment and the safety of nearby residents. In conclusion, the proposed development would exacerbate existing flooding risks in Derby, particularly for Oakwood, Breadsall, and Darley Abbey. It would place additional strain on already vulnerable drainage systems and watercourses like the River Derwent and Breadsall Brook, potentially leading to flooding further downstream. Additionally, the cumulative impact of multiple developments has not been fully assessed, and the potential public health risks and costs of future flood mitigation should not be overlooked. The development cannot proceed without comprehensive flood risk assessments and robust mitigation strategies to protect both residents and the environment.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	James Bellaby	Response-00337	The more concrete we lay the less places for heavy rain to drain off too. Of course flooding will occur in a flood prone area.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	James Park	Response-00856	This will put more demand on the drainage through Breadsall Village which has already been severely affected by other developments. Which has caused flooding throughout Breadsall Village
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	James Roberts	Response-00673	As per the Wildlife section, anyone who walks the fields being proposed to be developed know they get very boggy / water logged in the winter. Changing these fields to asphalt and concrete will drive all of this water elsewhere, most likely onto the greenway causing rapid degradation (as seen elsewhere on the greenway where significant works have been required to maintain the paths)

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	James skivington	Response-00359	The current housing development build by Redrow homes draining is very poor. The balancing pond water currently flows into the proposed find and then down under the greenway and into the lower field on the north side of the greenway. This already floods this field on a regular basis. And is not good for the local wildlife. And the breadsall village
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Jamie Branagan	Response-00335	As Breadsall Village sits within Erewash you must realise how flooding has increased massively in the village in the past 10 years. This coincides with the development of both estates in Oakwood North / Hilltop. Adding to this will only exacerbated the flooding experienced in Breadsall.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Jane Hodges	Response-00299	I am extremely concerned that this development will cause an increase to the already severe flooding we experience in Breadsall Village. I have walked along the A608, alongside the proposed developments, after heavy rain and seen water pouring out from under the road, over the fields and down into the village via the brook at the side of the Greenway and the path down from the windmill pub. I assume this comes from the overflow from the small reservoir on the corner of the A608 and Lime Lane, built for the new development there. However at least the fields must absorb some of this water so what will happen when the fields are replace by houses? The floodwater on Rectory Lane in November 2019 and again in October 2023 came within 3 meters of my front door and went into the homes of two of my immediate neighbours. Everyone in the village says that these floods have been worse than any previous and this coincides with the building of the Lime Lane development, so we are very scared what will happen if the proposed developments go ahead. Our understanding is also that our homes, which were built by EMH in 2017 were only granted planning permission on the understanding that they were above the previous highest flood level and yet they have been flooded. We have been told that the Sewerage/drainage in the village hasn't been updated to allow for the Lime Lane development and at least two of the houses in the village had floodwater come in through the internal drains.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Janet Brewster	Response-00577	Breadsall Village is already suffering from the water which is being discharged from both the Persimmon and Durose attenuation systems. The attenuation ponds may discharge at an acceptable rate but neither point of discharge are connected water course. This causes significant flooding and damage at several points in the village. This development simply cannot be allowed to do the same as Persimmon has done, and simply let the discharged water flow down to the village. My property is currently affected by this problem and I fear things will get worse.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Janet Jones	Response-00895	This village has history of flooding and the Victorian pipe work isnt coping with it already
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Janet O'Brien	Response-01835	I question the impact the development will have on drainage , flooding and sewers in the local area. Local Authorities are fully aware of the inadequate infrastructure in the village of Breadsall which will be undoubtedly impacted.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Janette Booth	Response-00295	Flooding since the creation of the new housing developments has more severe and regular. The pathway through the Greenway from Hill Top to Breadsall Village becomes almost river like at times. It's needed to be closed for repairs from flooding, cutting off a major link for people walking to get the buses. The repairs aren't great. If the water isn't able to soak I to the ground it's got to go somewhere, and it seems to be Breadsall Village, including the brook that runs through, which has also had to have work done to help reduce flooding. It doesn't always work.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Janette Glenn	Response-00422	Breadsall village already suffers from flooding problems. The run off from yet more houses up the hill from the village will make the situation even worse. Residents already report that it has worsened with the two most recent developments.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Jason Reader	Response-00320	I live in Breadsall village and my house suffered flooding in 2023, development like this with no flood alleviation for surrounding areas I object to.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Jeanette Kent	Response-00402	More housing = more rain run off = more flooding of local areas
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	J Hasse	Response-00875	Too much risk of flooding the houses that are already in Breadsall.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	John Hudson-Peat	Response-01833	Breadsall Village has suffered serious flooding due to the loss of "flood" plains/areas due to the continued development around the village.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	John Moffat	Response-01289	There has been serious ground-water issues in this area since the railway was built - the remains of their mitigation system can be seen today above hte old station. Covering these fields with houses & tarmac will further exacerbate the flooding problems Breadsall suffers.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Julie and Michael Coulton	Response-01811	We have lived in Breadsall Village for the past 11 years. The first 9 years were peaceful and uneventful and then we had Storm Babet in October 2023. Our home was flooded for the first time in its history. Whilst we are aware that some homes are susceptible to flooding, ours was never one of them and is not shown on any environmental map as being in a flood zone. Having spoken to many flood experts over the last 2 years, both independent and Government led, they have concluded that the reason our property flooded is due to outside forces/changes. They are particularly concerned with the effect the new housing estate, at the top of Brookside Road / Lime Lane is having on the village. The fact that the drains in the village are no longer fit for purpose (in fact the highway drain outside my property had collapsed), is a major concern, because they are extremely old and too small to carry away the torrents of water that are hitting our village during heavy rain. The pond that has been added onto the Lime Lane housing development is not able to cope with extreme wet weather and can overflow in the direction of the village. To propose the addition of another housing estate, north of Breadsall Hill Top, will only create a more hazardous environment for us. There needs to be some serious investment in larger and more modern drainage solutions before additional housing should be considered.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Julie Bates	Response-01326	Breadsall village has seen a vast increase in flooding since the development of the? ? Persimmon estate and Breadsall Hilltop which are situated within the water? ? catchment area. Further urbanisation of the water catchment area will undoubtedly? ? lead to an increase of flooding events within Breadsall Village. he planned access to the site can only be achieved by cutting through 2 designated? ? and widely used public footpaths located in the existing Redrow estate at Breadsall? ?

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Julie Herbert	Response-01282	Breadsall already floods on a regular basis, building more houses and taking away soak area is going to put peoples homes at even more risk.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Justine Dean	Response-00844	The addition of the 2 recent housing estates has caused Breadsall village to flood on a regular basis. This is hurting people's livelihoods. So many people have sold and left. New buyers left unaware of the future floods they face. I don't live in the village but it feels no consideration is given to existing residents who bear the brunt of new construction. Please bring back a caring society.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Kara Crossley	Response-00865	Breadsall village floods numerous times a year due to the development on Breadsall hilltop which damages family homes and small local businesses. There is not proper drainage infrastructure now, so adding more houses will cause further flooding and damage to Breadsall village
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Karen Read	Response-00923	Please send environmental study before i can comment from the research i have done it will be totally detrimental to the surrounding area especially breadsall village
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Keerthi	Response-01450	Breadsall village has seen a vast increase in flooding since the development of the Persimmon estate and Breadsall Hilltop which are situated within the water catchment area. Further urbanisation of the water catchment area will undoubtedly lead to an increase of flooding events within Breadsall Village.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Kev Rodgers	Response-00897	There are already 'drainage effects' in Croft Wood from the previous housing development, this proposed development will no doubt add to or create new wet/damp areas where there used to be none and may well lead to additional surface water, ultimately appearing on Croft Lane, potentially causing flooding issues.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Kimberley Woodward	Response-01445	We don't want the foul and top water sewers becoming overpowered with more housing and causing flooding and sewage issues.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Kirstin Woodward	Response-01043	My concerns are primarily focused on the flooding risks to Breadsall Village, the A61, and all surrounding areas. Over the past few years, since the development of the last two housing estates, the flooding in the area has worsened. Breadsall Village has experienced a river running through its centre as a direct result of poor drainage systems in the houses near Lime Lane. The Durose Country Estate has a surface water drainage system that essentially consists of a trench dug into a field. There has been no adequate planning for how water is managed once it leaves the estate. This became particularly evident during the most recent flooding, which led to the closure of the A61 near Bookers.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	K Munson	Response-00631	Flooding never used to be a problem now as a consequence of significant housing development it is a now a threat with every significant amount of rainfall
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Lara Small	Response-01262	I'm personally grateful that the decision was made to build Durose Country Park, I now live in a home probably built on allocated as Green Belt Land. I see the irony in my objection to further development and I'm trying to avoid a 'Not In My Back Yard' attitude. I understand the housing crisis won't fix itself unless more homes are built. I seek to urge the planning team to consider how to get the most value out of the of the fields available in the area, and I'm not sure if the awkward triangle North of Breadsall Hilltop really achieves that. Fitting in sufficient houses to make it profitable seems disproportionate to the effort in getting access to the fields, levelling the sloped land, cutting through protected hedgerows, pressurising the Great Northern Greenway, establishing a road network and critically, establishing water catchment & run off areas that will be critical to ensuring the inhabitants of Breadsall Village stay flood free. One of the wonderful things about Derby, and part of the reason why I've chosen to settle here, is due its lack of heavy city intensity. As a proud Rolls-Royce employee, a huge amount of employee wealth is poured into Derby and its surrounding areas. Perhaps, this is also the reason why further housing is being considered; its becoming a more attractive place to live, but I urge you to ensure the city remains in balance with the green space around it. May I offer my very best wishes for your future plans and development of Derby, and may I urge you to consider the balance and impact of all options.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Laura	Response-00379	Is there a true viable system. That will prevent Breadsall village from getting flooded?
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Laura Louca	Response-01266	All the new builds will certainly have terrible consequences when it comes to flooding in Breadsall Village. It has already got worse since the two biggest new build sites were built. Concrete, brick work and tarmac does not soak up rain water - fields, trees and hedges do.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	L Burton	Response-00342	The drains are constantly overflowing and having workmen out since they were built.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Leah McCormack	Response-01481	There has already been increased flooding in Breadsall village since the Durose Country Park development has been built. More houses in this area will make it worse
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Lee Wheatley	Response-01492	The proposed development of 160 houses could have several negative implications for surface water runoff and drainage patterns that ultimately affect Breadsall Hilltop. Increased impermeable surfaces associated with a development of this scale (roofs, roads, driveways) can significantly increase the volume and rate of surface water runoff. This increased runoff, if not adequately managed within the development site, can overwhelm existing drainage systems both within Erewash and potentially in downstream areas like Breadsall. I am particularly concerned about the adequacy of the drainage infrastructure proposed for the 160 houses. The Core Strategy Review Amendment should clearly outline the Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) that will be implemented to manage surface water runoff within the development site. It is crucial that these SuDS are robust, well-designed, and have sufficient capacity to handle increased rainfall events, especially in light of climate change predictions for more intense and frequent storms. Without a comprehensive and effective drainage strategy for the 160 houses, there is a significant risk that excess surface water will flow into existing watercourses and drainage networks that serve Breadsall Hilltop, exceeding their capacity. This could lead to: ? Increased risk of fluvial flooding from local streams or rivers if the development contributes significantly to their flow rates. ? Increased risk of surface water flooding in low-lying areas of Breadsall Hilltop due to overwhelmed drainage systems. ? Surcharging of existing sewers and potential sewage backups. ? Damage to roads and infrastructure in Breadsall Hilltop due to increased water flow and saturation.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Linda Morris	Response-00867	In recent years Breadsall has had increasing flooding from the result of the run off from the developments in Oakwood and the A608 corridor. Any additional housing would exacerbate the already serious lack of drainage capacity.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Linda Smith	Response-01799	Breadsall village has been increasingly plagued by flooding since the construction of two large estates situated on the boundary between Derby City and the Borough. There are now other applications to further develop the area which falls into remit of the City.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Lisa Stone	Response-01018	As on previous comment, the field is water logged and muddy majority of the winter and autumn months, can be spring too if it rains significantly, the field currently absorbs this preventing it affecting local houses, the woodland areas also significantly flood during bad weather and the trees fall down, there will be significant flooding if houses and gardens are built there.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Lucy Lewis	Response-01459	This land is always flooded during winter months
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	lynne hollis	Response-01234	Breadsall already experiences frequent flooding, and this development at the top of the area will likely worsen the issue. Increased urbanization can lead to reduced drainage capacity, putting homes and infrastructure at greater risk. Proper flood mitigation measures must be considered before proceeding.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Mandy Cooling	Response-00312	There must be serious concern about the flooding risk to Breadsall village by further development. There has been increase in water coming in to the brook in Breadsall since the previous developments and there's no doubt a risk of unforeseen consequences particularly around flooding, caused by destroying natural drainage of the earth.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Margaret Stafford	Response-01231	This is a significant issue for Breadsall village which is downstream to this development. The proposed development will increase the water surface drainage coming down into the Breadsall Village. The village already suffers from flooding and the devastating effects on households when this occurs. The ancient culverts are not able to take the strain of excess water coming down Brookside Road hill now, let alone when an extra 150 houses are added. Breadsall village will be directly downstream from this housing development. Croft Lane near to the A61 roundabout already has significant water draining down on to the road constantly all year round. Severn Trent have investigated several times only to find it is run off from the land above. The sewage pipes that run under the roads are ancient and have little capacity to take an increase in volume. This fact was established a few years ago during Breadsall Village Flood Defences investigations and discussions.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Mark Herbert	Response-01285	This land had always helped to absorb rainfall, I've lived here 24 years and never had as many flooding incidents as since ne building happened, more houses will make it even worse as the main drainage system is never upgraded
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Martin Harrison	Response-01395	I object to the proposed development due to concerns over flooding and inadequate drainage. The area already struggles with surface water during heavy rainfall, and additional hard surfaces from new housing will only increase the risk. Without robust and proven drainage solutions, this development could lead to property damage and safety issues for both new and existing residents.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Mary Hinckley	Response-00297	Breadsall is vulnerable to flooding. Removing this land will exacerbate the risk of flooding due to the loss of ground for drainage of surface water.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Mary Moffat	Response-01226	Breadsall Village is surrounded by high ground and has suffered for some years from flooding which has been severely exacerbated by the two large estates given planning permission by Derby City Council without a full assessment of the flooding risk to Breadsall. If this proposal was accepted, extra houses above Breadsall would only serve to make this problem worse.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Masheda Chowdhury	Response-01339	1. Increased Surface Water Runoff Risk: ? The current site is largely undeveloped greenfield land, which naturally absorbs rainfall. Building 160 homes, driveways, and roads will result in a significant increase in impermeable surfaces. ? Without adequate Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS), this will exacerbate surface water runoff and increase flood risk locally and downstream. 2. No Detailed Flood Risk Assessment Provided: ? For a site of this size and sensitivity, a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) should be required and publicly available before planning permission is granted. ? There is no clear evidence of this assessment in the policy, leaving uncertainty around how the development would be drained or protected from flood risk. 3. Known Drainage Problems in Surrounding Area: ? Parts of Oakwood and Breadsall already experience localised surface water issues after heavy rainfall. ? Adding this development without significant infrastructure upgrades will worsen existing drainage pressures, affecting roads, footpaths, and nearby properties. 4. Downstream Impact on Watercourses and Sewer Capacity: ? Increased runoff from this development may overload existing drainage systems and watercourses, particularly if connections are made to combined sewer systems or culverted streams. ? There is no evidence that Severn Trent Water or the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) have agreed to or assessed the full downstream impact. 5. Potential Flooding of Adjacent Public Rights of Way: ? Breadsall Footpath 24 runs through or alongside the development site. ? Poor drainage or runoff management could lead to flooding and erosion of this well-used footpath, reducing accessibility and safety for local residents. 6. No Mention of Sustainable Drainage Features (SuDS): ? The policy fails to reference any SuDS features (e.g., swales, retention ponds, green roofs, permeable paving). ? Without these, the development risks being non-compliant with national drainage guidance and local sustainability policies.
			Matt	Response-00604	Increased drainage issues in breadsall with flooding all just passed on
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Megan Byrne	Response-01432	Breadsall village has already experienced a noticeable increase in flooding incidents in recent years, which many residents attribute to the cumulative impact of nearby developments and the loss of permeable green space. Additional development on this site risks exacerbating the problem by reducing natural drainage capacity and increasing surface water runoff. It is essential that any proposal affecting this area includes a comprehensive and transparent flood risk assessment, taking into account the recent history of flooding in Breadsall and the cumulative impact of multiple developments in close proximity. Without robust and demonstrable mitigation measures, this development could contribute to further flood events, placing existing homes and infrastructure at greater risk. I strongly urge the Council to consider this risk carefully before making any planning decision.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Melissa Little	Response-00389	In recent years, there has been a significant number of extreme weather bands which had caused a lot of flooding in the Oakwood/ Breadsall Hill Top area. I regularly walk these areas and the fields provide much needed drainage for heavy rain. In the area to the left, nearest to croft woods after a period of rain there is often sitting water on the field and it becomes very boggy. Is this appropriate land to being g new homes on? Imagine the gardens flooding because the land is not appropriate soil to facilitate draining. Plus. New build gardens notoriously are full of building waste, hindering possible drainage further. With this area being build on, the risk to flooding in the local area, especially on the main road will be significantly increased. Causing a huge risk to road users, plus thr additional traffic to potentially hundreds of extra cars on the road in the area due to the number of homes being built.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Michael Albinson	Response-00790	The village already has severe flooding problems not helped by the existing developments around the area. Increasing housing will only put the village at risk where there and home, businesses and schools.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Michael Grignon	Response-01335	Breadsall is already prone to flooding, taking away the natural habitat and adding concrete will only add to this problem
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Michael Poplar	Response-00565	Recently completed developments have already overloaded the streams, land drainage and antiquated combined drainage system running downstream of all these new and proposed developments through Breadsall. Despite many representations to both Severn Trent and the lead Flood Authority (Derbyshire County Council), nothing has yet been proposed, let alone implemented to alleviate what has now become a regular flooding problem.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Mollie	Response-01549	Flooding. This greenfield site currently absorbs rainfall and mitigates surface runoff. Hard surfacing and loss of vegetation will significantly increase flood risk, both on-site and downstream in existing residential areas. The proposed SuDS (Sustainable Drainage Systems) have not been proven to be sufficient, especially during extreme weather events. There is a high risk of: -Overwhelming local drainage ditches and culverts. -Increased flooding risk to homes along Brookside Road and Hill Top. There are records of previous flooding events in the area. Without detailed hydrology modelling and assurances from the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA), development should not proceed.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Monique Johnson	Response-00663	This is the ultimate problem. Breadsall CANNOT cope with any extra input from drains. Flooding has caused major disruption and damage. It is IMPOSSIBLE to envisage any mor building in and around our village.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Mrs Bullock	Response-00966	We have seen massive floods in the village over the years, this would make things worse.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Mrs Francoise Poplar	Response-00602	Recent developments have had a serious detrimental effect on both the natural watercourses running off these higher level areas down into Breadsall and had added to problems with the already overloaded 100 year old combined drainage system. A continued cavalier attitude to adding to these problems without taking action to improve the situation amounts to irresponsibility.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Mr SJ Read and Mrs S E Read	Response-01225	The extensive recent housing development in the Hilltop area has increased flood risks in Breadsall village by overloading the already inadequate watercourses and the old combined sewer. The proposed new development would clearly increase the flooding risk yet further.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Mr Softley	Response-00344	The fields proposed already flood. Development works will increase the risk to existing properties from the runoff from the hills.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Mrs Sarah Morley	Response-01515	Since the two new housing estates have been built, there has been a massive increase in floods flowing down the path from the windmill and along the bridal path. This then goes down into the village and has severly flooded the village and road have had to be closed. How can this aera cope with even more houses adding to the flooding??
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Nathan Cooke	Response-00896	This development will only add to the issues in the surrounding villages, mainly Breadsall village
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Nathan Latymer	Response-00361	Flooding has been rife over the last few years in this area and these houses will only have an adverse effect
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Neal Flint	Response-01220	Breadsall has only recently flooded, this with proposed development and other developments in the area this would significantly in crease risks of flooding events in the future.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Nicholas lloyd	Response-00356	I object to this planning application on the grounds that the proposed development will exacerbate existing flooding and drainage issues in the area. The site is located within a known flood risk zone, and previous incidents have demonstrated the vulnerability of the local infrastructure to heavy rainfall. Building on this land would increase impermeable surfaces, such as roads and rooftops, leading to higher volumes of surface water runoff. This additional runoff could overwhelm the existing drainage systems, leading to increased flood risks for surrounding properties and infrastructure. Moreover, the proposed development lacks a comprehensive flood risk assessment and fails to demonstrate how it will mitigate the impact on local watercourses and drainage networks. Given the increasing frequency of extreme weather events due to climate change, it is imperative that new developments do not compromise the safety and well-being of existing communities. Therefore, I urge the planning authority to reject this application to prevent further strain on an already vulnerable drainage system.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Norma HASWELL	Response-01384	I am highly concerned about the potential for development to increase flood risks in the area.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Oakwood Ward Councillors Eyre, Mulhall and Trehwella	Response-01359	We are in agreement with comments from Breadsall with regard to flooding.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Paige Skivington	Response-00366	Breadsall already floods due to the drainage from the Redrow estate, it simply cannot manage another building site.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Pamela Walker	Response-00649	Breadsall Village has been subject to large amounts of flooding over the last few years, no doubt exacerbated by the amount of building and lack of land to absorb water.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Patrick Baker	Response-01349	The building of the houses on hilltop has already seen a number of significant flood events in Breadsall village, including significant damage to the footpath to the Windmill Inn which has yet to be properly repaired. The additional run off rainwater will bring additional load to an already failing system.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Philip Booth	Response-00683	Due to the steep nature of the site and number of houses and roads being built this would only add to the Flooding issues in the area. Especially in Breadsall village, which has had major flooding in recent years. Breadsall village relies on a 100-year-old combined foul/surface water sewerage system, the majority of which has a diameter of only 15 cm. It may be unable to accommodate surface water run-off during extreme rainfall. In these circumstances there is a further risk of contamination from foul sewage.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Rachael	Response-00332	Flood risks are already high, Breadsall has been particularly hard hit, yet even the local houses have seen significant concerns around drainage due to the new build houses and even the new builds themselves have struggled with drainage in gardens.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Richard Hewitt	Response-01464	Breadsall already has known flooding issues at the bottom of Brookside Road near Damsons Cafe. Many residents have already put flood protection in place as insurance companies recognise the area as high risk. As I'm typing this objection, having had no rain for weeks and being one of the driest April / May on record for many years, there is currently water running onto Croft Lane. This was a rare occurrence until the development was completed on the A608 Hilltop, but now the waterflow seems to be permanent. Additional houses will create increased water runoff which will flow in the Breadsall village direction as the village lies on lower ground. The last flooding in Breadsall saw water being pushed out from the road manholes located half way down Brookside Road before reaching the village (near the wooded area). This never happened prior to any development in the Lime Lane area and the attenuation system near the junction is obviously not adequate to perform the task it was set out to do. Additional houses will make the problem worse.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Richard Johnson	Response-00697	Flooding and drains. The capacity of the existing drainage system in the village is insufficient using old drainage/sewage pipes which are just not big enough. We expect the new housing developments will also use these old pipes making the flooding risk significantly worse. At some stage we will have to replace the piping and now is the time to make the changes, before the new houses are built.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Richard Kingham	Response-00849	Huge increase of flash flooding to surrounding properties if severe rain happens as we have had due to the fields being a big soak away for a lot of the properties around Elmwood.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Richard Straw	Response-01412	The local area wouldn't be able to cope with all the extra houses plumbing
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Robert Mee	Response-01501	Breadsall village suffers regularly from flooding, and this development will only exacerbate that, as there will be additional run-off from the new estate.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Robert Mee	Response-01789	Breadsall village suffers regularly from flooding, and this development will only exacerbate that, as there will be additional run-off from the new estate.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Rowe	Response-01299	Breadsall already gets flooding from the new build now.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Roy Ling	Response-01243	Since the two developments Persimmon and Redrow were built off the A 608 road Breadsall Village has suffered flooding. Both these developments discharge surface and foul into Breadsall village. An additional 160 houses would lead to more properties being flooded.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Ruth Duxbury	Response-00301	Flooding is already severe in the village of Breadsall through run off water. When there is heavy rain the village is often impassable due to the water level and homes and businesses are flooded. New housing developments should not come at the cost of people's homes. The drains are ancient and struggle with current levels of run off in heavy rain.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Sally	Response-00873	We have been subjected to flooding down in Breadsall village due to inadequate drainage from the new developments north of Breadsall village. This will increase with more houses, unless an in-depth investigation in to the situation is carried out. Many villagers live in fear of their houses flooding since the new developments have happened.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Samantha Watts	Response-00869	The proposed development poses a severe risk to flood-prone areas in Breadsall Village, which sits at a lower elevation and has experienced repeated flooding in recent years. Since the construction of the Persimmon houses, flood incidents have increased, leading to damage to homes and rising insurance premiums for local residents. A major concern is the brook that runs under Croft Lane, which is already at capacity due to excessive surface water runoff. Additional hard surfaces from the new development such as roads, rooftops, and driveways will further reduce natural drainage, increasing surface water flow into this already overwhelmed system. Without robust flood mitigation measures, this development risks exacerbating drainage issues, putting homes and infrastructure at greater risk.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Sam Saunders	Response-01557	The proposed development raises serious concerns about flooding and drainage, particularly given the existing flood risk in nearby areas such as the A61 and Breadsall Village. These locations are already prone to surface water and fluvial flooding, demonstrating the vulnerability of local drainage systems. Introducing 160 new homes will increase impermeable surfaces, leading to higher runoff volumes and intensifying flood risk downstream. Without robust and effective drainage infrastructure, the development could exacerbate flooding issues, threatening properties, roads, and natural habitats. Current Environment Agency data highlights these flood-prone zones, emphasizing the need for comprehensive flood risk assessments and sustainable drainage systems to mitigate potential impacts. Failure to adequately address drainage and flood risks may not only endanger existing residents but also reduce the resilience of the area to future extreme weather events linked to climate change. Any development must prioritize sustainable water management to protect both the community and the environment.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Sandra Perry	Response-00307	Breadsall is at increased risk of flooding, and it is noticeably worse since the last houses were built; any more will worsen the situation further. Built environment creates RUN OFF. Breadsall is in a valley, DOWNHILL from the development so more and more water filling the stream and flooding the old houses here. It's utter selfishness by developers and the city planners.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Sara Cotton	Response-00370	Breadsall village floods regularly don't make it worse
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Sarah Hewitt	Response-01461	We already have more flooding in Breadsall village following the most recent development. Our sewers & drains are of the single system type & therefore we are already up to capacity.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Scarlett Hamblin	Response-00398	Flooding has become a yearly issue over the past few years with my pretzel and the green wave flooding annually with the increased amount of concrete and tarmac surface water has nowhere to go except together and flood. We are already at capacity with the amount of housing in Oakwood with two new housing Estates added recently we do not need a further one increasing the flood risk.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Scott Watson	Response-01284	The proposed development presents a significant flood risk to Breadsall Village, which sits at a lower elevation and has faced repeated flooding in recent years. Since the construction of the Persimmon homes, flood incidents have become more frequent, leading to property damage and higher insurance costs for residents. A primary concern is the brook running beneath Croft Lane, which is already struggling to manage excessive surface water runoff. Introducing more hard surfaces?such as roads, rooftops, and driveways?will further reduce natural drainage, increasing surface water flow and straining an already overwhelmed system. Without effective flood mitigation measures, this development threatens to worsen existing drainage issues, putting homes and local infrastructure at even greater risk. Our neighbours and our land flooded in 2023 for the first time
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Sharon Coward	Response-00348	The area already suffers from flooding & the lose of green belt land to more housed will cause more flooding in the future.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Shui-Yee Bateman-Wong	Response-00984	Already regular flooding in the area
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Silvia Mircic	Response-00884	Breadsall village already suffers from heavy flooding during periods of heavy rain. This proposal must be rejected, and alternative sites should be sought that do not put existing homes in such obvious and predictable danger. On page 2 of P&DG's Green Wedge Review, it states: 4. ?The Green Wedge provides vital flood storage and provides space to allow water to soak away naturally, reducing the need for engineered drainage? Paragraph 159 of the NPPF (Planning and flood risk) states that: Inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future). Where development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Simon Ferrad	Response-00853	This will exacerbate the flooding in Breadsall village
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	simon morris	Response-00866	In recent years Breadsall has had increased flooding as a result of all the run off from the housing developments in Oakwood/A608 corridor. Any additional housing will exacerbate the already serious lack of drainage capacity.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Stella Beaumont	Response-00842	The village can't cope with the current throughput and surely has enough flooding issues to deal with. Some people have incurred thousands of £ worth of flood damage, become uninsurable and been out of their houses for over a year in the worst cases. This development won't help that it will make it worse !!!
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Stephen and Janet Allis	Response-01221	where does water drain to
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Stephen Brown	Response-01832	2) More specifically ? drainage. This may be OK for the orange marked area, but is more questionable for the yellow area. The lay of the land will tend to pour surface water towards Breadsall village, and the brook. This is subject to flooding during heavy downpours, or ?flash floods?. How will this be satisfactorily diverted around this village?
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Steven furness	Response-01516	We already have flood issues in Breadsall village. The houses will remove soil drainage and add to the problem if more water entering the brook. The brook cannot cope. The existing new houses and the overflowed water retention pond has not worked. Why would you make a known flood problem worse???
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Stuart Brown	Response-00771	Additional housing will affect the natural drainage. Breadsall floods regularly and building properties on green land in this area in particular will undoubtedly compound this issue
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Susan Dundon	Response-00396	Increase risk of flooding
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Thomas Bateman-Wong	Response-00985	Derby already suffers heavily with flooding.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Tom Parker	Response-01398	Flooding is already a huge risk in the area, the village of Breadsall is flooded multiple times a year which has only been made worse since the redrow estate was built.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Tony Hawkins	Response-01532	The land currently provides natural flood defences to the Village and Durose Estate as it has drainage ditch's running around the perimeter. If this land was built on the defences will be removed causing flooding to the Durose Estate and the Breadsall Village. The village suffers serious flooding and further building on this land will increase this further.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Vanessa Calderone	Response-01065	I'm not sure the area can cope as Breadsall already floods.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Wobbina Bugg	Response-00846	Flooding is already an issue from the existing developments on the Hilltop. Croft Lane in the Village is always draining water from them , even in the very dry periods we have recently experienced. It effects roads and traffic.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Adam Millward	Response-00418	It should be all green belt and used for farming. Why not regenerate one of the old brown field sites like stanton iron works? You could build a whole new community on that wasteland.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Flooding / Drainage	Adelle Cavanagh	Response-00392	More of our green belt land is being lost. This is impacting on residents of Derby rather than Erewash

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Alexander lee	Response-01439	Objection to Proposed Development ? Conflict with Policy CP18 (Green Wedges) I note that this application has been amended to exclude the development adjacent to the A61. However I still wish to raise strong objections to the proposed development (both in its amended form and original form) on the grounds that it conflicts with Policy CP18 concerning Green Wedges. Although the site lies just outside the designated green belt surrounding Breadsall, it directly abuts existing woodland and open countryside, forming an important part of the green corridor along the Great Northern Greenway. The application site provides valuable habitat for wildlife and functions as an essential green buffer. Its loss would significantly reduce ecological connectivity and visual amenity, impacting local biodiversity and the quality of life for residents, walkers, and cyclists who currently use and enjoy this open space. The site is actively appreciated by the community as a visual break in built development and as a wildlife corridor connecting to other open areas. While the outline proposal includes the retention of woodland, there are serious concerns that development will increase pressure on these areas, potentially leading to degradation over time. I am concerned that the proposed development does not provide an adequate buffer to the woodland corridor and built development will sit too close and will detrimentally impact the existing woodland. There is no BNG Assessment listed in the application documents on the portal so it appears that it hasn't yet been done. How can there be any confidence that the proposal would be able to satisfy the statutory requirement to deliver 10% net gain. Any BNG delivery off site or through the purchase of biodiversity units elsewhere, dilutes the benefit of 10% net gain as the biodiversity is lost here in this locality and the significant environmental impact is here. Crucially, the proposed development sits adjacent to land at Breadsall recently released from the green belt, which Erewash Borough Council is considering for housing allocation. If both sites are developed, the cumulative impact will be substantial?leading to the loss of meaningful green space, erosion of the rural character of the Great Northern Greenway, and the elimination of the settlement gap between Breadsall and the wider Derby conurbation. For these reasons, I urge the Council to reject the proposal in order to uphold the principles of Policy CP18 and protect the integrity of this important green wedge.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Alex Cargill	Response-01834	*further intrusion on Green Belt
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Alistair Crawford	Response-01404	The purpose of the green belt is to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas EBC previous reviews and assessment stated that the built extent of the City has a very clear edge along the northern periphery of Oakwood along Hill Top and Lime Lane. The Green Belt in this location helps to define the edge of the City and prevents sprawl to the north. The previous Green Belt Review also stated that the area immediately between Derby and the areas immediately north are generally the most important areas of Green Belt and that as such little development should be directed there. The Green Belt is therefore important in this location to prevent sprawl into the open countryside between the separate settlements such as the village of Breadsall As such, the Green Belt is performing this role in this location and I can see nothing that could have changed the result of the previous review, other than an opportunistic attempt to override clear protections. Housing should only be allowed in the Green Belt in ?exceptional circumstances? ie. when all brownfield sites have been exhausted. I have lived at Manor Farm Barns for the past 9 years which is in the area indicated safeguarded for future housing. The residents at Manor Farm Barns have had for 20 years restrictions imposed on them by way of permitted development rights being removed and the strict specifications of material used on the properties such as wooden windows, cast iron guttering etc. These restrictions were imposed for the reason being to protect the interest of the amenity of the green belt and keeping the character and visual impact of these buildings in the rural Green Belt. The view of this area and buildings within the landscape being considered very important. Which now will be completely obliterated by an uninspiring mass generic urban sprawl. The loss of this important amenity cannot be underestimated as it can be seen from afar and cannot be replicated once lost. The residents knowingly bought into this planning concept and have accepted the restrictions as being positive for the openness of the greenbelt amenity. Previous reviews state the ?safeguarding valued countryside? which ironically now states ?safeguarded land?on the map Shouldn't the latter have stated ?earmarked for future housing?. This I know has caused misunderstanding and apathy within the community.. Developers will always opt and put pressure on the more profitable greenbelt development, rather than more challenging brownfield sites such as the Stanton Steelworks. Your amended study states that the area is not performing well as a greenbelt, although to date it has prevented urban sprawl into the village of breasall, sustained the openness of the rural amenity.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Andrea R Rowley	Response-01230	See comment on wildlife. Brown and grey sites MUST be built on first before greenbelt areas.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Andrew David Williams	Response-00796	Breadsall village provided EBC with a Breadsall Neighbourhood Plan about 3 yrs ago setting out planning consideration and setting out protection of the greenbelt land around the village. This is a legal document that safeguards all aspects of greenbelt , wildlife and planning issues. There should be no more building on this land as set out in the neighbourhood plan.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Angela Smyth	Response-00296	The council should use all brown belt areas before attempting to build on the green belt.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Ann Sherlock	Response-00410	The map used in this proposal is out of date, and fails to show the impact various housing estates have already had on the green belt and surrounding area. Adding the current proposal will be extremely detrimental to the local green belt, and it is disappointing that the public have been intentionally lied to in relation to how the current proposal will affect the green belt area, missing two extremely large housing estates and falsely portraying a larger area of unused land and impact the housing proposal will have on the green belt area.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	A O Smith	Response-01798	The impact of extending residential development on this scale is to reduce the biodiversity of this area, with a negative effect on wildlife In particular, the blackcaps, the chiffchaffs, and other migrant birds habitat would be removed,let alone the resident nuthatches ,treecreepers, tawny owls and bats that live in and around Breadsall Village

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Ben Martin	Response-00787	The proposed development completely contradicts the National Planning Policy Framework 13 (NPPF 13) which states: 142. The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. 143. Green Belt serves five purposes: a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The preservation of the greenbelt land is vital in helping to achieve three of the key objectives of the Breadsall Neighbourhood Plan, namely to maintain the rural character of the parish, to avoid urbanisation and to prevent coalescence with the Derby conurbation. It is equally important in achieving the Local Plan objective of 'ensuring the continued separation of neighbouring towns and rural settlements within Erewash Borough'. The most critical area of the current Green Belt is the land that separates Breadsall from the Derby conurbation is this proposed site.
			Bethan Eddy	Response-00976	This is the only bit of land separating Derby City and Breadsall Village, it removes the village boundaries
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Beverly Jordan	Response-01330	The removal of the green belt would kill off the established wildlife and woodland and destroy the countryside openness feeling of the hilltop area already decreased with the two new estates
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Carl Hill	Response-00670	No separation from a retail park and Breadsall village all area merging in to one
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Carol Hart	Response-01830	The small but lovely village of Breadsall has taken more than its fair share of developments, albeit no directly in the village but the surrounding developments are so close to the boundary that you can almost touch them, the urban sprawl is changing the whole landscape of the area and it not acceptable in any way.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Carol Westcott	Response-00973	We have a beautiful walk the Greenway and it's the only land around this area that can be enjoyed. The wildlife is wonderful around the Greenway with birds and wildlife.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Carys Whomsley	Response-01438	I am writing to register my strong objection to the above-mentioned planning application, both in its original and revised form. Despite the removal of the area adjacent to the A61 in the amended proposal, I believe that the proposed development remains deeply inappropriate and harmful for the following reasons: 1. Contravention of Policy CP18 and Loss of Green Wedge The proposed site lies just outside the designated Green Belt, but crucially directly abuts existing woodland and open countryside, forming part of the vital green corridor along the Great Northern Greenway. This area functions as a green buffer, enhancing ecological connectivity, supporting biodiversity, and providing visual and recreational amenity to local residents, walkers, and cyclists. Despite claims of woodland retention, the development threatens the integrity of this space. Proximity to new housing would increase human pressure on the natural environment, likely leading to degradation of woodland, fragmentation of habitats, and a reduction in wildlife corridors. No Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) assessment appears in the application documents, raising concerns about whether the legally mandated 10% net gain can or will be achieved. Biodiversity enhancements delivered off-site would do nothing to mitigate local ecological loss, thereby undermining environmental sustainability in the area. Moreover, the site lies adjacent to land recently released from the Green Belt and under consideration for housing allocation by Erewash Borough Council. The cumulative impact of developing both sites would be devastating: a continuous sprawl from Derby through to Breadsall, resulting in the elimination of the settlement gap and permanent damage to the character of the Great Northern Greenway. 2. Environmental, Infrastructural, and Policy Concerns The proposal directly contradicts the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Paragraph 143, particularly the goals of preventing urban sprawl and protecting the openness of Green Belt land. It also ignores the findings of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA 359), which previously deemed the site unsuitable for residential development due to accessibility and environmental limitations. The development is completely incompatible with the objectives of the Breadsall Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2019?2029, particularly the aims to: Preserve the rural character and prevent urbanisation; Avoid coalescence with the Derby conurbation; Safeguard wildlife and ecological features; Control flood risk and infrastructure strain; Protect valued green spaces and visual vistas.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Carys Whomsley	Response-01438	Breadsall has already experienced increased flooding, attributed to upstream developments like Persimmon Estate and Breadsall Hilltop, which lie within the same water catchment area. Any additional development would worsen this issue, placing homes and infrastructure at risk. Furthermore, the proposal relies on access through two existing public footpaths within the Redrow estate and offers no concrete infrastructure improvements. The A608 is already over-congested, and no plans are presented to handle increased traffic or to safeguard children commuting to local schools. 3. Loss of Community and Ecological Value This land offers more than just open space?it is a much-loved and well-used amenity for the local community. It serves as a peaceful escape for informal recreation and nature engagement, and its visual and environmental contributions to the neighbourhood are significant. Its destruction would represent a major loss in local character and quality of life. The proposal underestimates the pressure on existing services, lacks detailed mitigation plans, and fails to explain how proposed footpaths will link meaningfully into existing routes. Nearby Local Wildlife Sites will be impacted

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Chris Lunn	Response-01410	This land is a greenbelt/green wedge area and, as such, it is immensely important that it should remain so. These appear to be terms with which the council is either unfamiliar or for which they have total disregard. The proposed area is designated as a ?birds and bees? field which aims to increase the wildlife population, promote biodiversity and help to combat the effects of climate change and is integral to the Great Northern Greenway which was designed to enhance the quality of life for local residents. The field and track are heavily used by many people. Dog walkers, picnic-ers and people who just want to escape the stresses of life and reconnect with nature. The area provides essential habitat for many different species whose populations are already declining at an alarming rate. Hedgehogs and rabbits, once prolific in the area, are now a rarity. By proceeding with this development, the Council is eroding the very greenery that the Greenway was designed to protect. The Redrow housing estate cannot be without blame for this and no further habitat loss should be incurred. This proposed development completely undermines Erewash council?s approach to the importance of preserving greenbelt and green wedge land for current and future generations to enjoy. To replace the natural beauty of the area by developing this land for housing will permanently end the visual contrast between the urban and rural areas and set a precedence for all future developments. It would cause irreparable damage to the landscape, disrupt wildlife corridors and erode a space that absorbs carbon and helps to improve air quality. I would like to draw your attention to your campaign ?Wild About Erewash?. In it you encourage people to get involved as it: Improves health and wellbeing, improves biodiversity and reduces our carbon footprint. It certainly makes for interesting reading, especially as you appear to have reneged on every point. You have clearly lost interest in everything you maintained was at the heart of your approach to the welfare of the local area and its residents. Possibly this was just an agenda to win the local election on behalf of Labour? It certainly begs the question of just how many other points you intend to retract? Your rewilding sites may not have included the land to the north of Breadsall Hilltop but that would be because it didn?t need rewilding in the first place.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Christine Goodwin	Response-00642	This is Green Belt land and was previously in the Land Availability Assessment 359 stated to be unsuitable for residential development The government attaches great importance to the Green Belt and one of its main functions is to prevent urban sprawl and to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another. This development ensures that Breadsall becomes a suburb of Derby. This development is contrary to all planning requirements as it appears there has been little thought given to upgrading inadequate infrastructure particularly to roads and drainage both of which have the potential to be harmful to Breadsall Village which is already experiencing flooding due to previous developments on Breadsall Hill Top
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Clare Roters	Response-01553	A loss of this beautiful countryside would be a massive loss to Derby if I'm honest and a loss to the wildlife that live in it and thrive
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Colin Brewster	Response-00576	It is understood by the community that this location is Green Belt and in recent years has been deemed unsuitable for residential development. If this development was to go ahead Breadsall would automatically become a directly connected suburb of Derby, this should not be allowed.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Dana Demidoff	Response-00634	This flies in the face of previous Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment 359 on the site, as unsuitable for residentia development, plus, as already mentioned, a total lack of intent to upgrade inadequate infracture. This also ensures Breadsall becomes a suburb of Derby. NO protection of Green Belt land and completely ignoring the main clauses in the National Planning Policy Framwork.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	David Duxbury	Response-00305	The proposed development continues to erode the green wedge between Oakwood and breadsall village. Development adjacent to the proposed site and the development adjacent to lime lane and a608 have already significantly eroded the green belt surrounding breadsall village.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Diane Bakhda	Response-01411	At one time, the term "Green Belt" gave you some confidence that the land would be preserved either to benefit the environment or to help the country produce its own food. PLEASE can we go back to this definition!
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Edward James Gregory	Response-00728	Unsuitable for green belt / green separation
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Elaine hodgkinson	Response-00854	This is currently green belt which provides an important wildlife corridor for areas such as chaddesden wood. It must not increase flooding for Breadsall or drain much needed water from further up the hill.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Emma Binns	Response-00843	Why are all green belt areas now being built on?
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Emma Hawkins	Response-00813	The preservation of this greenbelt land referred to above helps to achieve these key objectives. It also provides separation of neighbouring towns and rural settlements within Erewash Borough and separates Breadsall from the Derby conurbation. The map provided in the consultation document is incorrect and does not show the existing Durose County Estate as demonstrated in the image below highlighting the estate. Housing on this land will merge into the existing estate and Derby City contradicting: ? 142. The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. ? 143. Green Belt serves five purposes: a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Gaynor Pawley	Response-00627	If this is Greenbelt land which is protected, why is it a target for ticking a box of the numer of houses built?

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Ged Doherty	Response-01822	If I could I would make the first 10 points of objection the Green Belt. People much wiser than me proposed the idea of Green Belt land for several reasons including the prevention of urban sprawl, reduction of flood risk, providing greenspace for communities to explore, providing a home for wildlife and safeguarding resources that help clean our air and water. It is not an asset that can simply be redesignated or have the importance of its categorisation reduced by councils because they have housing targets to meet. In our situation the Green Belt is vitally important to prevent the sprawl of Derby swallowing up the village of Breadsall, and in spite of comments to the contrary in your amended study of the area, it is performing that role very well. If there is genuine concern that it is not performing well then surely erecting houses on that land would worsen the situation by ensuring that the role would not be performed at all. Development on Green Belt land should ONLY be allowed in 'exceptional circumstances', and I would suggest that there are many brownfield sites that could be used to fulfil your targets without resorting to putting a blight on countryside areas such as in this proposal. I understand that developers love the idea of green field over brown field sites as there are many fewer construction hurdles to negotiate, but that is not an 'exceptional circumstance', and as a Planning Officer showing consideration to the residents of your area you should be fighting even the remotest suggestion of proposals for major developments on green belt land with every fibre of your body. I live at Manor Farm Barns, and have done so since the barns were converted over 20 years ago. We have had restrictions imposed for all of those 20 years because the properties are in a protected zone, so planning has been denied for items such as conservatories, the windows have to be of wood (necessitating replacement a couple of years ago at considerable cost over PVC) and I wasn't even allowed a wood effect metal roller shutter garage door because it was 'harmful to the environment', even though the wooden doors fitted were completely unfit for purpose and facilitated several break-ins. We have put up with these restrictions because of the privilege that we have of the beauty of the area we live in, and the loss of that once it is in the midst of the urban sprawl (the area indicated as 'safeguarded for future development') is beyond devastating and is simply wrong. We have always been assured that development could not take place on the land north of our properties because of the Protected Zone, but it appears that at the stroke of a pen, areas can be redesignated with absolutely zero consideration for the community within which these areas lie and the same level of thought as to why these areas were designated such in the first place. The rural amenity of this area MUST be maintained at all costs. The consultation maps are out of date and in some cases do not appear to recognise the complete development of Manor Farm Barns. Previous reviews produced after visits by the planning department stated this land is unsuitable for residential building. Now an amendment is produced, again at the stroke of a pen without the same due diligence. The overall impression is that the Planning Department have a complete disregard for the work and reasoning of previous incumbents and the views of members of the impacted community; any consultations will be meanin
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Ged Doherty	Response-01822	gless because the land has been reclassified and thus objections hold no water and Government targets have to be met regardless of any concerns. Thus little effort is needed with regard to consultations and what might be the best way forward as the proposals will be rammed through anyway. The 6 dwellings of Manor Farm Barns have a right of way to Mansfield Road using the track owned by the farm. We are unsure as to the intentions regarding the barns complex should this development be permitted, as our properties have not been marked as remaining (in white on the map) and are within the area 'safeguarded' for future development. (Please could the misleading term 'safeguarded' be changed, as this implies that it may be looking after the interests of parties involved, but actually only serves as our very own Sword of Damocles with the knowledge that development can take place at any time at the whim of the Planning Department.) The properties within the development were all purchased on the understanding that the area was a Protected Zone and thus commanded a considerable premium because of their location. If they end up being surrounded by this development there will be a huge reduction in the value of the properties and appropriate financial compensation would be required. If the map is correct (although I have been informed that it may well not be) then is the plan for the purchase of all buildings within the indicated 'safeguarded' zone under some sort of compulsory purchase? Again if this is the case there would need to be adequate market value compensation.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Gemma Cotter	Response-01374	This land is an essential part of the separation of Derby's suburbs and maintaining Breadsall's character as a separate Derbyshire village. It maintains a wedge of open countryside going towards Derby as far as the Paddock pub. The green belt is already under threat by a planning application at Chaddesden Woods which could sever the woods from open countryside. Some of this land could be lost to development near the A61. The more substantial that these green belts and green wedges are, the more ecological value they have at being able to sustain wildlife populations.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	George Langton	Response-01385	The Great Northern Greenway currently provides a much-valued tranquil green space in a heavily built-up area, and both development areas come very close to this.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Gillian Montgomery	Response-00625	Too much green belt land is being turned into housing.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Gillian Pearson	Response-00303	Breadsall is becoming subsumed by the urban sprawl of Derby and Oakwood. There will soon be no open spaces remaining, with loss of habitat for wildlife and places for people to roam amongst natural surroundings which is recognised as being so important for our wellbeing. Safeguarding land for future development is not what we should be doing - we should be safeguarding it for future generations against development.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Helen Foster	Response-00650	This expansion of the Derby conurbation directly contradicts the findings of the previous Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA 359), which deemed the site unsuitable for residential development. NPPF 13. Protecting Green Belt land 142. The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. 143. Green Belt serves five purposes: a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Helen Walker	Response-00325	See my previous comment stop building on green belt land go and do up empty buildings and make them into homes
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Hulland. Bdverley	Response-00496	Save green belt for our next generation to grow up with Look elsewhere
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Ian Lockwood	Response-01491	This proposed expansion of the Derby conurbation is in direct contradiction to the findings of the previous Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA 359), which identified the site as unsuitable for residential development. According to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), Section 13: Protecting Green Belt Land, paragraph 142 states that the Government places great importance on Green Belts. The core objective of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by maintaining land as permanently open, with openness and permanence being its defining features. Paragraph 143 outlines five purposes served by Green Belt land: a) To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas b) To prevent neighbouring towns from merging c) To safeguard the countryside from encroachment d) To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns e) To support urban regeneration by encouraging the reuse of derelict and other urban land The proposed development undermines these principles, particularly those aimed at preventing urban sprawl, protecting the countryside, and maintaining the distinct character of historic settlements.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Jack Bointon	Response-00969	This allocation will damage the preservation of wildlife and the environment. There are a lot of beautiful creatures where their homes will be destroyed.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Jake Moore	Response-01202	Protection of Greenbelt/Green Wedge: A Vital Asset for People, Wildlife, and the Environment The proposed development threatens a crucial greenbelt/green wedge that connects Derby City's core to the surrounding countryside, providing essential ecological functions and supporting a range of local wildlife. Its preservation is key to ensuring that biodiversity is maintained, Derby's environmental goals are met, and local residents continue to benefit from access to green spaces. The Oakwood and Breadsall areas support a variety of species, including: Birds like kestrels, barn owls, and skylarks, which depend on open fields for nesting and hunting; Mammals such as hedgehogs, foxes, and rabbits, which use these areas for shelter and foraging; Insects like butterflies and bees, critical for pollination; Bats, which rely on undisturbed areas for foraging and roosting. The development would disrupt wildlife corridors, leading to: Loss of habitat for species like hedgehogs, whose populations are already declining; Fragmentation of pathways, preventing safe movement for owls and bats; Increased human-wildlife conflict as urban sprawl encroaches on natural habitats. This green space also plays a vital role in maintaining air quality and carbon absorption, while offering public health and recreation opportunities. Its loss would not only harm local wildlife but also undermine Derby's ability to meet climate change objectives. The development would encroach on this greenbelt land, severing the vital buffer between Derby's urban sprawl and the countryside. It would lead to: Permanent loss of green space, reducing opportunities for wildlife and residents alike; Increased urban sprawl, degrading the aesthetic and ecological value of Derby's countryside. This development contradicts Derby City's own environmental and sustainability goals, which prioritize the protection of green spaces and wildlife habitats. Allowing this project to proceed without proper safeguards would not only harm local wildlife but also weaken Derby's commitment to creating a greener, more sustainable future. Protecting the greenbelt is essential not just for wildlife, but for maintaining the ecological health and quality of life for Derby's residents
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	James Bellaby	Response-00337	Less green belt less eco system, the more of the planet is being ruined.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	James Heesom	Response-00885	Further loss of green belt space
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	James Park	Response-00856	The great northern greenway will be affected by this and I use this regularly to walk my dogs
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	James Roberts	Response-00673	As per other sections, my main concerns are around the impact to the greenway and wildlife that use the fields and greenery in the area
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Jamie Branagan	Response-00335	The existing estate and the one at Lime Lane already destroyed greenbelt and ruined the natural look of Oakwood North/Hilltop. This proposed development will take away another slice of natural and beautiful landscape to be replaced with brick and tarmac.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Janet Brewster	Response-00577	Why has this area of land suddenly become a development consideration, when only a couple of years ago it was deemed unsuitable for residential development? Lying directly on the Derby - Erewash border it is the final piece of land that keeps us apart from Derby. It should remain Green Belt.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Janet Jones	Response-00895	Leave out green belt alone - it's disappearing fast

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Janet O'Brien	Response-01835	The Green Belt in this location helps to define the edge of the City and prevents sprawl to the north which is very important in maintaining rural and semi rural locations. We need a mix of small villages and larger estate locations to promote diversity within the community . This is the last slither of Green Belt creating a break between the City and Breadsall. Geologically this slither sits right above the village and water runoff once the land is developed would impact the green way putting the steep banks in danger of slippage. Previously EBC reviews stated, the Green Belt area immediately between Derby and the areas immediately north are generally the most important areas of Green Belt and that as such little development should be directed there. The Green Belt is performing a very important role in this location and I can see nothing that could have changed the result of the previous review. Along this edge we have seen ?????..developed over the past 5 years. I know there is a need for housing but you are choosing a very soft site which once developed we can never recover. Building in the Green Belt should only be in ?exceptional circumstances?. I can not agree with your desire to develop this area further. I live at Manor Farm Barns which is in the area indicated safeguarded for future housing. The residents at Manor Farm Barns have had restrictions imposed on them by way of permitted development rights being removed and the strict specifications of material used on the properties such as wooden windows, open fencing , cast iron guttering etc. These restrictions were imposed to protect the interest of the amenity of the green belt and keep the character and visual impact of these buildings in the rural Green Belt. We felt proud over the last 20 years to be custodians for future generations. The view of this area and buildings within the landscape has considerable impact. Which now will be completely obliterated by an uninspiring mass generic urban sprawl. The loss of this important amenity cannot be underestimated as it can be seen from afar and cannot be replicated once lost. Your amended study states that the area is not Mrs Janet O'Brien 2 Manor Farm Barns Hill Top Breadsall Derby DE21 4TP Erewash Borough Council Planning & Regeneration Town Hall Derby Road Long Eaton Derbyshire NG10 1HU Re: Strategic Policy 1.8 - North of Breadsall Hill Top Date: 18/05/2025 performing well as a greenbelt, although to date it has prevented urban sprawl into the village of Breadsall and sustained the openness of the rural amenity.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Janette Booth	Response-00295	Not sure if it's a greenbelt, but certainly close to green areas which are rapidly shrinking, causing additional issues with flooding.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Janette Glenn	Response-00422	The area between the city and Breadsall village is being severely encroached upon. This leads to harm to biodiversity as well as worsening the existing flooding issues in Breadsall.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Jason Reader	Response-00320	Green belt should be protected, I wouldn't object so much but suspect more houses will be built adjacent to this plot on what is green belt. Along with this and the lime lane application lots of greenbelt land has been lost on Breadsall hilltop over the last 10 years. Not including the redrow and persimmon estates already present.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Jeanette Kent	Response-00402	Wildlife and ourselves NEED a greenbelt. Stop building on them
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Jessica Softley	Response-01408	This land has previously been designated as Green Belt land. Building upon this land would go against the purposes of Green Belt land such as preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.
			J Hasse	Response-00875	Leave it alone
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Jim Smith	Response-00741	This is Green Belt land and although in a review of some sort it was considered that it ?performs poorly? is totally irrelevant. It certainly meets the requirement of the Governments National Planning Policy NPPF 13, section 142 and 143, which should be adhered too.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	John Harlow	Response-00619	The green belt needs to increase not decreased.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	John Hudson-Peat	Response-01833	They have no interest in protecting Greenbelt land even though there are various other sites (grey belt/brownfield) around the Borough that could be utilised for housing, house builders seem not to want to build on these kind of sites as they are not "attractive" enough areas to live in.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	John Moffat	Response-01289	Apologies for being brief - I have recently broken my right arm. I strongly object to this proposal overf loss of greenbelt that separates Breadsall Village from Derby. This proposal is contrary to previous Strategic Land Availability Assessment 359 & is contrary to the aims of NPPF 13 that protects Greenbelt land.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	John O'Brien	Response-01796	The purpose of the green belt is to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas EBC previous reviews and assessment stated that the built extent of the City has a very clear edge along the northern periphery of Oakwood along Hill Top and Lime Lane. The Green Belt in this location helps to define the edge of the City and prevents sprawl to the north. The previous Green Belt Review also stated that the area immediately between Derby and the areas immediately north are generally the most important areas of Green Belt and that as such little development should be directed there. The Green Belt is therefore important in this location to prevent sprawl into the open countryside between the separate settlements such as the village of Breadsall As such, the Green Belt is performing this role in this location and I can see nothing that could have changed the result of the previous review, other than an opportunistic attempt to override clear protections. Housing should only be allowed in the Green Belt in 'exceptional circumstances' ie. when all brownfield sites have been exhausted. I live at Manor Farm Barns which is in the area indicated safeguarded for future housing. The residents at Manor Farm Barns have had for 20 years restrictions imposed on them by way of permitted development rights being removed and the strict specifications of material used on the properties such as wooden windows, cast iron guttering etc. These restrictions were imposed for the reason being to protect the interest of the amenity of the green belt and keeping the character and visual impact of these buildings in the rural Green Belt. The view of this area and buildings within the landscape being considered very important. Which now will be completely obliterated by an uninspiring mass generic urban sprawl. The loss of this important amenity cannot be underestimated as it can be seen from afar and cannot be replicated once lost. The residents knowingly bought into this planning concept and have accepted the restrictions as being positive for the openness of the greenbelt amenity. Previous reviews state the 'safeguarding valued countryside' which ironically now states 'safeguarded land' on the map Shouldn't the latter have stated ' earmarked for future housing'? This I know has caused misunderstanding and apathy within the community.. Developers will always opt and put pressure on the more profitable greenbelt development, rather than more challenging brownfield sites such as the Stanton Steelworks. Your amended study states that the area is not performing well as a greenbelt, although to date it has prevented urban sprawl into the village of breadsall, sustained the openness of the rural amenity.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Jon Lewis	Response-00347	The proposed development will further surround the existing green belt area. This will have a detrimental effect on the existing and surrounding wildlife. The proposal further extends housing and the city onto the countryside until no green belt is left or just small corridors in which wildlife are expected to be confined to.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Julie Herbert	Response-01282	We are getting less and less countryside around us, we have already had so many new homes taking over fields and beautiful wildlife habitat, this is not only a threat to our wildlife, but also to peoples mental health.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Kara Crossley	Response-00865	The whole point of a green belt land is to protect it from development and prevent urban sprawl. It's protected for a reason!
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Karen Read	Response-00923	This is the last bit of green belt in the area. The proposed site is the greenbelt between derby and breadsall i strongly object due to the complete unacceptability of the obliteration of the greenbelt land which was designated to provide well being for current inhabitants i include all wildlife as well as people and restrict urban growth. The most important thing about greenbelt is its openness please explain how this is in line with this policy. Why are you not looking at brownfield sites which are plentiful in the erewash area.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Karen Smith	Response-00635	This is a strategic piece of land that provides a green corridor for nature
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Kate barlow	Response-00351	No need to built in the green area. Plenty of brownfield sites around derby
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Keerthi	Response-01450	The proposal also totally ignores the Breadsall Parish Council Village Neighbourhood plan 2019 - 2029, link - <a href="https://www.breadsallparishcouncil.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/Breadsall-Neighbourhood-Plan_v21-final-draft-low-res-1.pdf">https://www.breadsallparishcouncil.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/Breadsall-Neighbourhood-Plan_v21-final-draft-low-res-1.pdf</a> ). The key points of which I would like to highlight below from Chapter 7, page 8 are points 1, 2, 3, 7, 9, 11 & 12: Protect and enhance the rural character of the parish and prevent urbanisation. 2 Enforce the requirements of the Green Belt to prevent inappropriate development and avoid coalescence with the Derby conurbation. 3 Encourage small-scale residential development in appropriate locations within the village envelope. 4 Ensure that a significant proportion of new housing development in the parish will comprise small dwellings to help cater for the lack of such accommodation. 5 Protect and enhance existing employment uses within the parish, including home working where this does not adversely affect adjoining properties and their amenities. 6 Encourage new small-scale employment opportunities in the limited locations where this is appropriate while preventing industrial or commercial uses that would be incompatible with the Green Belt or with the parish generally. 7 Ensure that all new developments, replacement buildings and extensions are constructed with high-quality materials, using designs that are compatible with the adjoining development and the parish in general. 8 Encourage energy conservation through sustainable construction methods and domestic-scale energy generation, but resist large-scale energy generation that would harm the visual character of the parish. 9 Improve measures to control existing flood risks within the parish and resist any new development that may increase existing flood risks. 10 Identify and preserve specific buildings, structures, natural features, views and vistas that enhance the character of the parish. 11 Identify key wildlife and biological features within the parish and take appropriate steps to preserve them. 12 Mitigate the effect of the large volume of through traffic in the village and aim to prevent any growth in through traffic. 13 Control parking on pavements where possible, including enforcement of strict requirements for the provision of sufficient on-site parking. 14 Preserve and enhance local facilities within the parish, including especially the village shop, the Memorial Hall, the village school, the church, sports pitches, footpaths and greenways. 15 Maintain access to facilities provided outside the parish, particularly through provision of a regular bus service. The preservation of the greenbelt land is vital in helping to achieve three of the key objectives of the Breadsall Neighbourhood Plan, namely to maintain the rural character of the parish, to avoid urbanisation and to prevent coalescence with the Derby conurbation. It is equally important in achieving the Local Plan objective of 'ensuring the continued separation of neighbouring towns and rural settlements within Erewash Borough.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Kirstin Woodward	Response-01043	Derby has already lost parts of its designated Greenbelt land, and as such, any remaining greenbelt areas must be preserved at all costs. Greenbelt land serves a vital purpose?it helps prevent urban sprawl, protects the countryside and established habitats, and provides safe routes for wildlife. It also ensures access to open spaces and contributes to climate control by supporting tree growth and environmental balance. Any further development on such land should be halted to protect these invaluable resources.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	K Munson	Response-00631	Green Belt should remain PROTECTED
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Lara Small	Response-01262	I?m personally grateful that the decision was made to build Durose Country Park, I now live in a home probably built on allocated as Green Belt Land. I see the irony in my objection to further development and I?m trying to avoid a ?Not In My Back Yard? attitude. I understand the housing crisis won?t fix itself unless more homes are built. I seek to urge the planning team to consider how to get the most value out of the of the fields available in the area, and I?m not sure if the awkward triangle North of Breadsall Hilltop really achieves that. Fitting in sufficient houses to make it profitable seems disproportionate to the effort in getting access to the fields, levelling the sloped land, cutting through protected hedgerows, pressurising the Great Northern Greenway, establishing a road network and critically, establishing water catchment & run off areas that will be critical to ensuring the inhabitants of Breadsall Village stay flood free. One of the wonderful things about Derby, and part of the reason why I?ve chosen to settle here, is due its lack of heavy city intensity, As a proud Rolls-Royce employee, a huge amount of employee wealth is poured into Derby and its surrounding areas. Perhaps, this is also the reason why further housing is being considered; its becoming a more attractive place to live, but I urge you to ensure the city remains in balance with the green space around it. May I offer my very best wishes for your future plans and development of Derby, and may I urge you to consider the balance and impact of all options.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Laura Louca	Response-01266	Just preserving a slither of land known as the Greenway is not enough - wildlife requires the fields, trees, hedgerows, grasses, shrubs, wild flowers and just an important- peace! If planning permission for all of the houses around this area is granted we will have lost a significant amount of green space in which I have seen rabbits, foxes, badgers, endless species of birds and insects.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	L Burton	Response-00342	Upon buying the house, we were told the ground opposite was green belt land and could not be built on. It was our primary reason for buying and our house price will be severely impacted with the loss of view which added value to our property and that we paid for. We will lose personal equity with the addition of a house estate to the front on green belt land. The green belt is home to a lot of wildlife including bats which are often seen in the gardens
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Leah McCormack	Response-01481	Objection to Proposed Development ? Conflict with Policy CP18 (Green Wedges) I note that this application has been amended to exclude the development adjacent to the A61. However I still wish to raise strong objections to the proposed development (both in its amended form and original form) on the grounds that it conflicts with Policy CP18 concerning Green Wedges. Although the site lies just outside the designated green belt surrounding Breadsall, it directly abuts existing woodland and open countryside, forming an important part of the green corridor along the Great Northern Greenway. The application site provides valuable habitat for wildlife and functions as an essential green buffer. Its loss would significantly reduce ecological connectivity and visual amenity, impacting local biodiversity and the quality of life for residents, walkers, and cyclists who currently use and enjoy this open space. The site is actively appreciated by the community as a visual break in built development and as a wildlife corridor connecting to other open areas. While the outline proposal includes the retention of woodland, there are serious concerns that development will increase pressure on these areas, potentially leading to degradation over time. I am concerned that the proposed development does not provide an adequate buffer to the woodland corridor and built development will sit too close and will detrimentally impact the existing woodland. There is no BNG Assessment listed in the application documents on the portal so it appears that it hasn?t yet been done. How can there be any confidence that the proposal would be able to satisfy the statutory requirement to deliver 10% net gain. Any BNG delivery off site or through the purchase of biodiversity units elsewhere, dilutes the benefit of 10% net gain as the biodiversity is lost here in this locality and the significant environmental impact is here. Crucially, the proposed development sits adjacent to land at Breadsall recently released from the green belt, which Erewash Borough Council is considering for housing allocation. If both sites are developed, the cumulative impact will be substantial?leading to the loss of meaningful green space, erosion of the rural character of the Great Northern Greenway, and the elimination of the settlement gap between Breadsall and the wider Derby conurbation. For these reasons, I urge the Council to reject the proposal in order to uphold the principles of Policy CP18 and protect the integrity of this important green wedge.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Lee Wheatley	Response-01492	The Green Belt serves fundamental and long-established purposes, including preventing urban sprawl, maintaining the openness and rural character of the countryside, providing opportunities for recreation, and safeguarding the setting of existing settlements. Building 160 houses on this protected land would represent a direct and unacceptable erosion of these crucial functions. Such a substantial development will inevitably lead to increased pressure on the Green Belt through increased traffic, noise and light pollution, and the potential for future incremental encroachment. The visual amenity of the Green Belt, enjoyed by residents of Breadsall Hilltop and the wider area, would be negatively impacted, diminishing the rural buffer that defines the character of our surroundings. The Green Belt land in the vicinity of the proposed development likely contributes to local biodiversity, wildlife corridors, agricultural land and scenic views enjoyed by Breadsall Hilltop residents and users of the Great Northern Greenway. The loss or degradation of these environmental assets due to the development would be a significant detriment to the ecological health and visual appeal of our region. Allowing a development of this scale on or adjacent to the Green Belt could establish a damaging precedent, potentially opening the door for further unwelcome development on protected land in the future. Beyond the direct impact on the Green Belt, the proposed 160 houses also raise concerns about the strain on existing infrastructure and services relied upon by Breadsall Hilltop residents, as outlined in my previous objections. The cumulative impact of a development of this size, potentially impacting the Green Belt and adding to local service demands, is a serious concern that the Core Strategy Review Amendment appears to have not adequately addressed.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Linda Morris	Response-00867	The Green Belt continues to be eroded which leads to a sprawl of Oakwood/Hilltop/Chaddesden. The individual identities of these communities ceases to exist with associated urban behaviour issues arising ie vandalism. Loss of Green Belt will result in the loss of Flora and Fauna which it is important to preserve for future generations.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Linda Smith	Response-01799	I am amazed that the Planning Office would consider using Green Belt land for this proposal. There have already been firm objections to the proposed development between Lime Lane and the ancient woodland of Chaddesden Wood. How then is this parcel of land different and does not attract similar objections using the same criteria.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Lisa Stone	Response-01018	We live basically in the city centre which is all industrial there is so little green space anywhere nearby and we need this for wellbeing and good mental headspace, it's proven that green and nature is positive for mental health having houses in this one local green space we have that's not made and just naturally occurring will just make people move away from the city not attract them, no one wants to live in a concrete jungle with polluted air
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Mandy Cooling	Response-00312	This would appear to be a significant development on Green Wedge. It's particularly concerning at a time when there is so much talk about the environmental impact that we are making and it's disappointing that we aren't seeing any innovative proposals to regenerate and redevelop areas rather than destroying even more green spaces and natural habitat for ancient woodland, birds and animals. In effect this development, along with those proposed by Derby City Council, would join up Oakwood, Breadsall Hilltop, Breadsall Village into one mass of suburbia which I'm not sure benefits anyone - certainly not the environment
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Margaret Stafford	Response-01231	This is a sizeable housing development and will destroy part of the Green Wedge and cause disruption to nature and woodland areas. It is important to preserve these areas as once they are destroyed and built upon, they are never replaced and wildlife habitats are lost. Brown and grey sites should always be considered before green belt areas.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	marion Morris	Response-00870	The green belt continues to be eroded which leads to a sprawl of Oakwood/Hill top/Chaddesden the individual identities of these communities ceases to exist with associated urban behaviour issues arising i.e. vandalism. Loss of greenbelt will result in the loss of habitat for flora and fauna which it is important to preserve for future generations. If greenbelt ceases to be protected the urban spread will be uncontrollable with no city or county delineation.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Martin Harrison	Response-01395	I object to the proposed development as it encroaches on green belt land. These areas are meant to be protected from urban sprawl to preserve natural landscapes, limit overdevelopment, and maintain clear boundaries between communities. Approving this development would set a dangerous precedent and undermine long-standing planning policies.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Mary Hinckley	Response-00297	This proposal would lead to Breadsall Village being an extension of Oakwood. To allow Breadsall to remain as a village a green wedge needs to separate the communities of Oakwood and Breadsall Village.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Mary Moffat	Response-01226	My principal objection is that if this is approved it would mean a loss of Greenbelt and Breadsall village would become an extension of the Derby conurbation. This would also be contrary to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment 359 which stated that this area was unsuitable for residential development. Erewash's Green Belt Assessment states that this land performs poorly against the main purposes of the Green Belt and this ignores the main clauses of the National Planning Policy Framework NPPF 13. NPPF 13. Protecting Green Belt land 142. The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. 143. Green Belt serves five purposes: a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Erewash Council appear determined to ignore NPPF 13. This proposed extension of the Derby conurbation contradicts all of the above and would ensure that Breadsall Village becomes a suburb of Derby. We have a right to remain a village and enjoy our surrounding areas of Green Belt.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Masheda Chowdhury	Response-01339	1. Encroachment into the Green Belt and Urban Sprawl: ? The proposed development extends the built-up area northward, reducing the separation between Breadsall village and the urban edge of Oakwood. ? This undermines one of the core purposes of the Green Belt: to prevent towns from merging and to safeguard the countryside from encroachment. 2. Loss of Open, Rural Character: ? The northern boundary of the site lies immediately adjacent to open countryside and Green Belt land, which provides an important visual and environmental buffer between the city and Breadsall. ? Building on this site will degrade the rural setting and diminish the visual transition between Derby?s urban fringe and the countryside, contrary to the aims of Strategic Policy 1. 3. Sets a Dangerous Precedent for Future Green Belt Erosion: ? With 14.6 hectares of safeguarded land identified nearby, approving 160 homes here opens the door to incremental erosion of protected land. ? Safeguarded land is not the same as allocated land and should not be used as justification for large developments encroaching on protected zones. 4. No Exceptional Circumstances Justifying Green Belt Release: ? National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 140 requires that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, which must be fully evidenced and justified. ? No such exceptional justification has been provided in this case for why development in or adjacent to Green Belt should proceed. 5. Negative Impact on Biodiversity and Landscape Character: ? The Green Belt in this area supports a variety of habitats and is adjacent to the Great Northern Greenway (Local Wildlife Site ER005). ? Development here could fragment habitats and reduce biodiversity connectivity ? going against local and national biodiversity goals. 6. Conflicts with Local Policy Commitments to Preserve Landscape: ? Strategic Policy 1.8 does mention landscaping, but it fails to mitigate the full impact of a major housing block at the edge of the Green Belt. ? This development weakens the landscape protection aims outlined in Derby City and Derbyshire County policies.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Matt	Response-00604	Need to keep up to Derbyshires rural setting once you build on the belt can never go back
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Megan Byrne	Response-01432	Major impact see other comments
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Michael Grignon	Response-01335	What is the point of having green belt if it is not respected by the powers that be, especially when there are so many brown belt sites ready for development
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Michael Poplar	Response-00565	This is vandalism of existing Green Belt in direct contravention of current NPPF Green Belt protections given in paragraphs 142 and 143. The unrestricted sprawl would effectively join onto Breadsall merging it with Derby as a mere suburb.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Mollie	Response-01549	The site lies within the Derbyshire Green Belt, protected under the Erewash Local Plan (Policy EN1) and NPPF paragraphs 137?138. Developing here would harm openness, create urban sprawl, and set an unwanted precedent for further encroachment. The fields and hedgerows support protected species (hazel dormouse, nesting farmland birds). The ecological surveys in the application are insufficiently robust, and no clear mitigation or long-term management plan is provided. Local footpaths and informal green spaces used daily by residents for walking and mental health will be severed or degraded without any on-site public open space meeting the required 10?ha per 1,000 population standard.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Monique Johnson	Response-00663	There are plenty of brown belt sites that could be used rather than encroaching on our green belt which is very precious for all the reasons already given. In Derby city there are brown sites which would be ideal. Re using spaces that have already been used for building. This would also make much better sense as residents there would be closer to work or transport (bus and train stations) to get to work. The city would also benefit from the presence of these people to bring more economic and social activity right there.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Mrs Bullock	Response-00966	Please protect our green belt.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Mrs Francoise Poplar	Response-00602	This is a primary concern as the proposals would effectively join Derby onto Breadsall contrary to the intention outlined in the current NPPF, which states that Green Belt protection is important to stop neighbouring towns merging into one another, to check unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas and to safeguard the countryside from encroachment.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Mr SJ Read and Mrs S E Read	Response-01225	This is the most important objection to the proposed housing development. This land has always fulfilled the key green belt function "to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas" (NPPF Clause 143) and as recently as 2022 the land was agreed to be unsuitable for development (SHLAA 359). The value of the land in fulfilling this basic green belt function has in fact increased in the past few years as development within the Oakwood area has moved closer and closer to the Erewash boundary. The implication of the allocation of this land for housing development is that it has suddenly become perfectly acceptable for Breadsall to become a suburb of Derby. No valid justification has been given for this abrupt change of policy. Erewash Borough Council states that this land "performs poorly" against greenbelt criteria yet, as stated above, it actually fulfils its greenbelt function perfectly. In the consultations for the recent Breadsall Neighbourhood Plan preservation of the green belt was the most frequently mentioned topic. Although the Neighbourhood Plan was not permitted to create a formal policy related to the green belt the consultation process gave a clear indication of the strength of local feeling on this subject.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Mr Softley	Response-00344	What green belt? There will be nothing left. Do not kid yourselves into thinking you care about this with the proposals you have made.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Mrs Sarah Morley	Response-01515	The whole purpose of Green Belt areas is to stop the unrestricted spawl of large build up areas. If houses are build in this area, then the to areas will run into one. Green Belt areas are very important and we must keep them. I own number 5 Manor Farm Barns, my husband purchased this 20 years ago, when they were first built. As part of living at these Barns we have to follow strict criteria, i.e. we have to only have wooden brown windows. We have to only use certain materials. These were put into place to protect the look of the area. What is the point of this if you are going to try and build 100's of houses on this land. Why when there is so much land in Derby that isn't green belt and protected land, do you have to build land on this area and change the name of it. I DONT THINK YOU HAVE MADE IT CLEAR AT ALL THAT YOU WANT THE LAND TO BE ALLOWED TO BE BUILT ON IN THE FUTURE.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Nathan Cooke	Response-00896	Should not be built on!

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Neal Flint	Response-01220	The land earmarked for development and the land safeguarded are the last vital green belt to protect Breadsall as a village, for years developments have encroached on the village and this is the only small section now dividing us from urban sprawl and protecting its rural status and feel. The developments especially the safeguarded land would almost tower of the village due to the elevation of the land and would blight the village visually it is outrageous that it could even be considered for development, it would leave us with hardly any separation from the estates of Oakwood and Chaddesden and almost finish us off as a village settlement it also sets a dangerous precedent for other areas of green belt and protected land.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Nicholas Lloyd	Response-00356	I strongly object to this planning application on the grounds that the proposed development constitutes inappropriate development on designated Green Belt land, as defined by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The primary purpose of Green Belts is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open, and this development would undermine that objective. The NPPF stipulates that such development should only be permitted in "very special circumstances," which have not been demonstrated in this case. Allowing this development would set a concerning precedent, potentially leading to further erosion of protected Green Belt areas. Additionally, the loss of this land would negatively impact local biodiversity, disrupt wildlife habitats, and diminish the quality of life for residents who currently benefit from the open, rural character of the area. Therefore, I urge the planning authority to reject this application to preserve the integrity of the Green Belt and maintain the environmental and social benefits it provides.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Oakwood Ward Councillors Eyre, Mulhall and Trehwella	Response-01359	We would like to see a report of a full study of the impact of this development.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Patrick Baker	Response-01349	The proposed development would make an unbroken housed area joining to the Derby city developments. Breadsall village would effectively be joined to Derby in terms of access for walkers and wildlife
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Peter John Ball	Response-00705	This site will join the village of Breadsall to the Derby City suburbs. This negates the whole reason for having a Greenbelt which is to restrict the merger of urban areas.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Philip Booth	Response-00683	Green belt land is meant to protect against building and preserve the land so the biodiversity is not lost forever. I understand this is a green belt area and is sometimes referred to as Green Wedge, which has constraints.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Rachael	Response-00332	It is Green belt land that is being proposed to build on. We need to preserve our Green belt to ensure we have access to clean, fresh air. Wildlife, exercise, a happy and healthy way of life.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Richard Hewitt	Response-01464	I have lived in Breadsall village for 34 years and it is a little haven surrounded by fields, walkways and a general feel of living in the countryside while being a short distance from Derby, A38 and A52. Further development will eventually lead to Breadsall being swallowed up into a Derby district. With this planning application and the one for the green belt / woods opposite Morrisons on Sir Frank Whittle Way, the area will become over developed.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Richard Johnson	Response-00697	The green belt is supposed to provide a distinction between built up areas and agricultural use of land / countryside. It always seems the green 'belt' suffers the first to be ignored and the land gradually depleted to provide new housing. We need green space for farming and recreation. Let's use existing derelict sites for building and avoid encroaching onto 'Green Belt' land.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Richard Stone	Response-01029	The old railway line walk is a popular and great area to walk and is enjoyed by people and animals, not only this it has a historic value all destroyed by houses in this area. It is also a fairly steep hill and not good land for putting houses on anyway.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Richard Straw	Response-01412	The green belt would be completely gone and all the wildlife and heritage would disappear
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Robert Mee	Response-01501	The Core Strategy and this Amendment are developed in order to meet the housing targets allocated to the council by central government. I do not believe that the number of houses required by government constitutes, in itself, the 'exceptional circumstances' which are required under the Framework. This is particularly so in view of there being no published objective basis for the numbers allocated to each authority. The term 'exceptional circumstances' does include 'instances where an authority cannot meet its identified need for homes'. The waiting list for social housing in the general area might suggest that this is the case, but I do not accept that these plans will go far to address this issue. The vast majority of the planned housing allocations are not even for affordable housing, let alone social housing. Additionally, I do not remember seeing evidence that Erewash has specifically quantified local (i.e. Erewash) housing needs. I also do not believe that much, if any, of the Green Belt selected for development would fit the definition of 'Grey Belt'. As a concept, I can support the idea of Grey Belt as originally reported, i.e. pieces of land within the Green Belt which have previously been developed. Indeed, I can think of a few locally, though they are all fairly small. I find the arguments that I have heard over distances between the edge of Derby and the edge of other towns, and how these distances will still be maintained, extremely spurious. The Green Belt in its entirety exists to prevent Nottingham and Derby from merging. While building on any of these sites does not immediately make the two cities any closer to each other, it does reduce the green space between the two cities, which is precisely what the Green Belt was established to prevent. The Green Belt is a regional initiative, covering two counties and several local authorities. With Erewash having such a high proportion of its land earmarked as Green Belt it is incumbent on the region as a whole to find a solution to the housing shortage, rather than to expect our authority to have to sacrifice its green spaces. This site, like that at Acorn Way, has the immediate effect of enlarging Derby, situated as it is next to the recent development within the Derby City boundaries (which doesn't appear to be shown on the map included within the consultation document. This needs to be rectified before anything is submitted to the Planning Inspectorate).

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Robert Mee	Response-01789	My main reason for objecting to these developments is that I do not believe that the criteria set out in the NPPF has been met justifying any encroachment into the Green Belt at this time. The Core Strategy and this Amendment are developed in order to meet the housing targets allocated to the council by central government. I do not believe that the number of houses required by government constitutes, in itself, the ?exceptional circumstances? which are required under the Framework. This is particularly so in view of there being no published objective basis for the numbers allocated to each authority. The term ?exceptional circumstances? does include ?instances where an authority cannot meet its identified need for homes?. The waiting list for social housing in the general area might suggest that this is the case, but I do not accept that these plans will go far to address this issue ? the vast majority of the planned housing allocations are not even for affordable housing, let alone social housing. Additionally, I do not remember seeing evidence that Erewash has specifically quantified local (i.e. Erewash) housing needs. I also do not believe that much, if any, of the Green Belt selected for development would fit the definition of ?Grey Belt?. As a concept, I can support the idea of Grey Belt as originally reported, i.e. pieces of land within the Green Belt which have previously been developed ? indeed, I can think of a few locally, though they are all fairly small. I find the arguments that I have heard over distances between the edge of Derby and the edge of other towns, and how these distances will still be maintained, extremely spurious. The Green Belt in its entirety exists to prevent Nottingham and Derby from merging ? while building on any of these sites does not immediately make the two cities any closer to each other, it does reduce the green space between the two cities, which is precisely what the Green Belt was established to prevent. The Green Belt is a regional initiative, covering two counties and several local authorities. With Erewash having such a high proportion of its land earmarked as Green Belt it is incumbent on the region as a whole to find a solution to the housing shortage, rather than to expect our authority to have to sacrifice its green spaces. This site, like that at Acorn Way, has the immediate effect of enlarging Derby, situated as it is next to the recent development within the Derby City boundaries (which doesn't appear to be shown on the map included within the consultation document ? this needs to be rectified before anything is submitted to the Planning Inspectorate).
1.6	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Roy Ling	Response-01243	This is green belt land and a wedge between Derby City and Breadsall Village. In 2022 this land was deemed unsuitable for residential development, SHLAA 359.
1.6	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Ruth Duxbury	Response-00301	There are already several housing developments in this area and all have no regard to the environment. Often old trees and hedgerows are cut down and not replaced.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Samantha Watts	Response-00869	The proposed development threatens protected Green Belt land, which serves as a vital buffer against urban sprawl and preserves the rural character of Breadsall Village. Green Belt areas are designated to prevent uncontrolled expansion, safeguard natural landscapes, and maintain biodiversity. Allowing construction on this land undermines these principles and sets a concerning precedent for future developments. Beyond its environmental value, the Green Belt provides essential recreational space for residents and supports local wildlife. The loss of this land would diminish access to green spaces, negatively impacting community well-being and biodiversity. Furthermore, national and local planning policies emphasize that Green Belt development should only occur in exceptional circumstances. There is no compelling justification for this proposal, especially when alternative brownfield sites could be considered.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Sam Saunders	Response-01557	The proposed development involves building on designated Green Belt land, which raises substantial concerns due to the fundamental purpose and protections that Green Belt status provides. Green Belt land is specifically protected under national planning policy to prevent urban sprawl, preserve the openness and character of rural areas, and safeguard the countryside from inappropriate development. Constructing 160 homes on this land would fundamentally undermine these objectives, leading to irreversible environmental and social consequences. Building on Green Belt land results in the permanent loss of open spaces that serve as essential natural buffers between settlements. This erosion of the Green Belt compromises the clear physical distinction between Derby's urban area and the village of Breadsall, threatening the separate identities of communities and increasing the risk of coalescence. The development would encroach on valued landscapes, reduce biodiversity, and disrupt wildlife habitats, particularly given the site's proximity to the Great Northern Greenway and other local wildlife sites. Furthermore, Green Belt land plays a vital role in carbon sequestration, flood mitigation, and maintaining local climate resilience. Development increases impermeable surfaces, exacerbating flood risk and reducing natural drainage. The loss of Green Belt space diminishes opportunities for recreation and mental well-being for local residents, as these green areas provide important informal amenity spaces. Given the national and local importance of protecting Green Belt land, any proposal to develop within it should be subject to the highest scrutiny. Exceptional circumstances must be demonstrated, and all alternatives outside the Green Belt thoroughly exhausted. This proposal fails to justify the harmful impacts of building on protected Green Belt land, and approval would set a concerning precedent for future encroachment into valued open countryside.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Sandra Perry	Response-00307	It's a disgrace that there's a proposal to build even more, right up to the city boundary. There is no green belt. Why build in fresh green land instead of brown field. And such poor quality housing with no garden.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Sara Cotton	Response-00370	Green belt land is important for our environment
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Sarah Hewitt	Response-01461	There are plenty of other areas to use. This will bring Breadsall village closer to Oakwood which 50 years ago was not supposed to happen. There should be a green wedge. We have the lovely Greenway. Please leave this beautiful area alone.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Saravan P	Response-01448	I object to the proposed development, in both its original and amended forms, due to its clear contravention of Green Wedge Policy CP18. Even with the A61 area excluded, this application still threatens a crucial green corridor along the Great Northern Greenway, directly bordering existing woodland and open countryside. This site is a valuable wildlife habitat and a vital green buffer, cherished by the community for its ecological significance and as a visual amenity for residents, walkers, and cyclists. Its loss would severely diminish ecological connections and the visual landscape. While some woodland is proposed for retention, I am deeply concerned about the increased pressure and inadequate buffer zones, which will likely lead to its degradation.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Scarlett Hamblin	Response-00398	We need to protect our diminishing green belt. We cannot allow for houses to destroy our green areas.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Scott Watson	Response-01284	The proposed development puts protected Green Belt land at risk, an area that plays a crucial role in preventing urban sprawl and maintaining the rural character of Breadsall Village. Green Belt designation exists to limit unchecked expansion, protect natural landscapes, and support biodiversity. Permitting construction here would disregard these principles, setting a troubling precedent for future development. Aside from its environmental importance, the Green Belt provides valuable recreational space for the community and serves as a habitat for local wildlife. Losing this land would reduce access to green spaces, negatively affecting both biodiversity and residents' well-being. Furthermore, national and local planning policies make clear that development within the Green Belt should only be permitted under exceptional circumstances. In this case, there is no compelling justification, particularly when suitable brownfield alternatives are available
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Sharon Coward	Response-00348	The position of the development will negatively affect the people of oakwood & the green belt that surrounds it. A deliberate policy of building on the boundary with oakwood & Breadsall will negatively affect the green belt surround these areas.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Silvia Mircic	Response-00884	This expansion of the Derby conurbation directly contradicts the findings of the previous Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA 359), which deemed the site unsuitable for residential development. NPPF 13. Protecting Green Belt land 142. The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. 143. Green Belt serves five purposes: a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Simon Ferrad	Response-00853	This will completely remove the green belt between Derby and Breadsall village. The village will essentially become a suburb of Derby.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	simon morris	Response-00866	The green belt continues to be eroded which leads to a sprawl of Oakwood/Hill top/Chaddesden the individual identities of these communities ceases to exist with associated urban behaviour issues arising i.e. vandalism. Loss of greenbelt will result in the loss of habitat for flora and fauna which it is important to preserve for future generations. If greenbelt ceases to be protected the urban spread will be uncontrollable with no city or county delineation.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Siu Lap Lau	Response-00606	Green space is important for everyone. Absolutely needs protect.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Stella Beaumont	Response-00842	Green belt ? Is there any left to plunder ? We need to preserve it
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Stephen and Janet Allis	Response-01221	does it still exist?
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Stephen Brown	Response-01832	1) Basic amenity ? do we really want to continue extending our developments and housing further into the green belt? This is not in character with this neighbourhood.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Steven furness	Response-01516	This will eliminate the green gap between Breadsall village and Derby. Unacceptable.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Stuart Brown	Response-00771	Any development on greenbelt is not environmentally acceptable. Directly impacts established biodiversity?s in the area
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Susan Dundon	Response-00396	It will affect our green belt
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Thomas Bateman-Wong	Response-00985	Looking at the plans, how is everything greenbelt apart from this specific spot? The whole area should be greenbelt. There are definitely other areas of Derby that would suit that would not take away from the greenbelt. Other rundown buildings and sites that should be rejuvenated rather than just leaving them ruined and moving on to ruin somewhere further.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Thomas Monkhouse.	Response-01318	Once again the area proposed for development is Green Belt farming land. Green Belt land should still be protected particularly farmland for the production of food
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Tom Parker	Response-01398	The land in which the development is being proposed to be built on is in fact green belt, we need to keep our green belt in order to have access to clean, fresh air, wildlife, exercise and a happy healthy way of living
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Tony Hawkins	Response-01532	The preservation of this greenbelt land referred to above helps to achieve these key objectives. It also provides separation of neighbouring towns and rural settlements within Erewash Borough and separates Breadsall from the Derby conurbation. The map provided in the consultation document is incorrect and does not show the existing Durose County Estate as demonstrated in the image below highlighting the estate. Housing on this land will merge into the existing estate and Derby City contradicting: ? 142. The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. ? 143. Green Belt serves five purposes: a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The landscape of the countryside for Breadsall/Breadsall Hill Top will disappear and become one big housing estate connecting Breadsall to Derby City
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Green Belt	Wobbina Bugg	Response-00846	This is Green Belt and an important area for biodiversity
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Adam Garner	Response-00613	Already limited in the area are Oakwood and Chadeston are at capacity now. It?s very difficult to get an appointment today, and often need to use the walk in in town or A&E.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Adam Millward	Response-00418	Again, my parents live in Oakwood and they already can't get in at Oakwood dentist or doctors surgery, they have to travel to city centre to access both if these services. New dentist, gp and health Centre would needed to be included in this project.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Adelle Cavanagh	Response-00392	It is almost impossible to get an appointment with our GP as it is. I cannot contemplate how the current healthcare services can begin to consider taking on more patients
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Alexander lee	Response-01439	Practically non existent due to staffing shortages. Again this will make it worse.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Alex Cargill	Response-01834	*GP surgeries .Already overloaded
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Alistair Crawford	Response-01404	There is no provision to support the extra housing in terms of schools, dentists, doctors, drainage and sewers. Previous reviews stated this land is unsuitable for residential building and was conducted with due diligence by the planning department and councillors who actually visited the site at the time. This has now been overturned by this latest amendment without the same due diligence or physical visits. The details on the maps published for consultation are incorrect and out of date in respect of access roads and complete development of the Manor Farm Development.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Amber	Response-00329	Cannot get appointment now in Oakwood let alone with two further huge developments!
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Amber Hubbard	Response-00845	Local GP practices are beyond capacity with long waits to even get an appointment. Additional development will only make this worse. Same applies to lack of dentist or pharmacy provision
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Andrea R Rowley	Response-01230	Existing healthcare facilities are already very over stretched. What plans are in place to increase capacity to accommodate the extra people coming into the area?
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Andrea wightman	Response-00354	Where are the healthcare facilities ?? This is an erewash development and it appears the facilities of Oakwood are expected to be used. It is extremely difficult to gwt access to the local doctors in Oakwood, a few hundred more people trying to access an already stretched service is not acceptable. A new doctors, dentist and pharmacy are needed as the existing ones are not able to cope with more demand
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Andy Madeley	Response-00381	I am unable to get on to a NHS dentist practice, and it took 30 days to see a nurse at the surgery. Increasing houses will reduce the capacity of local services.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Angela Clarke	Response-01400	Access to already busy Drs, Dentists in the local area , no planning evident for new or extra services becoming available for increased population numbers in local area.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Angela Smyth	Response-00296	The doctor surgery in Oakwood is already at capacity. No new housing should be built in the area until this is sorted. New GP surgeries and dentists are needed for Oakwood and the two additional housing estates already built.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Ann Sherlock	Response-00410	The map used is out of date and the local healthcare facilities are already at capacity. Adding the current proposal will be extremely detrimental to the local healthcare facilities, and it is disappointing that the public have been intentionally lied to in relation to how the current proposal will affect the area, missing two extremely large housing estates and falsely portraying a smaller population and impact the housing proposal will have.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	A O Smith	Response-01798	There is no provision in the proposals to support the infrastructure needed , such as doctors surgeries.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Ashley syll	Response-00397	What provision to access healthcare, already oversubscribed for healthcare provision prior to additional 160 houses. Access to emergency services and access routes also limited
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Ben Martin	Response-00787	There has been zero improvement to doctor facilities, dentists, public transport, schools, parks etc since the development of the Breadsall Hilltop and Persimmon estates on the already health care stressed area of Oakwood.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Bethany Seivewright	Response-01563	No additional health services being built, doctors are already overcrowded and is almost impossible to get an appointment. The Oakwood surgery also doesn't accept half of Durose estate as out of catchment - never mind additional houses
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Beverly Jordan	Response-01330	Two estates have already been built putting pressure in this areas for medical facilities
		Healthcare Facilities	Brendan Hargreaves	Response-00629	the healthcare facilities are already struggling without extra pressure with more people
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Bridgette Cussens	Response-00390	The healthcare services are already at full capacity, I struggle to get appointments when needed and adding to that will make it much worse for myself and the current residents of oakwood
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Cameron Coope	Response-00369	GP and dentist places are already few and far between
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Carl Hill	Response-00670	I cannot get a dentist appointment my GP is in the city centre as I cannot get a spot at the Oakwood surgery who is paying for additional GP?s for the potential 800 residents before factoring in the existing development next door and the one at Lime Lane..
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Carol Westcott	Response-00973	We cannot get an appointment at our already full GP practices how are we going to in the future with at least another 320 people needing a Doctor's surgery

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Carys Whomsley	Response-01438	I am writing to register my strong objection to the above-mentioned planning application, both in its original and revised form. Despite the removal of the area adjacent to the A61 in the amended proposal, I believe that the proposed development remains deeply inappropriate and harmful for the following reasons: 1. Contravention of Policy CP18 and Loss of Green Wedge The proposed site lies just outside the designated Green Belt, but crucially directly abuts existing woodland and open countryside, forming part of the vital green corridor along the Great Northern Greenway. This area functions as a green buffer, enhancing ecological connectivity, supporting biodiversity, and providing visual and recreational amenity to local residents, walkers, and cyclists. Despite claims of woodland retention, the development threatens the integrity of this space. Proximity to new housing would increase human pressure on the natural environment, likely leading to degradation of woodland, fragmentation of habitats, and a reduction in wildlife corridors. No Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) assessment appears in the application documents, raising concerns about whether the legally mandated 10% net gain can or will be achieved. Biodiversity enhancements delivered off-site would do nothing to mitigate local ecological loss, thereby undermining environmental sustainability in the area. Moreover, the site lies adjacent to land recently released from the Green Belt and under consideration for housing allocation by Erewash Borough Council. The cumulative impact of developing both sites would be devastating: a continuous sprawl from Derby through to Breadsall, resulting in the elimination of the settlement gap and permanent damage to the character of the Great Northern Greenway. 2. Environmental, Infrastructural, and Policy Concerns The proposal directly contradicts the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Paragraph 143, particularly the goals of preventing urban sprawl and protecting the openness of Green Belt land. It also ignores the findings of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA 359), which previously deemed the site unsuitable for residential development due to accessibility and environmental limitations. The development is completely incompatible with the objectives of the Breadsall Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2019?2029, particularly the aims to: Preserve the rural character and prevent urbanisation; Avoid coalescence with the Derby conurbation; Safeguard wildlife and ecological features; Control flood risk and infrastructure strain; Protect valued green spaces and visual vistas.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Carys Whomsley	Response-01439	Breadsall has already experienced increased flooding, attributed to upstream developments like Persimmon Estate and Breadsall Hilltop, which lie within the same water catchment area. Any additional development would worsen this issue, placing homes and infrastructure at risk. Furthermore, the proposal relies on access through two existing public footpaths within the Redrow estate and offers no concrete infrastructure improvements. The A608 is already over-congested, and no plans are presented to handle increased traffic or to safeguard children commuting to local schools. 3. Loss of Community and Ecological Value This land offers more than just open space?it is a much-loved and well-used amenity for the local community. It serves as a peaceful escape for informal recreation and nature engagement, and its visual and environmental contributions to the neighbourhood are significant. Its destruction would represent a major loss in local character and quality of life. The proposal underestimates the pressure on existing services, lacks detailed mitigation plans, and fails to explain how proposed footpaths will link meaningfully into existing routes. Nearby Local Wildlife Sites will be impacted
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Charlotte	Response-00458	No local doctors in the area. Currently not taking on patients for local dentists, over capacity issues. Oakwood shops at capacity with car park always full, no other amenities to support more housing.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Chris Harris	Response-01521	Already inadequate doctors surgeries
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Chris Hopkinson	Response-01396	Same as school. Added strain to derby city area
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Chris Lunn	Response-01410	Local doctors and health services are already stretched far beyond capacity. Clearly this is not a problem confined to Derby but why is it necessary to inflict even more suffering and hardship on an already over populated, over developed area? Getting a doctor?s appointment in a timely manner is virtually impossible which leads to the ?clogging up? of A & E Departments and causing additional strain on hospitals or walk-in clinics. Waiting times for appointments will cause even more delays in getting treatment delivering a poorer quality service. When the Redrow estate was built, again no consideration was given to the additional number of people all requiring doctors and healthcare, hence we now have an overloaded system in the area which cannot cope as it is, without the additional 160 houses being proposed. Mental health issues are likely to rise as stress builds up due to frustration caused by too many people, in too small an area, all trying to access the same places at the same time. This proposed development cannot be allowed to go ahead; this land is vital to the wellbeing of the area, the community and the wildlife.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Clare Roters	Response-01553	Go appointments in the area are massively hard to get and those of us with existing conditions are already suffering with the services already provided in the area
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Dana Demidoff	Response-00634	Again no infrastructure
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	David Byrne	Response-01433	Health care facilities particularly at oakwood precinct is already constrained, often being impossible to get face to face appointments, more residents will worsen this
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	David Duxbury	Response-00305	This development is on the edge of Erewash and healthcare services will almost certainly be provided by the park medical practise. This practice is already vastly over subscribed. Services have not been expanded and developments adjacent to the proposed development and adjacent to lime lane have already added significantly to demand.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Edward James Gregory	Response-00728	Doctors / Dentists are already at capacity, and Erewash does not provide these services in this area. Erewash should provide developments where it will service the residents, not assume other areas will provide this.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Elaine hodgkinson	Response-00854	Oakwood doctors are already heavily over subscribe with it being impossible to get an appointment for the majority of people. This development will not have any positive affect on funding from developers.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Emma Charlton	Response-01545	The local GP surgery?s are struggling under pressure of being over subscribed



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Emma Daniels	Response-00346	All the houses keep going up in Oakwood and no additional healthcare facilities to accommodate these people. Cannot get into a dentist or an appointment at the drs when needed as it is, why add extra strain on already overstretched non existent facilities in Oakwood
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Emma Hawkins	Response-00813	There are only two doctors in Oakwood which covers a vast catchment area and are full to capacity with appointments very difficult to achieve. There is one dentist in Oakwood whom are not taking on NHS patients this dentist business is more cosmetic. There are not facilities within Breadsall Village under Erewash Borough Council which can services this new proposed development.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Faye Wilkinson	Response-01129	There are no plans to provide or build new healthcare services in this area. Residents of the community already report difficulties obtaining access to GP or dentist services. Again, it is not environmentally conscious to expect residents to have to drive to these services.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Gary Murfin	Response-00374	Park medical and Lister house surgeries already struggle and seem to be at full capacity, it's very hard to get a appointment sometimes, also there aren't enough dentists in the area and no nhs dentists
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Gaynor Pawley	Response-00627	After Multiple recent developments it is near on impossible to get an appointment at the doctors. The plans will build on Erewash land but due to the proximity to Oakwood, Derby City facilities would be more favourable without any contribution to improve the services. All the revenue from these houses would end up elsewhere.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Ged Doherty	Response-01822	The area is already stretched beyond the limit for medical facilities and to force through yet more development into such a small area is nonsensical and will have a considerable impact on those already resident.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Gemma Cotter	Response-01374	There is inadequate access to GP services and dentistry around this area of Derby. Lister House frequently has no capacity across its 4 clinics (car ownership essential to accept short notice appointments in Chellaston, Alvaston or Normanton). My family has experienced asthma escalating to 999 calls because timely access to a GP for additional steroids to relieve symptoms was not available. This is a greater overall cost to the NHS. There is no NHS dentistry in Oakwood. Breadsall does not have any medical services locally.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Gillian Pearson	Response-00303	Will there be any additional healthcare provision included in the planning conditions? We are currently waiting several weeks for a non urgent doctor's appointment at our GP practice.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Harry Mee	Response-00882	They do not have the capacity for 190 new houses.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Helen Walker	Response-00325	Don't start on healthcare what healthcare we go to a doctors in Spondon and have done for years again no adequate health provisions for Oakwood and the surrounding area before the last lot of houses were built and even less now, we are Derby City yet it is Erewash who are wanting these houses built but won't be affecting their health facilities as it will be again all the docs etc around here fighting to provide facilities for them.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Hulland, Bdverley	Response-00496	GP - already struggle to get in at GP, more houses just makes even worse than it us
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Jake Moore	Response-01202	The addition of 160 new homes will place significant pressure on local healthcare facilities, including GP surgeries, dental practices, and hospitals. These services are already operating at or near full capacity, with long waiting times and limited appointment availability for existing residents. As the development would likely bring several hundred new residents to the area, it will: Exacerbate existing waiting times for GP appointments and other essential health services; Overburden local healthcare professionals, leading to delays in care and reduced service quality; Increase demand for mental health services, particularly with the added stresses that a rapidly growing population can bring; Place pressure on pharmacy services and other local health resources, further limiting access for current residents. There has been no indication that the developer has made provisions for expanding or improving local healthcare infrastructure to meet the needs of the additional residents. The failure to address this will create further health disparities and undermine efforts to ensure accessible healthcare for all.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	James Bellaby	Response-00337	The very small doctors is very difficult to get an appointment as it is.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	James Roberts	Response-00673	As per School Capacity, the Oakwood GPs are already rejecting patients from the existing estate, stating it is outside of the Oakwood district map, so the current estate has to look to Allestree for GP placements. An extra 160 households will not be manageable with the current GP capacity in Allestree, and will put an increased strain on Derby hospital which regularly gets close to black alert status given the lack of beds and doctors. Again this is commonly overlooked in the general rush to build more houses (which are needed undoubtedly, but not without the infrastructure and support in place first)
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	James skivington	Response-00359	Very hard to get any local dentist and doctors currently adding to this will only scratch demand
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Jamie Branagan	Response-00335	No one living on this proposed new estate will look to Erewash for their health needs. Clearly they will all look to Oakwood and Derby city for doctors, dentists and emergency care. All of which are already overstretched. Most current residents have to travel out of Oakwood for a doctors or dentists appointment.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Janet O'Brien	Response-01835	There is no provision to support the extra housing in terms of dentists and doctors
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Janette Glenn	Response-00422	Local GP practices already cannot provide enough appointments to meet local demand. The problem would be exacerbated by adding yet more homes to the edge of Oakwood.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Jared Smyth	Response-00894	The GP in Oakwood is already oversubscribed
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Jason Reader	Response-00320	No mention of additional health care provision, both doctors and dentists.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Jeanette Kent	Response-00402	Healthcare facilities are already grossly oversubscribed. Try giving up valuable space for doctors surgeries, dentists etc before even more housing that will again be using Derby City money and resources whilst paying Amber Valley taxes
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	J Hasse	Response-00875	More houses means more strain on local doctors and dentists.
			Jim Smith	Response-00741	There appears to be no intention to provide any additional social provisions such as GP surgery, which are already over stretched.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	John Harlow	Response-00619	Having just spent over 12 hours in the A&E at Derby royal hospital I can't reassure you that there is no and I repeat NO capacity for any extra patients. GPs are over worked with no room for extra patients. I fear that people at this proposed site would have to come into Oakwood / Chad. hoping for an appointment but there are none, even for the residents that currently live at Oakwood Dentists are also very restricted with very few offering NHS patients
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	John Hudson-Peat	Response-01833	The lack of infrastructure to service new developments are none existence (GPs etc) just take a look at the recent developments close by.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Jonathan Park	Response-01191	Their is not enough capacity to serve the current populace of the area in regards to doctors and dentists, this will only exacerbate this issue further - no new health care facilities have been proposed.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Jon Lewis	Response-00347	Local doctor's practices are already overloaded. It is virtually impossible to get quick appointments even for children. Which are then having to attend emergency medical centres. The increase in housing and population will only make the above worse.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Julie Bates	Response-01326	As a person who has a chronic illness the affect more houses will have on trying to get drs appointments will be terrible , we already can't get appointments as it is and all the drs in the areas are the same so this will have a massive effect on all of us who live nearby . The chance of getting appointments is already next to impossible. We have to go through 111 and then the walk in centres I don't see how they will cope with more patients coming to live into in this area .
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Julie Herbert	Response-01282	Oakwood and Chaddesden doctors can not cope with their current patient load, it is impossible to get an appointment already, this development will make this so much worse, I already live in fear of requiring medical help.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Justine Dean	Response-00844	I am local and have given up on my doctors and dentist. The lack of available healthcare is already a problem. If you build please be kind to new residents and tell them they do so without the chance of getting a doctors or dentist where appointments are available
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Kara Crossley	Response-00865	It's already impossible to get into the local GP practices so without more infrastructure like this to go with new housing developments then more pressure is being added to already stretched services
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Karen Read	Response-00923	It is almost impossible to get health care in our area so how do you propose to cater for the increased demand for the many services that people require when you are already overwhelmed with the current numbers on the books it is a very alarming situation could you respond to how you will address this situation and where you will build the facilities required to service the community I would also like a survey on the current residents mental health as this obviously causes alarm and distress to people whom will be adversely affected by the destruction of greenbelt land and their homes
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Karen Webster	Response-00420	Existing GPs and Dentists are already over subscribed. You cannot get appts now, how will these houses help with that, the bad situation will just become worse. None of the contribution from Erewash helps with this and yet it's the Derby council tax payers that will suffer with worsening healthcare facilities.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Keerthi	Response-01450	To accommodate 160 House new health care facilities should be added. The proposal doesn't take it into account. I personally suffered quite a bit to get a dental appointment with the existing number of houses.i can't agine how it is going to be with 160 more houses.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Kimberley Woodward	Response-01445	You can't get a doctors appointment as it is let alone with more people in the area.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Kirstin Woodward	Response-01043	What healthcare facilities ! My dentist is in Allestree, my doctors is in Derby City Centre. The nearest walk in centre/hospital is 20 mins drive in either direction. My elderly parents-in-law came to live with us and we couldn't get them a local doctor so travel to the opposite side of Derby for care!
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	K Munson	Response-00631	Already inadequate with a service struggling to cope
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Laura Fallows	Response-00339	Already terribly over subscribed doctors surgeries. Appointments never available.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Laura Louca	Response-01266	Same as the school capacity issue - enormous amount of new homes but no new doctors surgeries or dentists (NHS or otherwise)
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	L Burton	Response-00342	It is impossible to get an appointment in local surgeries. We are at a doctors in Chaddesden as it is slightly better than that local to us, which is still a drive away
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Lee Wheatley	Response-01492	The proposed Core Strategy Review Amendment raises concerns about the capacity of schools and healthcare facilities in Breadsall and Breadsall Hilltop to accommodate increased population from planned development. Breadsall CoFE VC Primary School is near capacity, and increased housing will pressure primary and secondary schools across Derby, potentially leading to oversized classes and shortages. Healthcare services, including GP surgeries like Lister House and Park Lane, and Royal Derby Hospital, will face strain, causing longer wait times. The development's impact on local infrastructure, including accessibility to schools and healthcare, and the need for expanded facilities and resources, is a key concern, along with the effect on community resources and local businesses like the Central Co-op and The Windmill Inn.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Lisa Stone	Response-01018	Again all healthcare facilities are full and already cannot see all the patients needing appointments and peoples prescriptions are constantly delayed because of the sheer amount of people needing it already, add even more people to the mix and people will start dying when they cannot get basic healthcare. Again if the land is not big enough to build a everything to accommodate another population of people then it's not the right space
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Lucy Lewis	Response-01459	No spaces at local GP's
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	lynne hollis	Response-01234	I am deeply concerned that the proposed development will place significant strain on local healthcare services. With an increased population, existing facilities will struggle further to accommodate the demand, leading to longer wait times and reduced access to essential medical care.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Mandy Cooling	Response-00312	Any such development must surely need to include plans for critical infrastructure to support the influx of hundreds more residents such as plans for doctors? surgeries (which are already groaning under the weight of thousands of patients), schools etc

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Margaret Stafford	Response-01231	Existing healthcare resources and facilities are already overstretched. I cannot see any proposal to add additional infrastructure as part of this proposal.
			Mark Herbert	Response-01285	Local surgery can?t cope with current demand let alone more
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Martin Harrison	Response-01395	I object to the proposed development due to the additional strain it would place on local healthcare services. GP surgeries, dental practices, and hospitals in the area are already under pressure, with long waiting times and limited appointment availability. Increasing the local population without expanding medical infrastructure will further reduce access to essential care for existing residents.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Mary Hinckley	Response-00297	The continued planning and building of housing under the number that is required to fund the necessary infrastructure to support the increased population means the stretched healthcare provision for the area is put under further pressure.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Masheda Chowdhury	Response-01339	1. Existing GP Surgeries and Clinics Are Already Overstretched: ? GP practices serving Oakwood, Breadsall, and Chaddesden are already facing long waiting times for routine appointments. ? Adding 160 homes could bring an estimated 400+ additional residents, placing unsustainable pressure on already limited resources. 2. No Commitment to Expand Local Healthcare Infrastructure: ? The planning policy contains no mention of contributions toward NHS facilities or local health services (e.g. through Section 106 or CIL funding). ? Without clear agreements or investment, the development will negatively affect both new and existing residents? access to timely care. 3. Impact on Emergency and Specialist Services: ? Local hospitals (e.g. Royal Derby Hospital) and urgent care services are already under strain, with long A&E waiting times. ? Increased population without corresponding healthcare expansion will exacerbate the capacity crisis and reduce the quality of care. 4. No Assessment of Cumulative Impact from Future Development: ? The policy identifies an additional 14.6 hectares of safeguarded land for longer-term housing growth. ? The cumulative effect of future developments will overwhelm services unless healthcare planning is addressed comprehensively now. 5. Mental Health and Community Health Services Also Overloaded: ? Access to mental health support, health visitors, and community nursing is already limited ? and not accounted for in the current plan. ? Vulnerable groups will be further marginalised without planning to expand these critical services alongside population growth. 6. Contradicts Local Public Health and Planning Policies: ? Derbyshire County Council has previously recognised the importance of health-based planning in tackling inequalities. ? Approving developments without healthcare provision goes against this principle and undermines local strategic health objectives. We already struggle to get appointments having to wait 4 to 5 weeks for an appointment.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Matt	Response-00604	Already at a max capacity and a struggle to get any care
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Megan Byrne	Response-01432	I would also like to express serious concerns about the impact this proposed development would have on local healthcare services, particularly GP practices. Residents in the area are already experiencing significant difficulty accessing primary care. It is increasingly common to be unable to secure a timely appointment?or even to get through on the phone at all?with local doctors' surgeries. The current level of service is already stretched beyond capacity, and additional housing would further exacerbate this situation. The application does not appear to address how local healthcare infrastructure will be supported or expanded to meet the needs of an increased population. Without clear, funded plans for additional healthcare provision, this development would place undue pressure on already overburdened services, directly impacting the health and well-being of both existing and new residents. I urge the Council to take these healthcare concerns into account and to ensure that any decision made reflects the current limitations of local medical services.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Melissa Little	Response-00389	Doctors surgeries are hugely stretched, increasing the number of people (potentially by hundreds) within the area will only hinder this service even more. Myself and partner use a local surgery, he suffers with Asthma and regularly struggles to get his check up appointments within due to the surgery being so busy. I had an urgent matter to speak to the Drs about and it took me almost 8 hours to get into the hold queue. Imagine additional people being added to mine, or other surgeries, how much longer it could take to speak to a receptionist.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Michael Albinson	Response-00790	Can?t even get a doctors appointment anymore so given up. All the local dentist are full too so have to travel to Ilkeston for a dentist appointment
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Michael Grignon	Response-01335	As above
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Michael Poplar	Response-00565	All healthcare facilities in the area are already overloaded.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Mollie	Response-01549	Breadsall Hill Surgery and Morley House Surgery have patient lists at 105?110% of ideal, leading to multi?week waits for routine appointments. Derby Royal Hospital A&E is regularly on diversion status. There is no Section 106 or CIL commitment in the application to expand local medical capacity?be it additional GP surgery space, new practitioners, or dental facilities?to serve an extra population of perhaps 500+ people.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Monique Johnson	Response-00663	The same applies for health services. When the development at the top of Brookside road was built there was no provision mad for health services
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Mrs. Dorothy Monkhouse.	Response-01371	The recent new development has made the access to a doctor more difficult. A further increase in population would make a bad situation even more critical.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Mrs Francoise Poplar	Response-00602	What few health facilities exist in the vicinity are up to or beyond their capacity.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Mr SJ Read and Mrs S E Read	Response-01225	The new development would obviously place an additional burden on healthcare facilities but there is no reference to any improvement in such facilities linked to the proposed new housing.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Mr Softley	Response-00344	Same comment as Schools. There is no proposal to accommodate the sheer volume of houses being proposed by different councils on this site. Healthcare facilities are already stretched for Doctors and Dentists etc. This should be treated as a large development in Oakwood with the combined proposals from Derby City Council, not as a small addition to the local council. The disruption will be significant.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Mrs Sarah Morley	Response-01515	The doctors are already extremely over run, and trying to get an appointment is very hard work, This will be massively impacted by 160 new houses. Why aren't new surgeries created when so many houses are being built.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Mr Stephen Langton	Response-00025	There is a clear principle that developments within Erewash borough should not be relying upon and using healthcare facilities supplied and funded by the adjacent Derby City Council. This development should be considered to be an extension to the Erewash settlement of Breadsall, and NOT an extension to Derby city. Breadsall village will require the necessary investment for healthcare facilities and other infrastructure to support this development by Erewash Borough Council. Alternatively, it may be better to extend another settlement within Erewash that doesn't abut Derby city council.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Nathan Latymer	Response-00361	I can't get an appointment at my local (Oakwood) GP as it is, so more houses will worsen this situation
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Nicholas Lloyd	Response-00356	I object to this planning application on the grounds that the proposed development will place undue pressure on local medical and healthcare facilities, which are already operating at or near full capacity. The introduction of 500 new homes is projected to significantly increase the local population, thereby intensifying demand for GP services, hospital care, and other essential health services. For instance, NHS guidance indicates that one full-time GP typically serves 1,800 patients; thus, a development of this scale could necessitate the equivalent of additional GPs to maintain current service levels. Without a clear plan to expand healthcare infrastructure or increase staffing, this development risks compromising the quality and accessibility of medical care for both new and existing residents. Therefore, I urge the planning authority to consider these concerns and reject the application unless it can be demonstrated that the necessary healthcare provisions will be adequately addressed.?
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Oakwood Ward Councillors Eyre, Mulhall and Trehwella	Response-01359	We have seen little to no information in the consultation documents with regard to Healthcare Facilities. We would like this information.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Paul Walsh	Response-00341	Not enough doctor surgeries as it is.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Paul Wilkes	Response-01527	It is impossible to get a dentist or doctors appointment. Recently my wife required a blood test and we had to drive into Derby for a 5 minute appointment It is impractical to increase the population without suitable facilities. It is a government's responsibility to ensure the citizens are safe. Surely it is the Council's prime responsibility to ensure basic facilities are in place before more people are allowed to reside in Oakwood.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Philip Booth	Response-00683	Healthcare especially doctors are at capacity. It already takes weeks to get an appointment. Erewash residents would look to use Derby City practices.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Rachael	Response-00332	It has been incredibly difficult to find a doctors (where you are able to be seen in a timely manner) or a NHS dentist without going out of area. This will further compound due to increased residents.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Richard Johnson	Response-00697	Health care facilities do not exist in the village
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Richard Kingham	Response-00849	Not enough local healthcare facilities. Dentists and GPs are both oversubscribed and virtually impossible to get an appointment
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Richard Straw	Response-01412	The closest gym is springwood which is already very busy and over subscribed
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Roy Ling	Response-01243	There are no surgeries in the immediate area which will lead to more problems.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Ruth Duxbury	Response-00301	Healthcare facilities in the area are already stretched more houses will put a strain on the already over stretched system. Often local residents struggle to access GP services and dental services.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Samantha Watts	Response-00869	The proposed development raises serious concerns regarding the availability of healthcare services in the area. Existing medical facilities are already under strain, with long waiting times for GP appointments and limited access to specialist care. An increase in population without corresponding investment in healthcare infrastructure will further overwhelm local services, negatively impacting both new and existing residents. The additional demand for healthcare will place undue pressure on nearby clinics and hospitals, potentially leading to delays in treatment and reduced quality of care. Without clear plans for expanding medical facilities, this development risks exacerbating an already stretched system.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Sam Saunders	Response-01557	The development raises serious concerns regarding the capacity of local GP services serving Breadsall, Breadsall Hilltop, and the nearby Oakwood area. These communities currently rely on a small number of GP surgeries, including the Oakwood Medical Practice and the Breadsall Surgery, both of which are experiencing increasing demand. The Oakwood Medical Practice, in particular, serves a rapidly growing population within the Derby conurbation, where rising patient numbers have resulted in longer appointment waiting times and increased pressure on healthcare staff. Local NHS data indicates that Derby and Derbyshire have seen a consistent rise in patient registrations without equivalent expansion in healthcare infrastructure. This imbalance is particularly acute in suburban areas such as Oakwood and Breadsall, where population growth has outpaced the development of new medical facilities. The addition of approximately 160 new homes north of Breadsall Hilltop will inevitably lead to an influx of new residents requiring access to GP services, further straining already stretched resources. Current GP practices in the area face challenges including appointment availability, recruitment of healthcare professionals, and the provision of timely care for chronic conditions and routine medical needs. Without planned investment and expansion to accommodate this increased demand, residents may experience longer delays and reduced quality of care. This is particularly concerning for vulnerable groups, such as elderly patients and families with young children, who require consistent medical attention. In light of these factors, any approval of the proposed development should be contingent upon clear commitments to enhance local healthcare capacity. This includes funding for expanding existing GP facilities or creating new healthcare infrastructure to meet the needs of a growing population and ensure sustainable, high-quality care.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Sam Woods	Response-01576	the local area is already lacking in essential infrastructure and public services, such as schools, healthcare facilities, and transport links. Adding more housing without addressing these shortages will only exacerbate the problem, leading to increased pressure on existing amenities and a reduced quality of life for current and future residents. I urge you to reconsider the development in light of these concerns.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Sandra Perry	Response-00307	More houses= fewer GP appointments
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Sara Cotton	Response-00370	Our doctors surgeries are at patient capacity
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Sarah Hewitt	Response-01461	Not enough GPs already. Very hard to obtain an appointment already.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Scarlett Hamblin	Response-00398	Attempting to get a doctors appointment is already near impossible with multiple phone calls having to be made to even make contact with the doctors let alone actually getting an appointment. The NHS is already on the brink of collapse without adding in additional patients.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Scott Watson	Response-01284	The proposed development presents significant challenges for local healthcare provision, as existing medical facilities are already struggling to meet demand. Long waiting times for GP appointments and restricted access to specialist care highlight the strain on the current system. An increase in population, without the necessary expansion of healthcare infrastructure, will only worsen these pressures, affecting both new and existing residents. The rising demand for medical services will further burden nearby clinics and hospitals, potentially resulting in treatment delays and a decline in care quality. Without concrete plans for improving healthcare capacity, this development risks exacerbating an already overstretched system.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Sharon Coward	Response-00348	The development borders oakwood & the increased pressure on already pressured health care facilities would cause major problems in the oakwood area. It is already difficult to get Dr's appointments now, with increased numbers from this development it would have a detrimental effect on the residents of oakwood.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Shui-Yee Bateman-Wong	Response-00984	Not enough GPs in the areas already
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Stephen and Janet Allis	Response-01221	increase needed
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Stuart Brown	Response-00771	Oakwood surgery is already very difficult to get appointments due to the large numbers of people living in Oakwood and the number of additional estates that have been built in the surrounding area. 160 new homes will have an impact on this already struggling doctors surgery
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Susan Dundon	Response-00396	We can't get an appointment at present
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Thomas Monkhouse.	Response-01318	On medical issues, recent housing developments have added a noticeable reduction of appointment availability. These new proposals will worsen what is an already less than ideal situation.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Tom King	Response-00734	Local GPs already over capacity
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Tom Parker	Response-01398	We all know how difficult it is to get yourself into the doctors/dentists. It goes without saying that without having more facilities to service additional people, it will be a disaster to get your healthcare needs in this local area.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Tony Hawkins	Response-01532	There are only two doctors in Oakwood which covers a vast catchment area and are full to capacity with appointments very difficult to achieve. There is one dentist in Oakwood whom are not taking on NHS patients this dentist business is more cosmetic. There are not facilities within Breadsall Village under Erewash Borough Council which can services this new proposed development. I currently have no dentist myself and have been trying to get into the doctors for two weeks. There are not enough NHS services to cope with additional housing
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Healthcare Facilities	Tracey Turner	Response-00334	It's already impossible to register with a local GP surgery, you have to go further afield. Resources are stretched to the maximum!
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Abbie quinn	Response-00616	Totally ruin the landscape, we have a few of fields which would turn to houses. Also gives all of the housing around easy access to walk routes and nature trails which will be destroyed.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Adam Millward	Response-00418	It will be ruined obviously.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Ann Sherlock	Response-00410	The map used in this proposal is out of date, and falsely shows a more minimal effect on the landscape than is true. Adding the current proposal will be extremely detrimental to the landscape left due to the current Durose estate, and it is disappointing that the public have been intentionally lied to in relation to how the current proposal will affect the landscape, missing two extremely large housing estates (Durose and Alport Heights) and falsely portraying a smaller population and impact the housing proposal will have on the local landscape.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Anya andrews	Response-00605	Local landscape is going to be destroyed and out views from houses is going to be destroyed.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Ashley syill	Response-00397	This severely limits landscape to east of current development. Access roads and plots built north will not impact, but access to these from current mqin access route already narrow and will not cope with an additional demand
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Ben Martin	Response-00787	The proposed development is on Greenbelt land. This is used by walkers, horse riders, cyclists, bird watchers and nature lovers. It's a breeding and feeding ground for Buzzards, Kestrels and Barn Owls. Foxes and rabbits frequent the area and it provides a beautiful and scenic boundary between Breadsall Village and Breadsall Hilltop. A housing development here would utterly destroy the landscape.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Beverly Jordan	Response-01330	The landscape has already been altered to remove fields impacting on woodland wildlife farm animals air openness and this will be all but eradicated with further builds
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Carol Westcott	Response-00973	New houses are built with minimal gardening requirements drives hardly any lawns and hedges wildlife is just being driven out. Trees are destroyed by new buildings and we are supposed to be supporting climate change and helping to reduce the emissions how will this help.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Carys Whomsley	Response-01438	I am writing to register my strong objection to the above-mentioned planning application, both in its original and revised form. Despite the removal of the area adjacent to the A61 in the amended proposal, I believe that the proposed development remains deeply inappropriate and harmful for the following reasons: 1. Contravention of Policy CP18 and Loss of Green Wedge The proposed site lies just outside the designated Green Belt, but crucially directly abuts existing woodland and open countryside, forming part of the vital green corridor along the Great Northern Greenway. This area functions as a green buffer, enhancing ecological connectivity, supporting biodiversity, and providing visual and recreational amenity to local residents, walkers, and cyclists. Despite claims of woodland retention, the development threatens the integrity of this space. Proximity to new housing would increase human pressure on the natural environment, likely leading to degradation of woodland, fragmentation of habitats, and a reduction in wildlife corridors. No Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) assessment appears in the application documents, raising concerns about whether the legally mandated 10% net gain can or will be achieved. Biodiversity enhancements delivered off-site would do nothing to mitigate local ecological loss, thereby undermining environmental sustainability in the area. Moreover, the site lies adjacent to land recently released from the Green Belt and under consideration for housing allocation by Erewash Borough Council. The cumulative impact of developing both sites would be devastating: a continuous sprawl from Derby through to Breadsall, resulting in the elimination of the settlement gap and permanent damage to the character of the Great Northern Greenway. 2. Environmental, Infrastructural, and Policy Concerns The proposal directly contradicts the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Paragraph 143, particularly the goals of preventing urban sprawl and protecting the openness of Green Belt land. It also ignores the findings of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA 359), which previously deemed the site unsuitable for residential development due to accessibility and environmental limitations. The development is completely incompatible with the objectives of the Breadsall Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2019?2029, particularly the aims to: Preserve the rural character and prevent urbanisation; Avoid coalescence with the Derby conurbation; Safeguard wildlife and ecological features; Control flood risk and infrastructure strain; Protect valued green spaces and visual vistas.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Carys Whomsley	Response-01438	Breadsall has already experienced increased flooding, attributed to upstream developments like Persimmon Estate and Breadsall Hilltop, which lie within the same water catchment area. Any additional development would worsen this issue, placing homes and infrastructure at risk. Furthermore, the proposal relies on access through two existing public footpaths within the Redrow estate and offers no concrete infrastructure improvements. The A608 is already over-congested, and no plans are presented to handle increased traffic or to safeguard children commuting to local schools. 3. Loss of Community and Ecological Value This land offers more than just open space?it is a much-loved and well-used amenity for the local community. It serves as a peaceful escape for informal recreation and nature engagement, and its visual and environmental contributions to the neighbourhood are significant. Its destruction would represent a major loss in local character and quality of life. The proposal underestimates the pressure on existing services, lacks detailed mitigation plans, and fails to explain how proposed footpaths will link meaningfully into existing routes. Nearby Local Wildlife Sites will be impacted
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Charlotte	Response-00458	Current views across Breadsall Hilltop over to Darley are outstanding and very rare. These should be protected and cherished. They are so unique to Derbyshires naturally beauty of small villages across the terrain and unlike nowhere else in the country.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Chris Lunn	Response-01410	The proposed site is made up of clay soil which makes development even less suitable. The swelling and shrinking of the clay causes subsidence, ground heave and has a lower, load-bearing capacity requiring good drainage ? which this site DOES NOT HAVE. Open green spaces, within the development, would likely be curtailed due to the difficulties in growing any plants and greenery in the clay. Landscaping would be the first item to the ?shelved? as money will undoubtedly run out. The new housing will be subjected to cracking and other associated problems which will put further strain on funding and causing misery for homeowners.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Christopher Chambers	Response-00175	The proposed development will decimate the landscape in this area. Where once were rolling green fields will soon be a carpet of brick and tarmac.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	landscape	Clare Roters	Response-01553	This landscape is well kept, full of wildlife and still have farms who use it for live stock. It's calming, peaceful and relaxing. It's loved, respected and a great asset to derby
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	landscape	Colin Brewster	Response-00576	If approved this development would obviously bring about a further deterioration of the current landscape. Although my main concern is that Breadsall should not be allowed to be a suburb of Derby.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	landscape	Darren adams	Response-00874	Unfortunately the village will be overtaken by all new modern houses and effectively become a housing estate. Changing the English countryside from what was once villages to now modern housing Estates.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	landscape	Edward James Gregory	Response-00728	Unsuitable for green belt / green separation
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	landscape	Elaine hodgkinson	Response-00854	It will obviously have a detrimental effect on the landscape next to a site of a bronze age settlement.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	landscape	Emma Hawkins	Response-00813	The landscape of the countryside for Breadsall/Breadsall Hill Top will disappear and become one big housing estate connecting Breadsall to Derby City
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	landscape	Gaynor Pawley	Response-00627	As a suburb of Derby there should be a semi rural feel to the area. If more houses are built on this land it ends up becoming part of the inner city. If this is the case Erewash would be contributing to an extension of urban living not protecting the semi rural feel
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	landscape	Gillian Pearson	Response-00303	As already stated there will soon be no natural landscape remaining around Breadsall Village.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	landscape	Harry Mee	Response-00882	Running through Draycott really is a joy, and it's a joy that is shared by many. Dropping a load of ugly houses, that ruin the landscape, into the village is a terrible idea and is a great way of losing the identity of the village.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	landscape	Helen Foster	Response-00650	Once this green wedge/buffer zone is built upon, Breadsall's identity as a village will be gone, forever.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	landscape	Helen Walker	Response-00325	What landscape we don't have one anymore just houses across from Oakwood bishops drive entrance there were lovely fields a lovely walk down to the river of railway line, further up Mansfield road there were lovely field now just houses upon house soon houses and traffic and more traffic.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	landscape	Ian Lockwood	Response-01491	The green space that marks Breadsall out as a village in its own right will be forever destroyed, merging it into a single large conurbation with no identity of its own whilst destroying a countryside landscape enjoyed by many.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	landscape	Jake Moore	Response-01202	The proposed development of 160 homes would have a profound and irreversible impact on the local landscape, affecting both its aesthetic value and its environmental integrity. The Oakwood and Breadsall areas currently represent an important transition zone between Derby's urban fabric and the surrounding countryside. This green space serves not only as a visual buffer but also as an essential part of the region's character, enhancing the quality of life for local residents. The loss of this open land would significantly alter the visual landscape, leading to: Degradation of the natural beauty of the area, which is characterized by expansive fields, hedgerows, and open sky. The development would replace these scenic views with urban sprawl, diminishing the rural charm and tranquility that many people value in this part of Derby. Harm to the sense of place. The area forms a unique part of Derby's landscape, with historical and cultural connections to the local countryside. Building on this land would sever the connection between the city and the rural surroundings, eroding the distinctiveness of this green space and permanently changing its character. Visual intrusion into the broader countryside. The proposed development would extend Derby's urban boundary further into what is currently an open, uninterrupted landscape, creating a marked visual contrast between the natural, rural surroundings and the new housing. This will not only alter the local aesthetic but also disrupt the existing harmony between the built and natural environments. Moreover, the development would cause irreparable damage to the ecological landscape, severing important wildlife corridors and eroding the greenbelt's role as a buffer zone between urban and rural areas. This greenbelt is essential for maintaining the natural balance of the region and preventing further urban encroachment into the surrounding countryside. From an environmental perspective, the proposed development would reduce green space that currently absorbs carbon and promotes air quality, playing an integral role in improving the local microclimate and fragment the ecological network, which affects not just wildlife but also the broader landscape's ability to manage water flow and mitigate the effects of climate change. The landscape's aesthetic and ecological value is a key asset for Derby, not only in terms of its natural beauty but also for the health and wellbeing of its residents. Replacing this open space with urban development would diminish the overall quality of life in the area, both for local residents who enjoy the landscape's serenity and for the local wildlife that relies on these spaces for survival. The introduction of a large housing development would also dramatically alter the views, replacing natural, open spaces with rows of houses, potentially causing a loss in the visual amenity that homeowners currently enjoy and impacting house values of houses that have been purchased at a premium to be bordering said landscapes. The development would introduce increased noise, traffic congestion, and reduced privacy for homes overlooking the site. The disturbance from construction activity, as well as the ongoing presence of additional traffic and residents, could reduce the overall quality of life in the area. This is a significant factor that prospective buyers consider when purchasing homes, and a decrease in the quality of life can directly translate into lower property values. lead
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	landscape	Jake Moore	Response-01202	ng to the further degradation of the area's character and more homes being built nearby. The fear of this potential future development could make the area less attractive to buyers, leading to a decline in property values over time undermining the stability of the local housing market. This argument is supported by research showing that homes with access to green spaces or natural surroundings tend to have higher values, and any development that removes such features can reduce property values. In conclusion, the proposed housing development would have a negative and lasting impact on the landscape, irreversibly altering its character and function. Protecting this area is crucial for preserving the visual integrity, ecological health, and quality of life in Derby. The development would set a dangerous precedent for further encroachment on valuable landscapes, undermining the city's environmental goals and the natural beauty that defines it.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	James Roberts	Response-00673	The fields being proposed to be developed are regularly used by the dog walkers in the existing estate. Completely changing the landscape to houses, paths, roads, etc. is going to severely impact local dog owners. It will also likely drive everyone to the greenway, which will inevitably lead to degradation of the greenway given not everyone is considerate of the environment and their surroundings
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	James skivington	Response-00359	The greenway is such a beautiful park of derby building houses right up to this will have a damaging effect on this and the wildlife present
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Jamie Branagan	Response-00335	The existing estate and the one at Lime Lane already destroyed greenbelt and ruined the natural look of Oakwood North/Hilltop. This proposed development will take away another slice of natural and beautiful landscape to be replaced with brick and tarmac.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Janet Brewster	Response-00577	The local landscape is rapidly disappearing and if this development is approved it will add to a deteriorating situation. We need to keep our Green Belt at all cost.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Jessica Softley	Response-01408	This proposal will negatively impact the aesthetics of the landscape. The current view from the bottom of Dale Acre Way is green open space, followed by the woodland area of the Great Northern Greenway. Building upon this land would significantly alter this landscape.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Jonathan Park	Response-01191	The surrounding landscape is a key feature of why some people have purchased their properties on the estate including access to fields and nature areas as well as having their views obstructed by further development including in some cases, a loss of natural light etc
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Karen Read	Response-00923	it will be a detrimental effect to the landscape whilst Derbyshire was known for its beauty why destroy it our city and towns are a disgrace and to drive and see many more estates destroying our countryside and villages is an outcry
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Kirstin Woodward	Response-01043	This land is visible from the Derwent Valley World Heritage Site. Building on this land would alter the landscape and could jeopardize the area's heritage status. Derby should be proud of its industrial heritage, but it must also recognize the importance of balancing this with the preservation of its countryside and open spaces.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Lara Small	Response-01262	I'm personally grateful that the decision was made to build Durose Country Park, I now live in a home probably built on allocated as Green Belt Land. I see the irony in my objection to further development and I'm trying to avoid a 'Not In My Back Yard' attitude. I understand the housing crisis won't fix itself unless more homes are built. I seek to urge the planning team to consider how to get the most value out of the of the fields available in the area, and I'm not sure if the awkward triangle North of Breadsall Hilltop really achieves that. Fitting in sufficient houses to make it profitable seems disproportionate to the effort in getting access to the fields, levelling the sloped land, cutting through protected hedgerows, pressurising the Great Northern Greenway, establishing a road network and critically, establishing water catchment & run off areas that will be critical to ensuring the inhabitants of Breadsall Village stay flood free. One of the wonderful things about Derby, and part of the reason why I've chosen to settle here, is due its lack of heavy city intensity, As a proud Rolls-Royce employee, a huge amount of employee wealth is poured into Derby and its surrounding areas. Perhaps, this is also the reason why further housing is being considered; its becoming a more attractive place to live, but I urge you to ensure the city remains in balance with the green space around it. May I offer my very best wishes for your future plans and development of Derby, and may I urge you to consider the balance and impact of all options.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Laura Louca	Response-01266	You are enclosing people in between buildings and traffic - it's not just wildlife that needs the open spaces, fresh air to be healthy. The area is looking more and more ugly the more you build on it. It is depressing to see beautiful views and landscapes ruined by buildings.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	L Burton	Response-00342	The addition of the homes changes the landscape and eats into available green space to walk dogs, play and enjoy the community. It is a busy space which many people walk here to enjoy from the surrounding areas.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Lee Wheatley	Response-01492	My significant concern lies with the potential detrimental impact of this development on the landscape and visual amenity, which are highly valued by the residents of Breadsall & Breadsall Hilltop and contribute significantly to our quality of life and the character of the area. The landscape surrounding Breadsall Hilltop and the wider Erewash area is characterized by rolling fields, wooded areas and distinctive views. These features contribute significantly to the sense of place and provide a valuable visual backdrop for our community. The proposed development has the potential to fundamentally alter this landscape in several negative ways. The sheer scale of 160 new houses is likely to result in a significant visual intrusion into the existing landscape. This would involve the loss of open fields, the fragmentation of natural habitats, and the introduction of built structures that are out of scale or character with the surrounding environment. Residents of Breadsall Hilltop currently benefit from beautiful views across open countryside and the presence of green corridors. This development would obstruct or detract from these valued views, diminishing the visual amenity we currently enjoy. Furthermore, the construction phase of a development of 160 houses will inevitably lead to significant disruption and scarring of the landscape. This includes earthworks, the movement of heavy machinery, and the storage of materials, all of which can have a temporary but nonetheless significant negative impact on the visual environment. The long-term impact of the built development, including associated infrastructure like roads and lighting, will permanently alter the character of the landscape. I urge the Erewash Borough Council to undertake a thorough and detailed Landscape Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) for the proposed development of 160 houses. This assessment should specifically consider the views from Breadsall Hilltop and the potential cumulative impact of this development alongside any other planned or existing developments in the area. The findings of this assessment must be given significant weight in the Council's decision-making process.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Lisa Stone	Response-01018	The field currently there gets extremely wet and boggy and muddy during the winter months, this is where all the rain water is draining through if this is removed it will cause flooding to the houses being built there it is water logged for months at a time



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Martin Harrison	Response-01395	I object to the proposed development due to the negative impact it will have on the local landscape. The area offers scenic views and natural features that contribute to the character and enjoyment of the community. Large-scale construction would permanently alter the visual environment and diminish the area's rural and open feel.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Masheda Chowdhury	Response-01339	1. Harm to Rural-Urban Transition and Visual Character: ? The proposed development is located on the northern fringe of the Oakwood neighbourhood, adjacent to open countryside. ? Building 160 homes will create a harsh urban edge, disrupting the natural transition between the city and the surrounding landscape of Breadsall. 2. Inadequate Landscaping Measures: ? Strategic Policy 1.8 mentions landscaping and woodland to soften the northern boundary, but no firm guarantees are in place for how much green space will be retained or planted. ? Without a robust landscape buffer, the development will appear visually intrusive when viewed from Breadsall and the Great Northern Greenway. 3. Elevated Site and Visibility Concerns: ? Parts of the site are visibly prominent from surrounding public rights of way and nearby countryside, particularly from Breadsall Footpath 24 and elevated land to the north and east. ? A large housing estate in this location would dominate the skyline, affecting long-range views and reducing the openness of the area. 4. Loss of Green Open Space and Trees: ? Although the site is not formally designated public open space, it provides green openness and habitat that contributes to the overall landscape character. ? There is insufficient detail on tree retention, new woodland planting, or long-term management of landscaped areas. 5. Impact on Local Identity and Settlement Separation: ? The character of Breadsall as a distinct village with rural surroundings will be diminished by urban sprawl to its immediate south. ? The development risks undermining the historic separation between Derby's suburban edge and its neighbouring settlements. 6. No Landscape Character Assessment Submitted: ? There appears to be no published Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) accompanying this policy, which is necessary for a development of this scale in such a sensitive location. ? The absence of this assessment makes it impossible to fully understand or mitigate the visual and environmental consequences of the proposal.
			Matt	Response-00604	Hand in hand with what you expect from Derbyshire rural landscapes
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Megan Byrne	Response-01432	Major impact see other comments
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Melissa Little	Response-00389	As a resident of Oakwood, one of my favourite things is the suburban living. I have a dog who i regularly walk through the fields that are proposed to be built on. The local area and its nature spots have played a huge part in helping me overcome mental health struggles. Building more housing in our beautiful spot is not nessacary. I understand the need for more houses and the huge number of new homes proposed to be built by the government, but Oakwood is ar risk of merging into the other surrounding areas and having less and less of our beautiful natural landscape.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Michael Poplar	Response-00565	Nothing as yet has been proposed, but no doubt it is intended to be the minimal amount that can be got away with.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Mollie	Response-01549	The site is located on elevated land north of Breadsall Hill Top, and development here will be highly visible from surrounding countryside and existing villages such as Breadsall and Morley. The loss of open views will fundamentally alter the character of the area. The design and massing of the proposed homes are not in keeping with the historic and rural architectural character of the nearby conservation areas, including Breadsall Village. This would cause permanent visual harm to the landscape. The countryside gap between Derby and surrounding villages acts as a buffer to prevent coalescence. Building here will erode that gap and blur the boundaries between urban and rural communities.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Monique Johnson	Response-00663	We need to preserve the landscape we have today around the village. We have already lost part of it due to extensive building above the village. A greener world is important for health and wellbeing.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Mrs Francoise Poplar	Response-00602	Presumably in view of the density proposed landscape would be minimal. This has proved to be the case with recent developments.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Mr Softley	Response-00344	It's a big hill, it will be an eyesore and very imposing. To build houses there, the landscape will have to be completely carved up. This will eradicate the hilltop in Breadsall hilltop?
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Mrs Sarah Morley	Response-01515	The landscape at the moment has already been extremely compromised with the 2 new housing estates (450 new houses). How can you even consider compromising this more, with even more houses. Where you planning on building and changing the type of land so further land can be built on the future has beautiful and you can see the countryside for miles over the land. Derby has so beautiful countryside and yet more and more houses are eating this up every year. I under stand that some houses have to be built, but surely not to compromise on the beautiful green land where nature lives. There are so many other areas that could be built on
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Neal Flint	Response-01220	These developments would visual scar on the rural landscape and be seen from a wide area . The old railway is classes as a green way it wont be very green boxed in and blighted by housing.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Norma HASWELL	Response-01384	We should always be mindful of preserving the natural features, views, and vistas that enhance Breadsall's character. Adding further housing would impact greatly on this.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Paige Skivington	Response-00366	I absolutely do not want to look at a building site/new estate. When I bought my house, I bought it for the gorgeous view. You would be ruining all of that. You will be changing Oakwood/Breadsall into just hundreds of houses and no land, no natural environment. It's already hard enough to see open beautiful spaces and this would completely ruin the space we have access to. For all the children and animals in the area it would be a much more unsafe place to be.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Peter John Ball	Response-00705	The development of this site in Breadsall will have a significant impact on the Great Northern way and change dramatically the rural nature of the walking and cycling route.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Philip Booth	Response-00683	This area has a steep gradient and the number of houses being built would be out of character in this area.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Rachael	Response-00332	The current housing estates have added huge concerns to the landscape already, adding further will continue to jeopardise this. A main positive of Oakwood is being commutable whilst feeling in the countryside. This is going to destroy this.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Richard Kingham	Response-00849	The size of land and volume of houses, would ruin the landscape and the main reason bought our house. The view to the woods and abundance of wildlife that lives in the small area

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Richard Stone	Response-01029	This is a great view over Derby, offering a beautiful sunset over the city, as well as the grassland and woods, all while still being in a semi-built-up area. It's nice to have some nature nearby, but unfortunately, this will all be ruined and gone. The land is also fairly steep, which would be poor to build houses on without ruining the natural shape of the ground. I also understand that the area in question was promised not to be built when the current housing estate was built, which is exactly what this is going against.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Richard Straw	Response-01412	I enjoy my view from my house, I don't want to be looking out to a busy road
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Sam Saunders	Response-01557	The proposed development would significantly alter the local landscape, replacing open green space with dense housing and infrastructure. This change would cause visual pollution, diminishing the natural beauty and tranquillity that define the area. The site serves as an important transition between the urban Oakwood neighbourhood and the rural village of Breadsall, and development here risks eroding this distinctive character. The loss of open views and natural features would negatively impact residents' quality of life and the local sense of place. Additionally, proximity to the Great Northern Greenway and a designated Local Wildlife Site means that visual continuity of green corridors and habitats could be compromised. Without strong landscaping measures, the development would appear as an intrusive extension of urban sprawl, undermining the rural-urban balance and community identity.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Sandra Perry	Response-00307	This is such beautiful landscape, blighted by the new orange boxes that were built a few years ago. As you walk on the footpaths around the area (especially the paths at the back of Broomfield) the houses stick out as so ugly and it's so sad to see the landscape destroyed. And to think that these plans are expanding that development!
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Scarlett Hamblin	Response-00398	we are lucky to have such a beautiful area such as the Greenway on our local doorstep by how allowing houses to encroach on this area it is ruining the landscape and local area. We have a limited amount of green areas left and these do not need to be destroyed by yet more housing Estates. We need to protect and preserve our land landscape for future generations.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Sharon Coward	Response-00348	The landscape for the people of oakwood would be severely affected in a detrimental way losing a green landscape.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Stuart Brown	Response-00771	Currently a beautiful area with established biodiversity. Development will not improve the landscape in any way
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Susan Dundon	Response-00396	Landscape will be altered forever
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Thomas Bateman-Wong	Response-00985	See greenbelt
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Tom Antrobus	Response-00308	I moved to Breadsall because of the green open space in the surrounding area so for more houses to be built near by would be a huge disappointment
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Tom Parker	Response-01398	The current housing has already made a huge difference to the beautiful landscape and more building will jeopardise this further. A main positive of living in Oakwood is it being so close to the centre of Derby whilst also being in the countryside. This proposed development will destroy the countryside? element and will feel like one huge estate
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Landscape	Tony Hawkins	Response-01532	The landscape of the countryside for Breadsall/Breadsall Hill Top will disappear and become one big housing estate connecting Breadsall to Derby City. The Durose estate is classed as Breadsall
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Adam Millward	Response-00418	No doubt homes will be crammed in like there's no tomorrow with tiny gardens and extremely inconvenient to use drives ways (one car in front of another) claiming its a 2 car driveway. All while councils are completely powerless to stop this it seems, or they just don't care, or are paid off not to care, whichever one its true. This means people park all over the streets and it becomes a crammed narrow space.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Amy Govan	Response-01419	Durose country park and Limetree court already add a significant number of houses to this area, there are a lack of local amenities already and I would have severe concerns about adding more houses to this without adding any extra amenities
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Andrew charge	Response-01538	Concerned about the number of houses and the road being able to cope as too many new houses already built in the last few years.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Andy Madeley	Response-00381	To many houses either too many developments in the area.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Ann Sherlock	Response-00410	The map used in this proposal is out of date. Adding the current proposal will be extremely detrimental to the local area, and it is disappointing that the public have been intentionally lied to in relation to how the current proposal will affect the area, missing two extremely large housing estates and falsely portraying a smaller population and impact the housing proposal will have.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Anya andrews	Response-00605	The number of housing is to many for the area intended.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Ben Martin	Response-00787	160 houses on a small, 8.2 hectares is unrealistic and will have a further negative impact on the already stressed road. It also flies in the face of the previous Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment 359 on the site as unsuitable for residential development, plus the continually recurring problems seen on all recent developments including and not limited to, a total lack of intent to upgrade inadequate infrastructure, roads, drainage, social provision etc. but also critically ensures the Breadsall becomes a suburb of Derby. The proposed development completely contradicts the National Planning Policy Framework 13 (NPPF 13) which states: 142. The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. 143. Green Belt serves five purposes: a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Beverly Jordan	Response-01330	There have already been two new estates over the last 5 years further development would remove or impinge on the 6 barn dwellings and residents at Breadsall Hilltop
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Carol Westcott	Response-00973	We already have 2 new housing estates and this impacts on sales of the older houses as it's easier to buy a new house therefore devaluation of properties and properties taking much longer to sell

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Carys Whomsley	Response-01438	I am writing to register my strong objection to the above-mentioned planning application, both in its original and revised form. Despite the removal of the area adjacent to the A61 in the amended proposal, I believe that the proposed development remains deeply inappropriate and harmful for the following reasons: 1. Contravention of Policy CP18 and Loss of Green Wedge The proposed site lies just outside the designated Green Belt, but crucially directly abuts existing woodland and open countryside, forming part of the vital green corridor along the Great Northern Greenway. This area functions as a green buffer, enhancing ecological connectivity, supporting biodiversity, and providing visual and recreational amenity to local residents, walkers, and cyclists. Despite claims of woodland retention, the development threatens the integrity of this space. Proximity to new housing would increase human pressure on the natural environment, likely leading to degradation of woodland, fragmentation of habitats, and a reduction in wildlife corridors. No Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) assessment appears in the application documents, raising concerns about whether the legally mandated 10% net gain can or will be achieved. Biodiversity enhancements delivered off-site would do nothing to mitigate local ecological loss, thereby undermining environmental sustainability in the area. Moreover, the site lies adjacent to land recently released from the Green Belt and under consideration for housing allocation by Erewash Borough Council. The cumulative impact of developing both sites would be devastating: a continuous sprawl from Derby through to Breadsall, resulting in the elimination of the settlement gap and permanent damage to the character of the Great Northern Greenway. 2. Environmental, Infrastructural, and Policy Concerns The proposal directly contradicts the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Paragraph 143, particularly the goals of preventing urban sprawl and protecting the openness of Green Belt land. It also ignores the findings of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA 359), which previously deemed the site unsuitable for residential development due to accessibility and environmental limitations. The development is completely incompatible with the objectives of the Breadsall Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2019?2029, particularly the aims to: Preserve the rural character and prevent urbanisation; Avoid coalescence with the Derby conurbation; Safeguard wildlife and ecological features; Control flood risk and infrastructure strain; Protect valued green spaces and visual vistas.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Carys Whomsley	Response-01438	Breadsall has already experienced increased flooding, attributed to upstream developments like Persimmon Estate and Breadsall Hilltop, which lie within the same water catchment area. Any additional development would worsen this issue, placing homes and infrastructure at risk. Furthermore, the proposal relies on access through two existing public footpaths within the Redrow estate and offers no concrete infrastructure improvements. The A608 is already over-congested, and no plans are presented to handle increased traffic or to safeguard children commuting to local schools. 3. Loss of Community and Ecological Value This land offers more than just open space?it is a much-loved and well-used amenity for the local community. It serves as a peaceful escape for informal recreation and nature engagement, and its visual and environmental contributions to the neighbourhood are significant. Its destruction would represent a major loss in local character and quality of life. The proposal underestimates the pressure on existing services, lacks detailed mitigation plans, and fails to explain how proposed footpaths will link meaningfully into existing routes. Nearby Local Wildlife Sites will be impacted
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Clare Roters	Response-01553	More houses would mean services in the area would struggle, wildlife would die and traffic would be insufferable. We pay a lot to live here and chose the area for the beautiful countryside and, amenities and access to areas in Derbyshire. It would push people out of their much loved homes
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Edward James Gregory	Response-00728	Unsuitable for green belt / green separation
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Emma Hawkins	Response-00813	Too many
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Gary Murfin	Response-00374	There are far too many houses being planned to be built on the edge of Oakwood which is already a large estate, this site along with the houses planning to be built off Acorn way and near Chaddesden wood is going to create a lot of problems in the area
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Gaynor Pawley	Response-00627	60 houses on such a small piece of land would put stress on the area for flooding of Breadsall village, who are already suffering the consequences of recent developments. The more houses built the less pervious land is left, therefore moving the natural rain water down to Breadsall village and the inadequate brook which has flooded on numerous occasions in recent years.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Georgina	Response-00343	Too many properties
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Gillian Montgomery	Response-00625	Too many houses !!!
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Helen Foster	Response-00650	The traffic, light, and noise pollution generated by a development of this size would negatively affect the amenity value of the nearby conservation area and village in general. Additionally, this extension would ensure that Breadsall would become a suburb of Derby. I refer again to the NPPF 13. Protecting Green Belt land: 143. Green Belt serves five purposes: a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Helen Walker	Response-00325	Far too many do not need them, why don't they go and look at all the empty buildings which are around, pubs, shops, empty houses etc and start to make them into properties which people can live on and not come into green belt land we need fields, trees wildlife open spaces not a concrete jungle and no boundaries everywhere merging into one mass of houses
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Hulland. Bdverley	Response-00496	No more

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Ian Lockwood	Response-01491	The traffic, light, and noise pollution resulting from a development of this scale would significantly diminish the amenity value of the nearby conservation area and the village as a whole. Moreover, such an expansion would effectively transform Breadsall into a suburb of Derby. This concern is supported by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), Section 13: Protecting Green Belt Land. Paragraph 143 outlines the five key purposes of the Green Belt: a) To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas b) To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another c) To safeguard the countryside from encroachment d) To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns e) To assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the reuse of derelict and other urban land The proposed development directly conflicts with several of these purposes, particularly those relating to urban sprawl, countryside protection, and the preservation of historic character.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Jack Bointon	Response-00969	Too many houses and too many people living here at the moment.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Jake Moore	Response-01202	The proposed development of 160 homes within the Oakwood area will place considerable pressure on Derby City's resources, which are already under strain from the existing population. This development will increase demand for essential services such as public transport, waste collection, schools, healthcare, and local infrastructure. However, there is an additional concern regarding the geographical and administrative division between Derby City and Erewash Borough Council. Although the new homes will fall within the Derby conurbation, Council Tax contributions from these new residents will go to Erewash Borough Council rather than Derby City Council. This creates an imbalance in resource allocation because: Erewash Borough Council will benefit financially from the new homes without bearing the full cost of providing essential services and infrastructure in the area. Derby City Council will be left to manage the additional strain on local services, including public transport, waste management, and emergency services, without receiving the corresponding increase in funding to support the growing demand. This situation creates a funding discrepancy, where Derby City will be forced to shoulder the burden of an expanded population without receiving adequate financial support from the new Council Tax contributions, potentially leading to deterioration of service quality and undermining the city's ability to effectively manage its resources.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	James Roberts	Response-00673	160 households is far too many to be supported by the roads and local infrastructure. A much smaller expansion of the estate (maybe 40 households) may be manageable, but 160 is excessive and cannot be supported
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Jamie Branagan	Response-00335	160 houses equals c150-200 cars and at least c350+ people. All this will do is burden the already over stretched Oakwood ward in terms of both traffic and local services. Erewash will feel none of the pain of this development.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Janette Booth	Response-00295	The infrastructure is already struggling with the latest batches of housing. How is putting even more housing up a good idea in this location?
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Janette Glenn	Response-00422	The Oakwood edge of the city has already seen two new sizeable developments in recent years. The area cannot keep growing with no additional infrastructure and using up yet more greenfield sites.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Jon Lewis	Response-00347	It is expected for Oakwood ward to pick up the bill for the increase in services, yet Erewash will benefit from the increase in council tax. Far too many homes in such a small area at present with our even more numerous developments in the area. Oakwood is already one of the largest housing developments in Derbyshire and beyond. When will it stop expanding
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Justin Windsor	Response-01544	This proposal alongside the additional proposal from Derby city council will bring in excess of over 450 houses, the local infrastructure cannot support such an increase. This increase will put the health and safety of the current population at risk!
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Karen Read	Response-00923	I object to this policy change as the number of houses to be constructed will illuminate the area of openness separating the area from the city of Derby whilst causing damage to the water flow which in turn will increase flood risk. Can you please publish the environment agency summary regarding the flood risk assessment for the surrounding areas following construction of these houses I would also like a survey on the current residents mental health as this obviously causes alarm and distress to people whom will be adversely affected by the destruction of greenbelt land and their homes
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Kirstin Woodward	Response-01043	Oakwood is already a large housing estate, built adjacent to the previously established Breadsall Hilltop and Chaddesden estates. The number of homes in the area has pushed local facilities to capacity. More recently, the developments at Lime Lane and Durose Country Park have added hundreds of additional houses without a single new amenity to support them. Now the planned additional houses will overwhelm the area which is at capacity with the current infrastructure and facilities.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Lara Small	Response-01262	I'm personally grateful that the decision was made to build Durose Country Park, I now live in a home probably built on allocated as Green Belt Land. I see the irony in my objection to further development and I'm trying to avoid a 'Not In My Back Yard' attitude. I understand the housing crisis won't fix itself unless more homes are built. I seek to urge the planning team to consider how to get the most value out of the fields available in the area, and I'm not sure if the awkward triangle North of Breadsall Hilltop really achieves that. Fitting in sufficient houses to make it profitable seems disproportionate to the effort in getting access to the fields, levelling the sloped land, cutting through protected hedgerows, pressurising the Great Northern Greenway, establishing a road network and critically, establishing water catchment & run off areas that will be critical to ensuring the inhabitants of Breadsall Village stay flood free. One of the wonderful things about Derby, and part of the reason why I've chosen to settle here, is due to its lack of heavy city intensity. As a proud Rolls-Royce employee, a huge amount of employee wealth is poured into Derby and its surrounding areas. Perhaps, this is also the reason why further housing is being considered; it's becoming a more attractive place to live, but I urge you to ensure the city remains in balance with the green space around it. May I offer my very best wishes for your future plans and development of Derby, and may I urge you to consider the balance and impact of all options.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Laura Louca	Response-01266	So far we have seen 9 new homes on the old Windmill Garage site, 6 bungalows currently under construction behind number 7 Hilltop, 250 houses on the Persimmon Lime Tree Estate, plus an excess of 120 on the Redrow Estate. You now want us to have a further 160 next to the Durose site, plus who knows how many more on the land you have labelled as 'safe guarded for future development. Plus another 150 next to the Lime Tree Court Estate. Then another 356 off Sir Frank Whittle Way. Not to mention the 600+ near Acorn Way Oakwood, Leesbroom School area. IT'S SIMPLY TOO MUCH!
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	L Burton	Response-00342	There is already no infrastructure for the estate and its size such as doctors surgeries, local shops etc. as this has been bolted onto the edge of Oakwood already
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Lee Wheatley	Response-01492	? Quantifying the Impact on Infrastructure: ? The proposed development of 160 houses represents a significant increase in demand for local infrastructure and services. When considering the average household size, this could translate to an estimated 320-480 new residents relying on the same schools, healthcare facilities, and utilities currently serving Breadsall Hilltop. This scale of increase is unsustainable without concrete plans for commensurate expansion of these vital services. ? Highlighting the Change in Character: ? The addition of 160 houses has the potential to significantly alter the landscape and character of the surrounding area, potentially impacting the visual amenity currently enjoyed by Breadsall Hilltop residents. Such a substantial development could lead to a noticeable increase in traffic, noise, and light pollution, further eroding the semi-rural nature of our homes. ? Reinforcing Strain on Road Networks: ? The addition of potentially hundreds of new vehicles associated with 160 houses will undoubtedly exacerbate the existing traffic congestion in and around Breadsall Hilltop, particularly at peak times on routes such as A608. The current road infrastructure is already struggling to cope, and this significant increase in housing will only worsen the situation, impacting commute times, air quality, and the overall quality of life for our residents."
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Lisa Stone	Response-01018	150 houses is potentially 300 more cars, say 3 or 4 to a family nearly 500 additional people trying to cram into a small field effectively, we all want to live on each others doorsteps right? It's asking for trouble from noise complaints etc with houses being too close.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Mady Hall	Response-00788	There will be far more cars driving through the estate therefore there will be more cars parked up. We bought on this estate specially as it isn't a through route to more houses
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Martin Harrison	Response-01395	I object to the proposed development due to the excessive number of houses planned. The scale is disproportionate to the size and capacity of the local area, leading to overdevelopment. This will strain infrastructure, increase traffic, and alter the character of the community in a way that is not sustainable or appropriate.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Masheda Chowdhury	Response-01339	1. The Proposed Number (160 Homes) is Disproportionate to Local Capacity: ? Developing 160 homes on an 8.2-hectare site, adjacent to a rural-urban boundary, risks over-intensifying the land. ? This volume of housing is out of character with the surrounding area and incompatible with the infrastructure and services currently available (roads, schools, healthcare, etc.). 2. Exceeds Local Absorptive Capacity Without Supporting Infrastructure: ? Local services ? including GP practices, schools, bus routes, and road junctions ? are already at or near capacity. ? There is no evidence that these services can expand at a rate that keeps pace with the number of new homes proposed. 3. Precedent of Rejected Applications in the Same Area: ? Previous planning applications in the surrounding estate have been rejected on the basis of overdevelopment and infrastructure limitations. ? Allowing a development of this scale undermines those prior decisions and creates inconsistency in planning judgments. 4. Lack of Phasing or Scale Reduction Consideration: ? The proposal does not appear to explore phasing the housing delivery over time, which would help manage impact and monitor infrastructure strain. ? A phased approach or reduction in housing numbers would be more appropriate and responsive to the area's needs and limitations. 5. Cumulative Impact with Safeguarded Land: ? The 14.6 hectares of safeguarded land for future development suggests the 160 homes are just the first wave of much larger growth. ? The impact of this number of homes must be considered not in isolation, but in the context of future likely expansions. 6. No Demonstrated Local Demand for 160 New Homes in this Location: ? The scale of the development is not clearly justified by local housing need assessments specific to Breadsall or Oakwood. ? Building 160 homes without proven local demand could result in unbalanced growth and a mismatch with community needs.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Megan Byrne	Response-01432	Major impact see other comments
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Michael Poplar	Response-00565	160 too many currently proposed, plus the very worrying proposal that the "safeguarded" land of twice the area will come in useful to meet Erewash's future housing needs.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Monique Johnson	Response-00663	There are already too many of newbuilds in our above Breadsall. This has an appalling effect on the drainage and sewage system which just cannot cope. Residents of Breadsall are directly affected by this at all times but particularly when there is heavy rainfall. Flooding is already a major problem which has yet to be resolved. Adding anymore houses is going to compound the problem.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Mrs Francoise Poplar	Response-00602	Once again the authorities are going for the easy dig up a green field approach, rather than the use of brown field sites which might involve a little more effort. 160 houses is far too many for the existing crumbling infratructure to cope with.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Mr Softley	Response-00344	Where are these houses going? The topography simply does not seem compatible with the proposal. Significant ground works will be required with years of disruption to an already crowded.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Mrs Sarah Morley	Response-01515	In the last few years over 450 new houses have been build very close to this land. The road, schools, healthcare, wildlife etc COULD NOT COPE, with even more houses being built. As stated in my previous comments everything is already over loaded. Are other school, health care being built to accommodate this?
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Oakwood Ward Councillors Eyre, Muthall and Trehwella	Response-01359	We believe this number is unsuitable and have not seen evidence proving it to be a correct and appropriate number of houses for this site.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Philip Booth	Response-00683	This small site looks like thy are packing as many houses on as possible to hit there target for building new houses, instead of building the most appropriate number of houses.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Rachael	Response-00332	The Redrow estate is already a large housing estate, adding another 160 dwellings would make it unmanageable, congested and lose the charm or the area.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Richard Johnson	Response-00697	The extent of new houses being proposed will only increase the traffic through the village. The road network is insufficient and is already becoming a problem
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Richard Kingham	Response-00849	Not manageable. A lot of the garden soak away around here is onto that field so there is a fear of flash flooding in people's properties if we have severe rain as we have had previously as there is no run off with houses being there, which will be an increase in insurance and a fall in house values. If that's the case for myself I would be looking to sue the council and developer for lost finance.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Richard Straw	Response-01412	There would be too many houses and cars
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Sam Saunders	Response-01557	The proposed development of approximately 160 homes north of Breadsall Hilltop raises significant concerns regarding the scale of housing in relation to local infrastructure and community capacity. While meeting housing targets is important, the number of homes planned for this 8.2-hectare site may be excessive for the area, particularly given its location adjacent to established residential neighbourhoods like Hungerhill Close on Durose Country Park, Breadsall Village and Oakwood. Such a concentration of new housing risks overwhelming local services, including schools, healthcare, and transport networks, which are already under pressure. The density implied by 160 homes in this relatively small area could lead to a cramped and urbanized environment, detracting from the character and rural-urban transition that residents value. Moreover, the additional population would generate increased traffic volumes, exacerbating congestion and road safety concerns on local roads such as Dale Acre Way and the A609 Hill Top. The strain on public amenities and green spaces could also reduce the quality of life for both new and existing residents. A more phased or reduced-scale development would better allow for incremental infrastructure improvements and preserve the balance between development and community well-being. Without reconsideration of the housing numbers, the proposal risks unsustainable growth that could have lasting negative impacts on the local area.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Sandra Perry	Response-00307	Houses are packed in, close together to make as much money for the developer as possible. Most households have at least 1 car and that leads to congestion (see previous answer).
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Silvia Mircic	Response-00884	The traffic, light, and noise pollution generated by a development of this size would negatively affect the amenity value of the nearby conservation area and village in general. Additionally, this extension would ensure that Breadsall would become a suburb of Derby. I refer again to the NPPF 13. Protecting Green Belt land: 143. Green Belt serves five purposes: a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Stuart Brown	Response-00771	160 new homes with associated vehicles through dale acre way will have significant negative impact on the residents living on this road
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Susan Dundon	Response-00396	We don't need any more houses here
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Thomas Monkhouse.	Response-01318	Wherever you go there are new houses being built but little or nothing appears to be done to make sure that the infrastructure is keeping pace with the pace of house building.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Tom Parker	Response-01398	The redrow estate along with the persimmon development down the road already have sufficient amount of dwellings for this area, anymore and it will make this neighbourhood overcrowded, congested and the area will lose its charm.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Tony Hawkins	Response-01532	Too many. It will make the durose estate one big huge estate which was not planned nor designed to be large nor was the planning application approved on extending the estate
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Tracey Turner	Response-00334	New houses do need building but this should be done by the creation of a new community/district. Providing GP services, schools, amenities etc. Not add more to an already stretched area.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Number of Houses	Zora Wilson	Response-01575	Objection to Proposed Development ? Conflict with Policy CP18 (Green Wedges) I note that this application has been amended to exclude the development adjacent to the A61. However I still wish to raise strong objections to the proposed development (both in its amended form and original form) on the grounds that it conflicts with Policy CP18 concerning Green Wedges. Although the site lies just outside the designated green belt surrounding Breadsall, it directly abuts existing woodland and open countryside, forming an important part of the green corridor along the Great Northern Greenway. The application site provides valuable habitat for wildlife and functions as an essential green buffer. Its loss would significantly reduce ecological connectivity and visual amenity, impacting local biodiversity and the quality of life for residents, walkers, and cyclists who currently use and enjoy this open space. The site is actively appreciated by the community as a visual break in built development and as a wildlife corridor connecting to other open areas. While the outline proposal includes the retention of woodland, there are serious concerns that development will increase pressure on these areas, potentially leading to degradation over time. I am concerned that the proposed development does not provide an adequate buffer to the woodland corridor and built development will sit too close and will detrimentally impact the existing woodland. There is no BNG Assessment listed in the application documents on the portal so it appears that it hasn't yet been done. How can there be any confidence that the proposal would be able to satisfy the statutory requirement to deliver 10% net gain. Any BNG delivery off site or through the purchase of biodiversity units elsewhere, dilutes the benefit of 10% net gain as the biodiversity is lost here in this locality and the significant environmental impact is here. Crucially, the proposed development sits adjacent to land at Breadsall recently released from the green belt, which Erewash Borough Council is considering for housing allocation. If both sites are developed, the cumulative impact will be substantial?leading to the loss of meaningful green space, erosion of the rural character of the Great Northern Greenway, and the elimination of the settlement gap between Breadsall and the wider Derby conurbation. For these reasons, I urge the Council to reject the proposal in order to uphold the principles of Policy CP18 and protect the integrity of this important green wedge.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Alistair Crawford	Response-01404	The status of the six dwellings within the farm complex that only have ?right of way? to Mansfield Rd via the farm entrance. It is understood from the planning office that the farm will be unviable without the land and will be part of the complete development which at this stage, details are unknown. It is understood that the dwellings are not marked as remaining as per the other houses and businesses with their own access to Mansfield Road. Possible options which at this stage are unknown. a) If the dwellings remain and are encroached by the new development and with a change in terms of a rural access to Mansfield Rd the result will be a significant devaluation of the property. This devaluation will need to be addressed by adequate financial compensation. b) or compulsory purchase at market value based on property values before the development. Allowing the developer freedom to develop the properties or land as they wish. Also note this uncertainty regarding the future of the six dwellings is causing a considerable amount of mental stress. If these issues are not addressed I/we will be putting our case in person to the Planning Inspectorate.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Amber	Response-00329	Erewash council will be taking resource from Derby council paying residents! Outrageous.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Andrea R Rowley	Response-01230	Broadband is a necessity of modern life. Breadsall is fortunate to have an Open Reach Exchange on Rectory Lane however we do not have access to fibre to the premises (FTTP). Priority for fibre installation always seems to be given to newly built housing development sites with little consideration given to enhance the services for existing residents.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Andrea wightman	Response-00354	I strongly object to Erewash bolting a housing estate onto Oakwood, Derby city.. It is very convenient to have the estate away from the facilities in Erewash and expect Oakwood to cater for all of the extra people, children, traffic,.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Andrew David Williams	Response-00796	Since the land at Lime lane and at Breadsall hilltop has been developed the greenway has seen significant increase in anti social behaviour. There have been many instances of motorbikes using the Greenway , stones being thrown from the greenway into peoples properties in Breadsall and increased levels of noise late at night. Increased building will increase this and must be dissuaded at all costs.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Ann Sherlock	Response-00410	Why has the proposal been intentionally misleading? Why hasn't a current map been used instead of the out of date map that misses several hundred houses? Is it to display a lesser impact to push through a housing proposal that will undoubtedly cause severe harm to the already strained infrastructure of Oakwood and Breadsall? Is it to minimise the damage this proposal will have on the local area, wildlife and little green space we currently have left? Either way, it is disgraceful and the person in charge of the proposal, and whoever signed off on the maps used should be sacked and investigated for falsely misleading the public and authorities around this housing proposal.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Ben Martin	Response-00787	<p>This extension of the Derby conurbation not only flies in the face of the previous Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment 359 on the site as unsuitable for residential development, plus the continually recurring problems seen on all recent developments including and not limited to, a total lack of intent to upgrade inadequate infrastructure, roads, drainage, social provision etc. but also critically ensures the Breadsall becomes a suburb of Derby. The proposed development completely contradicts the National Planning Policy Framework 13 (NPPF 13) which states: 142. The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. 143. Green Belt serves five purposes: a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The proposal also totally ignores the Breadsall Parish Council Village Neighbourhood plan 2019 - 2029, link - <a href="https://www.breadsallparishcouncil.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/Breadsall-Neighbourhood-Plan_v21-final-draft-low-res-1.pdf">https://www.breadsallparishcouncil.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/Breadsall-Neighbourhood-Plan_v21-final-draft-low-res-1.pdf</a>). The key points of which I would like to highlight below from Chapter 7, page 8 are points 1, 2, 3, 7, 9, 11 &amp; 12: 1 Protect and enhance the rural character of the parish and prevent urbanisation. 2 Enforce the requirements of the Green Belt to prevent inappropriate development and avoid coalescence with the Derby conurbation. 3 Encourage small-scale residential development in appropriate locations within the village envelope. 4 Ensure that a significant proportion of new housing development in the parish will comprise small dwellings to help cater for the lack of such accommodation. 5 Protect and enhance existing employment uses within the parish, including home working where this does not adversely affect adjoining properties and their amenities. 6 Encourage new small-scale employment opportunities in the limited locations where this is appropriate while preventing industrial or commercial uses that would be incompatible with the Green Belt or with the parish generally. 7 Ensure that all new developments, replacement buildings and extensions are constructed with high-quality materials, using designs that are compatible with the adjoining development and the parish in general. 8 Encourage energy conservation through sustainable construction methods and domestic-scale energy generation, but resist large-scale energy generation that would harm the visual character of the parish. 9 Improve measures to control existing flood risks within the parish and resist any new development that may increase existing flood risks. 10 Identify and preserve specific buildings, structures, natural features, views and vistas that enhance the character of the parish. 11 Identify key wildlife and biological features within the parish and take appropriate steps to preserve them. 12 Mitigate the effect of the large volume of through traffic in the village and aim to prevent any growth in through traffic. 13 Control parking on pavements where possible, including enforcement of strict requirements for the provision of sufficient on-street parking. 14 Preserve and enhance local facilities within the parish, including especially the village shop, the Memorial Hall, the village school, the church, sports pitches, footpaths and greenways. 15 Maintain access to facilities provided outside the parish, particularly through provision of a regular bus service.</p>
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Ben Martin	Response-00787	
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Bethan Eddy	Response-00976	<p>I am following up on issues I raised at the full council meeting regarding the accuracies of the maps and information on Breadsall Hilltop land allocation. The map in the consultation document is not up to date and does not include the Durose development that is already built, if you look at the area on google maps you can see the further development. I am also concerned that the information is not accurate regarding Hungerhill Crescent as it is not a crescent, it is a close. These were raised at full council by myself prior to the consultation going out and I am concerned that the inaccuracies alter the way in which the information is viewed, as it looks like there is more 'green space' than there is. It also, makes me question the validity of the responses if people are unaware of the other developments in the area and that there will be little green space left.</p>
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Beverly Jordan	Response-01330	<p>As a Manor Farm resident the proposals are causing a lot of anxiety. We have been informed that the plans have not taken us into consideration. We have invested a lot in our home and wonder where or if we are considered in the proposals</p>



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Callum Gurney	Response-01402	Objection to Proposed Development ? Conflict with Policy CP18 (Green Wedges) I note that this application has been amended to exclude the development adjacent to the A61. However I still wish to raise strong objections to the proposed development (both in its amended form and original form) on the grounds that it conflicts with Policy CP18 concerning Green Wedges. Although the site lies just outside the designated green belt surrounding Breadsall, it directly abuts existing woodland and open countryside, forming an important part of the green corridor along the Great Northern Greenway. The application site provides valuable habitat for wildlife and functions as an essential green buffer. Its loss would significantly reduce ecological connectivity and visual amenity, impacting local biodiversity and the quality of life for residents, walkers, and cyclists who currently use and enjoy this open space. The site is actively appreciated by the community as a visual break in built development and as a wildlife corridor connecting to other open areas. While the outline proposal includes the retention of woodland, there are serious concerns that development will increase pressure on these areas, potentially leading to degradation over time. I am concerned that the proposed development does not provide an adequate buffer to the woodland corridor and built development will sit too close and will detrimentally impact the existing woodland. There is no BNG Assessment listed in the application documents on the portal so it appears that it hasn't yet been done. How can there be any confidence that the proposal would be able to satisfy the statutory requirement to deliver 10% net gain. Any BNG delivery off site or through the purchase of biodiversity units elsewhere, dilutes the benefit of 10% net gain as the biodiversity is lost here in this locality and the significant environmental impact is here. Crucially, the proposed development sits adjacent to land at Breadsall recently released from the green belt, which Erewash Borough Council is considering for housing allocation. If both sites are developed, the cumulative impact will be substantial?leading to the loss of meaningful green space, erosion of the rural character of the Great Northern Greenway, and the elimination of the settlement gap between Breadsall and the wider Derby conurbation. For these reasons, I urge the Council to reject the proposal in order to uphold the principles of Policy CP18 and protect the integrity of this important green wedge.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Carol Hart	Response-01830	The map showing the proposed site is also incorrect, the Durose development is not shown and a resident has said that his house is marked down in the proposed safeguarded site, he asks if the intention is to compulsory purchase his property, how can this site be judged correctly when the map is completely wrong, not just a development being left off but even incorrect naming of cul-de-sac and close.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Carol Westcott	Response-00973	I understand we need more housing but just reported 2 months ago there are 1800 empty houses in the Erewash area and 1200 in Derby why are these not being regenerated so that more housing estates are not built. The houses are already there so would not impact on the environment.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Carys Whomstley	Response-01438	I am writing to register my strong objection to the above-mentioned planning application, both in its original and revised form. Despite the removal of the area adjacent to the A61 in the amended proposal, I believe that the proposed development remains deeply inappropriate and harmful for the following reasons: 1. Contravention of Policy CP18 and Loss of Green Wedge The proposed site lies just outside the designated Green Belt, but crucially directly abuts existing woodland and open countryside, forming part of the vital green corridor along the Great Northern Greenway. This area functions as a green buffer, enhancing ecological connectivity, supporting biodiversity, and providing visual and recreational amenity to local residents, walkers, and cyclists. Despite claims of woodland retention, the development threatens the integrity of this space. Proximity to new housing would increase human pressure on the natural environment, likely leading to degradation of woodland, fragmentation of habitats, and a reduction in wildlife corridors. No Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) assessment appears in the application documents, raising concerns about whether the legally mandated 10% net gain can or will be achieved. Biodiversity enhancements delivered off-site would do nothing to mitigate local ecological loss, thereby undermining environmental sustainability in the area. Moreover, the site lies adjacent to land recently released from the Green Belt and under consideration for housing allocation by Erewash Borough Council. The cumulative impact of developing both sites would be devastating: a continuous sprawl from Derby through to Breadsall, resulting in the elimination of the settlement gap and permanent damage to the character of the Great Northern Greenway. 2. Environmental, Infrastructural, and Policy Concerns The proposal directly contradicts the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Paragraph 143, particularly the goals of preventing urban sprawl and protecting the openness of Green Belt land. It also ignores the findings of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA 359), which previously deemed the site unsuitable for residential development due to accessibility and environmental limitations. The development is completely incompatible with the objectives of the Breadsall Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2019?2029, particularly the aims to: Preserve the rural character and prevent urbanisation; Avoid coalescence with the Derby conurbation; Safeguard wildlife and ecological features; Control flood risk and infrastructure strain; Protect valued green spaces and visual vistas.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Carys Whomstley	Response-01438	Breadsall has already experienced increased flooding, attributed to upstream developments like Persimmon Estate and Breadsall Hilltop, which lie within the same water catchment area. Any additional development would worsen this issue, placing homes and infrastructure at risk. Furthermore, the proposal relies on access through two existing public footpaths within the Redrow estate and offers no concrete infrastructure improvements. The A608 is already over-congested, and no plans are presented to handle increased traffic or to safeguard children commuting to local schools. 3. Loss of Community and Ecological Value This land offers more than just open space?it is a much-loved and well-used amenity for the local community. It serves as a peaceful escape for informal recreation and nature engagement, and its visual and environmental contributions to the neighbourhood are significant. Its destruction would represent a major loss in local character and quality of life. The proposal underestimates the pressure on existing services, lacks detailed mitigation plans, and fails to explain how proposed footpaths will link meaningfully into existing routes. Nearby Local Wildlife Sites will be impacted

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Chris Lunn	Response-01410	There are already plans for two developments to the west of the current Durose Country park. The lack of infrastructure is of major concern as the amount of housing being proposed could potentially bring with it 3500-4000 additional adults and children. It would appear that little or no thought has been given to a matter of such importance.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Christine M Taylor	Response-01389	I object this strategy, due to three main reason, schooling, healthcare provision and environmental damage. Building 160 new homes is likely to put pressure on the local school, should the 1 school in Breadsall village, be at capacity, children will have to commute elsewhere such as Chaddesden. This will, increase pollution and cars on the road especially at rush hour. As well as this, the influx of people will put pressure on the Doctors at Oakwood medical centre, potentially demanding new doctors. Finally, the environment is likely to suffer and the urbanisation of the hill top is likely to create flood risk as the concrete is impermeable, Breadsall is already susceptible to flooding and I believe this to be a large concern. Traffic is also horrendous in Breadsall village.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Clare Roters	Response-01553	Crime in the area and lack of safety had already increased. More housing would bring more issues and spates of crime. Landscape and country so close to a city centre is almost unheard of these days and this landscape is decked is history, rare and endangered wild life ( birds of prey and bats) more housing would destroy this.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Colin Brewster	Response-00576	Mental and Physical Wellbeing This Green Belt land currently provides a green route from Breadsall Village, via the Great Northern Greenway, Oakwood, a route that is well walked by both communities. This open green route undoubtedly provides substantial physical and mental wellbeing to many local people. This again should not be lost to development.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Dana Demidoff	Response-00634	Why must you do this instead of encouraging recycling of derelict and other urban land
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Emma Charlton	Response-01545	A terrible waste of a beautiful green space enjoyed by nature, wildlife and dog walkers that keeps Breadsall and the surrounding area separated from large housing estates. All local primary schools are currently over subscribed, as well as the local doctors, so there is no infrastructure to support the increase in numbers to the area either. The newest nearby estate has lead to devastating floods in Breadsall Village and the allocation of social housing on the estate has lead to an increase in crime and antisocial behaviour in Breadsall. Of which we have sadly been victims of. And this development will only adversely contribute to more of this. Surrounding this land and closing the gap on all sides by mass residential housing will have a huge damaging effect on such precious, natural habitat for wildlife, as well as the local residents who chose, and worked hard to afford to live, in Breadsall village because of the distance from such estates and the peace and tranquility of the area.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Emma Daniels	Response-00346	You see housing developments all over derby but with additional parks/schools/road infrastructure to accommodate the extra houses, not seeing any of this in Oakwood, the houses are going up and facilities and services are staying the same, this is not right nor fair on the people of Oakwood
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Emma Hawkins	Response-00813	The proposal ignores the Breadsall Parish Council Village Neighbourhood plan 2019-2029. Key points of are: ? 1 - Protect and enhance the rural character of the parish and prevent urbanisation. ? 2 - Enforce the requirements of the Green Belt to prevent inappropriate development and avoid coalescence with the Derby conurbation. ? 9 - Improve measures to control existing flood risks within the parish and resist any new development that may increase existing flood risks. ? 11 - Identify key wildlife and biological features within the parish and take appropriate steps to preserve them. ? 12 - Mitigate the effect of the large volume of through traffic in the village and aim to prevent any growth in through traffic. The preservation of this greenbelt land referred to above helps to achieve these key objectives. It also provides separation of neighbouring towns and rural settlements within Erewash Borough and separates Breadsall from the Derby conurbation. The map provided in the consultation document is incorrect and does not show the existing Durose County Estate as demonstrated in the image below highlighting the estate. Housing on this land will merge into the existing estate and Derby City contradicting: ? 142. The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. ? 143. Green Belt serves five purposes: a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Not withstanding that there is a current planning application for the development of the land south of Breadsall Hill Top. The Durose Estate will be surrounded merging into one big estate of Derby City. The consultation states that access will be from Hungerhill Crescent. This is incorrect as it is actually Hungerhill Close. This would mean opening a road which is currently a Close ?dead end? to a through road. This road is not suitable nor wide enough to carry further traffic. Such new road would pass over a public footpath used by the local community gaining access to the Great Northern Greenway and Breadsall village by foot. This route is also used by school children who attend the school in the village further volumes of traffic would make this unsafe. Also, there is a natural pond located in the bottom right corner as highlighted by a purple dot within the above image, such development will have a negative impact on wildlife using this pond. The consultation states that access will also be provided from Dale Acre Way, again this road is in fact a ?dead end?. Such access would mean crossing an existing pathway used as mentioned above and the design of the estate in providing recreational space will be changed dramatically and no longer would be able to be enjoyed in the way that the estate does now. The road is also narrow and could not deal with increased volumes of traffic safely. The land also provides some natural drainage helping to prevent flooding to the local area particularly Breadsall Village which is badly affected by flooding. Such development will remove this and increase the risk of flo

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Emma Hawkins	Response-00813	oding immensely. Flooding to the village has increased since the development of Durose and Persimmon Lime Lane already. The proposed development will adversely affect the wildlife in the area forcing them into a much smaller corridor. Light pollution will negatively impact this much smaller corridor namely the Great Northern Greenway and also the farming animals next door. All of the above cannot be rectified with points 1-5 in the consultation as such planned estate will adversely impact the current situation as mentioned above. There are no provisions to improve the A608 which is already congested pushing more traffic through Breadsall Village, no provisions to provide services to help deal with the increase in population in the area such as doctors, Dentist and schools which are all full to capacity. The area cannot cope with potentially 2 further developments already going through planning and this further proposed development based on all the above points and I object.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Gaynor Pawley	Response-00627	All of the revenue would go to Erewash feeding into other areas for improvement, however due to the proximity to Derby City/ Oakwood, all the resources in Derby/ Oakwood would be effected.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Ged Doherty	Response-01822	Mental health is very important and in my case I run a small company so have considerable stress every day. The addition of the stress caused by this issue is deeply concerning and I know that that along with the hours I keep will make me most vulnerable to mental and physical degradation. On top of that the transformation of the Greenway into an urban strolling facility is removing a benefit to my health as I would wish to run in countryside and not alongside urban sprawl, and thus the situation would be even worse. Maybe you don?t care about the effect that your development plans have on those involved, maybe you do, but believe me when I tell you that this is a terrible idea and the concept and the confusion and uncertainty, and the no doubt deliberately confusing misuse of the word ?safeguarded? is causing huge stress to all involved. You have a great deal of responsibility in your role, and even more so with the ridiculous targets imposed upon you by successive governments, none of whom seem to have the ability to run a bath, never mind a country. We look to you to try to at least deal with some of those targets in a way that doesn?t obliterate any of the benefits of the areas concerned and show some empathy for the people who pay your wages.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Gemma Cotter	Response-01374	Although this site is in Erewash, it is not connected to other settlements or services within Erewash. The nearest services available are provided by Derby City and development at this site will not fund them through council tax. These services are already strained and struggle to meet the needs of the current population around Oakwood and Breadsall Hilltop. The boundary nature of this site and nearby area causes maintenance issues with roads and footways as maintenance and repairs are more complex to organise. There are other planning applications within the nearby area under consideration by Derby City Council and the cumulative effect of each development site must be considered holistically to protect the environment, living conditions, access to services and road safety.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Gillian Pearson	Response-00303	I do not believe that objections to proposed planning developments make any difference to the ultimate planning decisions made but I will continue to protest against the destruction of green fields and implore planners to ensure that conditions for necessary infrastructure improvements is made mandatory when permission is granted.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Helen Walker	Response-00325	We don?t need anymore houses around here, we need to keep the green open spaces increase good air quality and not increase the pressure that the local community is under already there are so many empty places which need to be changed into accommodation.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Hulland. Bdverley	Response-00496	Please build no more houses where persimmon homes are, Oakwood estate large enough

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Jake Moore	Response-01202	Adaptation to Extreme Weather: The proposed development could undermine Derby?s efforts to build climate change resilience. By encroaching on greenbelt/green wedge land, this development would reduce the city's natural capacity to adapt to changing weather patterns, such as increasing rainfall, heatwaves, and flooding. The loss of green spaces means the city has fewer areas for carbon sequestration, cooling, and biodiversity, all of which are vital for climate resilience. Sustainability Measures: Consideration should be given to whether the development incorporates effective sustainability measures, such as green building standards, renewable energy, and low-carbon infrastructure. Without these, the development could contribute to higher carbon emissions and further urban sprawl, undermining Derby?s climate goals. Impact on Local Economy: While new housing may bring some short-term economic benefits, it could also lead to long-term consequences for the local economy. A reduction in green spaces and increased congestion could affect the attractiveness of Derby as a place to live, work, and visit. Additionally, the strain on local businesses and tourism?especially if the area becomes less aesthetically appealing or accessible?could have negative repercussions. Cost of Infrastructure Upgrades: The council will need to invest heavily in upgrading existing infrastructure to accommodate the development, particularly regarding transport, drainage, and utilities. These costs should be considered when assessing the overall economic viability and impact of the project especially as council tax will be directed to Erewash constituents and areas rather than the Derby area impacted. Green spaces are essential for physical and mental health, providing areas for outdoor exercise, relaxation, and socialization. Without adequate green space, the community?s quality of life may suffer. And finally, The map submitted alongside the planning request fails to account for the existing 230-house development in the neighbouring field, which is an essential consideration in assessing the overall impact of the proposed development. The map contains no specific land reference for the proposed development site (for example, its Ordnance Survey or land registry number) to enable community members to cross-check whether it is listed in the SHLAA. These omissions raise serious concerns for the transparency of the application and the accuracy of the planning submission. By excluding this established development from the submitted map, the proposal overlooks the cumulative impact of multiple developments in the area. The 230 houses already built in the neighbouring field have already contributed to the urbanization of the area, and adding another 160 homes would significantly exacerbate the strain on local infrastructure, traffic, and environmental systems. It is crucial that the full extent of development in this area is considered to fully understand the implications of encroaching further into the countryside. More importantly, this omission highlights the potential for setting a dangerous precedent for future developments that could continue to erode the surrounding green spaces and rural character. The approval of this development would effectively create a domino effect, where each successive development would claim another portion of the countryside, weakening the natural and ecological integrity of the area. Once the countryside is fragmented by urban sprawl, it
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Jake Moore	Response-01202	becomes increasingly difficult to protect the remaining open spaces from further development. This sets a worrying precedent where piecemeal urbanization is allowed to slowly chip away at the greenbelt, turning rural areas into extensions of the urban environment, with each new development legitimizing the next. This is not just an issue of immediate environmental degradation?it poses a long-term threat to the countryside?s vitality, its wildlife, and its ability to act as a buffer between urban sprawl and the rural landscape. The missing development in the map serves as a clear demonstration of how, if allowed to proceed, this project could pave the way for further developments in the surrounding countryside, compounding the negative impacts on the local environment and landscape. Future developments would further fragment natural habitats, reducing the area available for wildlife and diminishing the quality of life for both existing and future residents. It is essential to evaluate this development in the context of its potential to trigger further, uncontrolled urban expansion. Erewash Borough Council, being a neighboring authority, is unlikely to have assessed this site as a priority for meeting its own local housing needs, given its location and the fact that it is encircled by Derby. Housing needs for Erewash Borough would typically be considered within the borough's established boundaries, not on land that is surrounded by a larger, more urbanized area (i.e., Derby). The housing needs assessments in Erewash Borough?s SHLAA focus on more appropriate sites within the borough that are aligned with its own growth objectives. Given the proximity of the proposed land to Derby City, it is unlikely that Erewash?s planning documents would identify this area as a priority for housing. If the land were genuinely needed for housing, it would be more appropriate for Derby City to have assessed it within its own Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). The fact that this site is not included in the SHLAA for Derby City supports the argument that this land is not essential for meeting local housing needs within the appropriate local planning authority?s remit. The proposed development undermines the long-term vision of sustainable urban development for Derby, potentially opening the door for more piecemeal development along the city?s edges, leading to further fragmentation of greenbelt land.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Jamie Branagan	Response-00335	Quite frankly I think it's a cheap shot for Erewash to try and propose such a development on its boundary. The map used to highlight the proposal is out of date and doesn't show how Oakwood North has already been developed with the existing Estate. The proposal to extend this estate and have access via the Bishops drive roundabout simply allows Erewash to wash its hands of any responsibility to these residents The traffic and all the requirements for amenities and services will naturally fall on Oakwood & I'm sure Erewash realises this. As I've mentioned in some of my other comments above, Oakwood and it's current residents simply can't absorb this increase in footfall.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Janet Brewster	Response-00577	Infrastructure This is once again a substantial development for the area and no infrastructure is being put in place. Schools, doctors etc. are already up to capacity and these problems urgently need addressing, before further development is allowed.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Janet O'Brien	Response-01835	Previous reviews stated this land is unsuitable for residential building and was conducted with due diligence by the planning department and councillors who actually visited the site at the time. This has now been overturned by this latest amendment without the same due diligence or physical visits. The details on the maps published for consultation are incorrect and out of date in respect of access roads and complete development of the Manor Farm Development. The status of the six dwellings within the farm complex that only have ?right of way? to Mansfield Rd via the farm entrance. It is understood from the planning office that the farm will be unviable without the land and will be part of the complete development which at this stage, details are unknown. It is understood that the dwellings are not marked as remaining as per the other houses and businesses with their own access to Mansfield Road. Possible options which at this stage are unknown. a) If the dwellings remain and are encroached by the new development and with a change in terms of a rural access to Mansfield Rd the result will be a devaluation of the property. This devaluation will need to be addressed by adequate financial compensation. b) or compulsory purchase at market value based on property values before the development. Allowing the developer freedom to develop the properties or land as they wish. Also note this uncertainty regarding the future of the six dwellings is causing a considerable amount of mental stress.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Janette Glenn	Response-00422	This is a cynical move by Erewash District Council to move its housing responsibilities to the edge of the city and does little to alleviate issues in Ilkeston, Sandiacre and Long Eaton. New residents will use their own cars most convenient facilities and these will inevitably be those provided by the city. Yet Erewash will be taking all the council tax and avoiding the responsibility.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Jessica Softley	Response-01408	The map containing the proposed land to be built on is incorrect and does not show the existing housing estate of Durose Country Park, which is where access is proposed through.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	John Harlow	Response-00619	The site ?Durose country park Estate? has only been completed approximately 2/3 years ago with still some ongoing problems that need to be resolved before and additional building takes place. Construction traffic is a night mare for residents who currently live there.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	John O'Brien	Response-01796	There is no provision to support the extra housing in terms of schools, dentists, doctors, drainage and sewers. Previous reviews stated this land is unsuitable for residential building and was conducted with due diligence by the planning department and councilors who actually visited the site at the time. This now has now been overturned by this latest amendment without the same due diligence or physical visits. The details on the maps published for consultation are incorrect and out of date in respect of access roads and complete development of the Manor Farm Development.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Karen Read	Response-00923	As stated in my above comments I am horrified to think this area will be ruined for the people who have worked and lived here i cannot understand why an area that has already had so many houses built has to endure yet more destruction of the precious green belt land Oakwood was and maybe still is the largest estate in europe enough is enough i would like to see the likes of ilkeston and heanor redeveloped before other areas are selected
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Kev Rodgers	Response-00897	In general, we seem to approve housing developments without ever any thought to the necessary supporting infrastructure, primarily schools and GP capacity and perhaps bus service provision, which in turn leads to additional vehicle use in the area as people use their cars to live their lives. In short, we try to address the housing shortage but we just add to road congestion and vehicle pollution.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Kirstin Woodward	Response-01043	The area cannot sustain more housing without a significant investment in infrastructure (roads, pavements, crossings, buses), as well as essential amenities (shops, schools, medical facilities, libraries, youth centres, uniformed clubs, pubs, restaurants, etc.). The area is already at breaking point. Without this necessary investment upfront, this proposal should be denied without further consideration.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Laura Louca	Response-01266	We've had enough in this area. Please stop building on Greenland. Find alternative sites. The 9 homes built on the old Windmill Garage site worked out well - build new homes on land such as that. There are many empty buildings around the town centres - renovate or knock those down and rebuild there instead. If it costs more then so be it - the cost of loosing our wildlife and open spaces is far more!
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Linda Smith	Response-01799	I also have concerns about the quality of the land which is included in the proposal. I have been informed by older villagers that the area was once a tip. I would be interested to know what sort of inspection has been authored to ensure this land is fit for building domestic dwellings.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Margaret Stafford	Response-01231	Broadband is a necessity of modern life. Breadsall is fortunate to have an Open Reach Exchange on Rectory Lane however we do not have access to fibre to the premises (FTTP). Priority for fibre installation always seems to be given to newly built housing development sites with little consideration given to enhance the services for existing residents.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Martin Harrison	Response-01395	I object to the proposed development on multiple grounds, primarily due to the significant and irreversible impact it would have on the local area. Traffic congestion is already a major issue, with key routes such as the A38, Mansfield Road, and the roads through Breadsall and Oakwood often gridlocked during peak hours. Introducing a large number of new homes with only one planned entrance and exit will worsen this considerably, increasing journey times, pollution, and accident risk. Air quality is another serious concern. With more vehicles funnelled through already-busy routes, emissions will rise, putting residents?especially children, the elderly, and those with respiratory conditions?at greater health risk. The development will also destroy green space that currently acts as a natural buffer against pollution and noise. Local infrastructure cannot cope with the additional pressure. Schools in the area are full, GP surgeries are overstretched, and public transport is limited and unreliable. The proposed housing will bring hundreds more residents without a plan to expand essential services. There are also major concerns around biodiversity and green belt loss. The site includes natural habitats that support local wildlife, and its development would lead to habitat destruction, species displacement, and long-term environmental damage. In terms of community fit, the number and type of homes proposed do not reflect the needs of the area. There is a shortage of truly affordable housing, yet the plans focus on high-cost builds. The design, density, and layout are also out of character with the existing community, risking an erosion of local identity. Drainage and flood risk have not been adequately addressed either. The area is known for surface water issues, and adding large amounts of impermeable ground will likely make this worse. There?s no clear evidence that robust flood mitigation measures are in place. Finally, the consultation process has felt tokenistic. Many residents feel ignored, and the lack of transparency throughout has created distrust in how this application has been handled. For these reasons, I urge that the planning application be rejected or significantly revised to properly address the real and valid concerns of the local community.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Masheda Chowdhury	Response-01339	1. Inadequate Community Consultation: ? Many local residents were unaware of the full scope and impact of this proposal until late in the process. ? There has been insufficient public engagement with the communities in Breadsall, Oakwood, and surrounding areas ? particularly those directly affected by access roads and visual impact. 2. Negative Impact on Quality of Life: ? This development will increase noise, traffic, and pressure on services, diminishing the quality of life for existing residents in the area. ? The cumulative effect of 160 homes and future safeguarded land development will fundamentally alter the area?s character and livability. 3. No Clear Benefit for the Local Community: ? Aside from housing numbers, there is no clear local gain ? no new community centre, public park, improved bus route, school expansion, or healthcare provision tied directly to the development. ? The plan appears to serve strategic housing targets, but not the needs of the immediate community. 4. Sets a Risky Precedent: ? Approving this site opens the door to the development of the adjacent 14.6 hectares of safeguarded land ? without any infrastructure plan in place to support such expansion. ? This could result in piecemeal planning decisions that fail to address the cumulative social and environmental impact of unchecked urban sprawl. 5. Contradiction with Climate and Sustainability Goals: ? Derbyshire County Council and Derby City Council have declared climate emergencies and pledged to protect green spaces, improve air quality, and support biodiversity. ? Approving a car-dependent, greenfield development with inadequate local facilities is inconsistent with these sustainability goals. 6. Strain on Emergency Services and Local Policing: ? No assessment has been provided regarding the impact on emergency services, including response times and police resources. ? With increased population comes increased demand ? this must be factored into planning.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Megan Byrne	Response-01432	I formally object to the proposed development, both in its original and amended form, on the grounds that it remains in direct conflict with Policy CP18 regarding Green Wedges. While I acknowledge that the revised application removes development adjacent to the A61, significant concerns remain. The proposed site lies immediately adjacent to existing woodland and open countryside and constitutes an integral part of the green corridor along the Great Northern Greenway. Although it technically falls outside the designated green belt surrounding Breadsall, the site plays a vital role in maintaining ecological connectivity and the rural setting of the area. The land in question provides valuable wildlife habitat and serves as a crucial green buffer. Its loss would diminish both the biodiversity and the visual amenity currently enjoyed by residents, walkers, and cyclists. This space is actively appreciated by the local community as a visual break in the built environment and as a wildlife corridor linking to other green areas. While the outline proposal includes the retention of some woodland, I am concerned that any development would inevitably increase pressure on these sensitive areas, risking their long-term degradation. The current plans do not appear to provide an adequate buffer between built development and the woodland, placing the ecological integrity of the site at risk. Notably, there is no Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessment included in the planning documents currently available on the portal. Without this, it is impossible to determine whether the proposal meets the statutory requirement for a minimum 10% net gain in biodiversity. Moreover, any BNG delivered off-site or through the purchase of biodiversity units elsewhere fails to mitigate the local environmental loss and undermines the core principle of net gain within this locality. It is also critical to highlight that the proposed development is situated adjacent to land at Breadsall recently released from the green belt, which is currently under consideration by Erewash Borough Council for future housing allocation. If both sites are developed, the cumulative impact will be significant?eroding the rural character of the Great Northern Greenway, closing the settlement gap between Breadsall and Derby, and resulting in the loss of meaningful green space. For these reasons, I strongly urge the Council to refuse this application in order to uphold the integrity of Policy CP18 and protect the essential role this green wedge plays in our natural and community environment.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Michael Albinson	Response-00790	Being a home owner in Hungerhill Close the points I have made are valid and true. On a personal note, we paid a premium to live within the estate away from main rounds or access road for our kids to play out side. The increase in traffic, noise pollution, dust, dirt and general disturbance will prevent all the current benefits we as home owners have paid a premium for buying within this area on this type of street.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Michael Grignon	Response-01335	As a resident of manor farm barns, whose houses were omitted from the core plans , weather due to an oversite or carelessness , these plans have caused extreme anxiety and stress to my partner and myself.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Mollie	Response-01549	I strongly object to the proposed housing development north of Breadsall Hill Top. The plans represent overdevelopment on green belt land, threatening the rural landscape and increasing pressure on already overstretched local services. The area lacks the infrastructure to absorb this scale of growth ? local roads are already congested, schools are near capacity, and GP surgeries face long waiting times. The site is visually prominent and inappropriate for high-density development, with real concerns about increased surface water flooding due to inadequate drainage provision. This proposal would cause lasting harm to the character, environment, and livability of the area, and should be refused.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Monique Johnson	Response-00663	Many os the problems that would arise from this new development had already been put forward when previous developments were applied for. The situation has definitely worsened. Breadsall which is in Erewash and has a wonderful village feel is being squeezed into the Derby conurbation. The village which has a lot of history should be protected from massive developments. It is becoming more fragile. As said, the best way to add houses is to use brown sites and repurpose them rather than leaving them empty and making the city unattractive because of their very presence in Derby.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Mrs Francoise Poplar	Response-00602	How much longer can we tolerate this monoculture of mass housing at all costs without any supporting infrastructure?
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Mr Softley	Response-00344	This should be treated as a large development in Oakwood with the combined proposals from Derby City Council, not as a small addition to the local council. The disruption will be significant and anything other than that can only be considered as extreme naivety and incompetence.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Mrs Sarah Morley	Response-01515	MANOR FARM BARNs - BARN CONVERSIONS On the map, it doesn't mention at all, the six existing barn conversions at the farm. Has this even been taken into consideration???? I don't understand why they are not on the map Will these properties still have their own private entrance or be connected to the mass number of houses you are wanting to build in the future. The value of my property, along with the other 5 properties will massively decrease in value. These properties were purchased to look over the lovely green countryside, where the wildlife live. We have had to follow strict criteria when renovation our houses to keep in in line with the countryside (brown wooden widows etc). This is causing me so much stress. As it isn't clear all all what you plan on doing with the land, and have only very recently realised what is being planned. I think you have purposely been very vague so no one realises your plans
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Mrs VA Forster	Response-00542	I wish to object to all categories. Flooding is worse and more houses will make it worse. From 8am to 9am and 3pm to 6pm we cannot navigate out of Smalley Drive onto Morley Rd now. The crash on Acorn way 22nd April proves how dangerous the traffic is becoming on narrow, country roads. We haven't enough Doctors and Dentists now and no infrastructure is planned. Erewash will be getting Council Tax but it's Derby City, yet again who provide the services which is wholly abhorrent to me. Parents already have to drive children to Schools, thus polluting the air further. The land is/was greenbelt. Yet you have Brownbelt land you could use. That's before we start on the catastrophic impact on our Wildlife. This land was owned by a local landowner and he was a major proponent of allowing for nature and green spaces, which this will remove access from. The Nature Reserves will be adversely affected by pollution, doubtless hedge and tree destruction. Yet on Oakwood we have TPOs. We have Grouse, Pheasants, Rookeries and countless other birds. These home buyers won't care that we have Wild Deer that cross the main roads and Cattle that sometimes escape and to be alert for them! It feels claustrophobic and will be worse. The roads around Spondon, Oakwood and Chaddesden cannot cope, cannot be widened. Locko Rd and Acorn Way are 60mph and unsuitable for buses. Amenities are a car journey away. You can't get a bus from Oakwood to Spondon without changing buses. These houses only have access to a Heanor Bus. Not local City Centre buses.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Neal Flint	Response-01220	Are we in breadsall and other communities not allowed to keep our identities and exist as villages or settlements in their own right anymore? Quite frankly people who are in power and make these decisions should hang their heads in shame, the way you and developers are allowed to run ruff shod over communities and their feelings is disgusting , you will do what you want no matter what peoples views or feelings are, its disgusting.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Oakwood Ward Councillors Eyre, Mulhall and Trehella	Response-01359	The map shown is incorrect. It fails to show both the Lime Tree Court Estate, constructed over six years ago, and the Durose Country Park Estate which the site is proposed to be bolted-on to. For what possible reason could BOTH of these sites, one of which provides the sole proposed entrance into the proposed development, could they have been missed off? Additionally, the A-Road is the A608, not the A609 as the documents state. And Hungerhill is a Close, not a Crescent. How could this have been incorrectly stated in the documents? Or was this a deliberate attempt to made the road appear to be something it is not? Finally, we see the acknowledgement that this is an expansion of the existing urban area as a clear acceptance that this is a bolt-on to the city, and another bolt-on to the Oakwood Ward, which will take Derby's housing growth and urban expansion and do nothing for Erewash residents, but will count towards EBC housing figures solely due to the land it is located on.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Philip Booth	Response-00683	Money raised from Council tax from these properties would not be spent on improving the services and infrastructure as these are all provided by Derby City Council nor Erewash.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Rachael	Response-00332	Further properties are not required in this area, the destruction of further green belt is not the answer. It will only continue to destroy peoples way of life, mental health, physical health and will cause many people to relocate out of the area due to continued disturbance. We should be promotion healthy, happy, outdoor activities, not removing the land for it to be done on.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Richard Stone	Response-01029	The main issue, more than anything, is the nature for the animals and bats in the area, but also the road system just cannot support more cars in multiple areas round this. Too much needs to be done to the roads before more housing is put in anywhere near here.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Richard Straw	Response-01412	I purchased my house on the basis that I had a nice open greenbelt space nearby and my kids can play out safely. Planning to build a road right outside my house would ruin my whole idea of my home
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Roy Ling	Response-01243	The submitted plan is incorrect, it fails to show the Persimmon and Redrow developments which then appears as more green fields than in reality. The point of entry is shown as Hungerhill Crescent this is incorrect Hungerhill is a Close. The correct plan should be resubmitted and the closing date put back.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Sam Saunders	Response-01557	First and foremost, the development?s location on Green Belt land remains the single most significant issue. The irreversible loss of protected countryside would undermine national and local planning policies designed to preserve the openness, prevent urban sprawl, and maintain the clear boundary between Derby?s urban area and Breadsall village. This loss not only threatens biodiversity and landscape character but also compromises climate resilience and community well-being. Secondly, infrastructure capacity across multiple sectors ? roads, schools, healthcare, and public transport ? is already under strain. The proposals lack clear, funded commitments to expand these services proportionately to the increase in population. This gap risks long-term negative impacts, including traffic congestion and road safety hazards, overcrowded schools, overstretched GP services, and inadequate bus networks, which could marginalize vulnerable residents and reduce quality of life. Thirdly, environmental concerns extend beyond Green Belt designation to biodiversity, flood risk, and air quality. The proximity to the Great Northern Greenway and local wildlife sites demands rigorous safeguards that appear insufficiently addressed. Likewise, flood risks in nearby areas such as the A61 and Breadsall Village highlight the need for advanced sustainable drainage solutions to prevent exacerbating existing vulnerabilities. Finally, the proposed housing mix and scale raise questions about whether the development truly reflects local needs. A balanced approach prioritizing genuinely affordable homes and appropriate density could mitigate some community impacts. In summary, the development conflicts with core planning principles related to protecting Green Belt land, ensuring sustainable infrastructure, and preserving environmental quality. Without robust mitigation and clear commitments, the proposal poses unacceptable risks to the community and landscape.
			Sarah Noble	Response-00611	We need more housing
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Sharon Coward	Response-00348	This development is going to have a detrimental affect on the people, services & infrastructure of oakwood & derby city council. People using the services & infrastructure of oakwood & derby city council while paying council tax to Erewash is utterly disgusting & underhand.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Steven furness	Response-01516	This will join Breadsall village to Breadsall Hill Top and hence Oakwood. It will no longer be a village but part of this continuous housing scheme. I would demand lower council taxes if we are now loosing village status.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Tom King	Response-00734	Local services and amenities already to capacity, adding further houses would cause a further strain on already strained facilities. Don't see how the current redrow development can be extended due to surrounding greenway and steep gradient.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Tom Parker	Response-01398	Further homes are not required in this area of Derby. We all know homes are in demand; however, the destruction of green belt land is not the answer. It will only destroy people?s ways of life, affect their mental and physical health, and will cause so many people (including ourselves) to relocate out of this area.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Tony Hawkins	Response-01532	The proposal ignores the Breadsall Parish Council Village Neighbourhood plan 2019-2029. Key points of are: ? 1 - Protect and enhance the rural character of the parish and prevent urbanisation. ? 2 - Enforce the requirements of the Green Belt to prevent inappropriate development and avoid coalescence with the Derby conurbation. ? 9 - Improve measures to control existing flood risks within the parish and resist any new development that may increase existing flood risks. ? 11 - Identify key wildlife and biological features within the parish and take appropriate steps to preserve them. ? 12 - Mitigate the effect of the large volume of through traffic in the village and aim to prevent any growth in through traffic. The preservation of this greenbelt land referred to above helps to achieve these key objectives. It also provides separation of neighbouring towns and rural settlements within Erewash Borough and separates Breadsall from the Derby conurbation. The map provided in the consultation document is incorrect and does not show the existing Durose County Estate as demonstrated in the image below highlighting the estate. Housing on this land will merge into the existing estate and Derby City contradicting: ? 142. The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. ? 143. Green Belt serves five purposes: a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Notwithstanding that there is a current planning application for the development of the land south of Breadsall Hill Top. The Durose Estate will be surrounded merging into one big estate of Derby City. The consultation states that access will be from Hungerhill Crescent. This is incorrect as it is actually Hungerhill Close. This would mean opening a road which is currently a Close ?dead end? to a through road. This road is not suitable nor wide enough to carry further traffic. Such new road would pass over a public footpath used by the local community gaining access to the Great Northern Greenway and Breadsall village by foot. This route is also used by school children who attend the school in the village further volumes of traffic would make this unsafe. Also, there is a natural pond located in the bottom right corner as highlighted by a purple dot within the above image, such development will have a negative impact on wildlife using this pond. The consultation states that access will also be provided from Dale Acre Way, again this road is in fact a ?dead end?. Such access would mean crossing an existing pathway used as mentioned above and the design of the estate in providing recreational space will be changed dramatically and no longer would be able to be enjoyed in the way that the estate does now. The road is also narrow and could not deal with increased volumes of traffic safely. The land also provides some natural drainage helping to prevent flooding to the local area particularly Breadsall Village which is badly affected by flooding. There are ditches running alongside the edges of the area which
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Tony Hawkins	Response-01532	will up with water as soon as it rains. The land also becomes sodden with water. Such development will remove drainage and increase the risk of flooding immensely. Flooding to the village has increased since the development of Durose and Persimmon Lime Lane already. The proposed development will adversely affect the wildlife in the area forcing them into a much smaller corridor. Light pollution will negatively impact this much smaller corridor namely the Great Northern Greenway and also the farming animals next door. This land is an essential green buffer. Its loss would significantly reduce ecological connectivity impacting local biodiversity. All of the above cannot be rectified with points 1-5 in the consultation as such planned estate will adversely impact the current situation as mentioned above. There are no provisions to improve the A608 which is already congested pushing more traffic through Breadsall Village, no provisions to provide services to help deal with the increase in population in the area such as doctors, Dentist and schools which are all full to capacity. The area cannot cope with potentially 2 further developments already going through planning and this further proposed development based on all the above points and I object.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Tracey Turner	Response-00334	Erewash should be ashamed of the underhand application process. The local derby city community will not see benefit from this build, for example council tax to pay for services that these properties will use in the area!
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Other	Wobbina Bugg	Response-00846	It has a detrimental effect on the character of Breadsall Village.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Adam Garner	Response-00613	Same reason as traffic congestion.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Amber Hubbard	Response-00845	Mansfield Rd is already much busier following the redrow and lime lane estates. This is adding more traffic without addressing congestion, road safety, reducing the speed limit, fencing off the existing play area from the road or additional crossing points
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Andrea R Rowley	Response-01230	See comments on Traffic congestion. At peak times it is very difficult and unsafe to venture out from Croft Lane on to the A61. Traffic is backed up on Croft Lane to the village triangle near to Damsons coffee shop. It's not just the extra cars per household, its delivery vans and houses having work done on their property that adds to the overall traffic volume in the proposed housing development site and the surrounding roads affected by the development.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Andrew David Williams	Response-00796	Road safety is a key issue with increased traffic through Breadsall village and lack of wide enough footpaths , speeding traffic and junction layouts.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Andy Madeley	Response-00381	Plenty of accidents on A608
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Angela Clarke	Response-01400	Having construction traffic accessing the new proposed site I feel will increase the safety for residents already on Durose Park,including children entering and exiting the site particularly at school times.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Ann Sherlock	Response-00410	The map used is out of date and there is already increased traffic and concerns around road safety due to the Alport Heights estate and Durose estate (both estates and established roads connected to them are conveniently missing off the map used, and perhaps intentionally misleading). There have been a number of accidents already on Mansfield Road around that area, and Breadsall village struggles with the traffic load already.
			A O Smith	Response-01798	The junctions and traffic calming are insufficient to minimise this increasing risk in Breadsall.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Ashley syill	Response-00397	Narrow roads to be able to extend to a further development. This directly into a roundabout to oakwood

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Ben Martin	Response-00787	There is nothing to address the safety of children who cross on a daily basis for school access. The road already has excessive congestion. There are no provisions to address the safety of children who cross on a daily basis for school access. The planned access to the site can only be achieved by cutting through 2 designated and widely used public footpaths located in the existing Redrow estate at Breadsall Hilltop from the A608.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Bethan Eddy	Response-00976	The roads are already busy, especially the junction of Brookside Road and Lime Lane already. There have been a number of accidents
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Beverly Jordan	Response-01330	Increased levels of traffic results in potential for traffic accidents , and pedestrian safety
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Brett James	Response-00871	The impact on an area already swamped by traffic will be detrimental to the area
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Carl Hill	Response-00670	See previous point about lack of points to cross due to too many junctions and now traffic.. recent accidents at alone Lime Lane junction
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Carol Westcott	Response-00973	There is a nursery school people walking and the road is 40mph which is far too fast
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Carys Whomsley	Response-01438	I am writing to register my strong objection to the above-mentioned planning application, both in its original and revised form. Despite the removal of the area adjacent to the A61 in the amended proposal, I believe that the proposed development remains deeply inappropriate and harmful for the following reasons: 1. Contravention of Policy CP18 and Loss of Green Wedge The proposed site lies just outside the designated Green Belt, but crucially directly abuts existing woodland and open countryside, forming part of the vital green corridor along the Great Northern Greenway. This area functions as a green buffer, enhancing ecological connectivity, supporting biodiversity, and providing visual and recreational amenity to local residents, walkers, and cyclists. Despite claims of woodland retention, the development threatens the integrity of this space. Proximity to new housing would increase human pressure on the natural environment, likely leading to degradation of woodland, fragmentation of habitats, and a reduction in wildlife corridors. No Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) assessment appears in the application documents, raising concerns about whether the legally mandated 10% net gain can or will be achieved. Biodiversity enhancements delivered off-site would do nothing to mitigate local ecological loss, thereby undermining environmental sustainability in the area. Moreover, the site lies adjacent to land recently released from the Green Belt and under consideration for housing allocation by Erewash Borough Council. The cumulative impact of developing both sites would be devastating: a continuous sprawl from Derby through to Breadsall, resulting in the elimination of the settlement gap and permanent damage to the character of the Great Northern Greenway. 2. Environmental, Infrastructural, and Policy Concerns The proposal directly contradicts the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Paragraph 143, particularly the goals of preventing urban sprawl and protecting the openness of Green Belt land. It also ignores the findings of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA 359), which previously deemed the site unsuitable for residential development due to accessibility and environmental limitations. The development is completely incompatible with the objectives of the Breadsall Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2019?2029, particularly the aims to: Preserve the rural character and prevent urbanisation; Avoid coalescence with the Derby conurbation; Safeguard wildlife and ecological features; Control flood risk and infrastructure strain; Protect valued green spaces and visual vistas.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Carys Whomsley	Response-01438	Breadsall has already experienced increased flooding, attributed to upstream developments like Persimmon Estate and Breadsall Hilltop, which lie within the same water catchment area. Any additional development would worsen this issue, placing homes and infrastructure at risk. Furthermore, the proposal relies on access through two existing public footpaths within the Redrow estate and offers no concrete infrastructure improvements. The A608 is already over-congested, and no plans are presented to handle increased traffic or to safeguard children commuting to local schools. 3. Loss of Community and Ecological Value This land offers more than just open space?it is a much-loved and well-used amenity for the local community. It serves as a peaceful escape for informal recreation and nature engagement, and its visual and environmental contributions to the neighbourhood are significant. Its destruction would represent a major loss in local character and quality of life. The proposal underestimates the pressure on existing services, lacks detailed mitigation plans, and fails to explain how proposed footpaths will link meaningfully into existing routes. Nearby Local Wildlife Sites will be impacted
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Chris Lunn	Response-01410	Road safety is another area of vital importance. As above, 160-320 additional vehicles flowing through the development and out into the Redrow estate, especially at peak times, will cause a build-up of traffic as it tries to enter Mansfield Road/Hilltop at the Dale Acre roundabout. It is already extremely dangerous getting out of Windmill Place due to traffic travelling too quickly and its proximity to the roundabout. Another 100-150 cars would undoubtedly cause accidents as people will take risks to compete with an already congested road system. Pedestrians will be vulnerable as they try to cross heavy traffic. These extra vehicles will cause additional pollution, noise and potentially increase the incidence of respiratory problems ? thus returning to the issue of inadequate healthcare facilities. Hungerhill Close, the road proposed to take the traffic flow on and off the proposed development already becomes congested as parked cars are an issue. With so many additional vehicles all having to use this route, the situation for pedestrians, many with young children, will become even more dangerous. Large vans, emergency vehicles and bin lorries will all have to use this road. Bin lorries, stopping every few metres to empty household waste will cause congestion and utter chaos at peak times. Cars will be discharging harmful emissions whilst waiting to get around large vehicles at the same time as small children are walking past. More health problems will undoubtedly arise.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Christine Goodwin	Response-00642	Speeding traffic is already a problem through Breadsall Village and is a particular concern on Brookside Road where the junior school is situated
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Clare Roters	Response-01553	We have nr on and genuine collisions already and only a few days ago a gentleman was knocked off his motorcycle on the roundabout at the entrance to Dale acre way. Cars speed down Mansfield road all the time and only a couple of years ago a motorcyclist was killed nr the durose estate

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Colin Brewster	Response-00576	The traffic situation in Breadsall Village has become ridiculous. The roads are just not capable of taking the increased flow and road safety has become an increased worry with the relocation of the village school to the main thoroughfare. A solution is needed before any additional development is granted.
			Darren adams	Response-00874	During non-rush-hour traffic the speed that vehicles go through the village is in excess of the current speed limit
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	David Byrne	Response-01433	There have been a number of near miss incidents on our estate already due to a large range of 4 way intersections, adding more traffic will likely result in an accident
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Edward James Gregory	Response-00728	The area already suffers from traffic congestion, and safety issues due to speed and number of vehicles. Area suffers from flooding and run-off onto the highways. There for further development will increase this and reduce safety
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Elaine hodgkinson	Response-00854	There is already bad congestion all the way from the junction with Mansfield Rd with particularly dangerous sections at the right hand junction next to Stice of India and the Lime lane and Breadsall junctions where there have been fatalities. It will badly increase the number of cars travelling through the residential area of Oakwood with the risk to residents that poses.
			Emma Binns	Response-00843	More cars will use Breadsall as a rat run and speed through the village.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Emma Daniels	Response-00346	No traffic calming measures or lights to cross safely with the congested traffic or speeding cars
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Emma Hawkins	Response-00813	The consultation states that access will be from Hungerhill Crescent. This is incorrect as it is actually Hungerhill Close. This would mean opening a road which is currently a Close ?dead end? to a through road. This road is not suitable nor wide enough to carry further traffic safely. Such new road would pass over a public footpath used by the local community gaining access to the Great Northern Greenway and Breadsall village by foot. This route is also used by school children who attend the school in the village further volumes of traffic would make this unsafe. The consultation states that access will also be provided from Dale Acre Way, again this road is in fact a ?dead end?. Such access would mean crossing an existing pathway used as mentioned above and the design of the estate in providing recreational space will be changed dramatically and no longer would be able to be enjoyed in the way that the estate does now. The road is also narrow and could not deal with increased volumes of traffic safely. The island to the entrance of the estate is all ready congested and un safe due to unclear road markings.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Faye Wilkinson	Response-01129	Cars are already parked roadside and on pavements due to limited parking for residents causing pedestrians to walk on the road which would become more dangerous with increased traffic.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Gary Murfin	Response-00374	With increased traffic from the new developments planned in the area road safety will become a bigger issue
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Gaynor Pawley	Response-00627	The 40 mph limit on the A608, which has been reviewed previously has been kept as it is a main route into Derby. If more housing developments are built this is increasingly becoming part of an urban city scape and as such the road infrastructure should be dealt with to put in a bypass for this area for safety.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Gemma Cotter	Response-01374	Nearby the A608/ Lime Lane junction is the site of frequent RTCs including fatalities. The staggered junction is difficult to negotiate at peak times and increased traffic density encourages risky pulling out of the side roads. Lime Lane at Kings Corner also has a poor safety record with multiple factors. Only minor improvements have been made since the construction of Oakwood and it is a major connection between Oakwood/ Spondon to go north of Derby or traffic entering Derby from areas such as Heanor or Ilkeston. Further housing developments between Oakwood and Breadsall will place additional strain on traffic flows and accident risk.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Gillian Pearson	Response-00303	Already mentioned as a concern
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Harry Mee	Response-00882	More road users and more congestion equals more incidents, simple.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Helen Foster	Response-00650	This proposal raises significant concerns about the increase in traffic volume, particularly along Brookside Road, a relatively narrow road not designed for heavy use, and as a consequence heightened risks for both drivers and pedestrians.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Helen Walker	Response-00325	The increased traffic will increase the risk of accidents the road is too fast at 40mph as it is, there is a nursery which does not have a crossing near it, will more traffic there is likely to be a serious accident.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Hulland. Bdverley	Response-00496	More traffic, more accudents
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Ian Lockwood	Response-01491	There are already significant queues at rush hour on Brookside Road in Breadsall, which is a narrow road not built for the volume of traffic it already receives as a result of other recent housing developments. This development will only compound this and increase the already multiple daily instances of near-misses around the traffic calming area and junction with Church Lane and Croft Lane, not to mention the heavy queueing at Pektron island where Croft Lane meets the A61.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Jake Moore	Response-01202	The addition of 160 homes could bring an estimated 300 additional vehicles into the area. Existing roads around the area are already under strain and not designed to accommodate such a significant increase in traffic. This will lead to: Increased risk of accidents, particularly at junctions and in residential streets where visibility is limited. Greater danger for children walking or cycling to local schools, as well as elderly and vulnerable residents. Higher likelihood of congestion and vehicle conflict, especially during peak hours, school drop-off times, and weekends. If the access roads to the proposed development connect to already busy or narrow streets, the situation could become unmanageable, posing real safety risks. Hungerhill Close already experiences severe congestion due to cars regularly parked on both the road. At present: The road is frequently reduced to a single usable lane, causing vehicles to mount pavements or reverse unsafely. Access for emergency vehicles, refuse collection, and delivery lorries is already constrained. Pedestrians, including children walking to local schools and elderly residents, are forced into the road due to blocked or narrowed pavements. Introducing 160 additional homes ? with potentially 300 or more new vehicles ? will compound an already dangerous situation. If Hungerhill Close is to be used for access to the development or bears even indirect traffic pressure from it, this creates an unacceptable safety risk.
			James Bellaby	Response-00337	More cars less safety for pedestrians etc.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	James Roberts	Response-00673	As per Traffic Congestion, Dale Acre Way & Hungerhill Close are not suitable for an effective doubling in households trying to use them daily. Multiple children in the area ride bikes & scooters and walk and play around these roads in the evenings because it is currently safe enough to do so. Adding in that many additional households to the roads will make this impossible without serious risk of injury to a pedestrian. Also living close to the Friday Lane and Bandy Lane junctions of Dale Acre Way, I have seen a number of near misses between cars taking the corners too fast and too tight without expecting oncoming vehicles. No amount of nondescript 'junction improvements' is going to mitigate the increased likelihood of accidents that comes with doubling the road usage (not even considering the risks while construction work is ongoing with industrial vehicles attempting to use the roads)
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Jamie Branagan	Response-00335	As mentioned under traffic, the area is already heavily congested. Your map is out of date and doesn't show the existing estate you propose to tag this development on to, giving a false sense of what the area currently looks like. Adding 160 more homes will add at least c150-200 more cars to a road that is notorious for accidents and collisions.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Janet Brewster	Response-00577	Over recent years road safety has become a real concern in Breadsall Village. The roads and particularly the junctions are really dangerous. A way to mitigate this situation needs to be found before any additional development is approved.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Janet O'Brien	Response-01835	The traffic levels at Peak times have considerably increased following the recent housing developments on the A608, making it difficult and unsafe to enter onto the road in either direction. Any further traffic load will only exacerbate this situation in both directions and through the village of Breadsall a ?rat run? for traffic heading for the A38 This is particularly concerning as traffic now passes the front gates of the new Breadsall Primary school and will only increase in volume.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Janette Booth	Response-00295	Accidents at Lime Lane junction and near Damsons in the village are already happening more frequently than they should. Speeding through the village, despite traffic calming is also a cause of concern.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Jason Reader	Response-00320	No mention of improvement to the lime lane - brookside road junction where there have been fatal accidents. Make the developer pay for road improvements to slow traffic and reduce accidents.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Jeanette Kent	Response-00402	Even more traffic on the already over used roads are a recipe for disaster, the road already has regular accidents on it, more traffic means the risk of even more accidents
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Jessica Softley	Response-01408	Access to the proposed build is through the existing Durose Country Park estate, including Dale Acre Way which regularly has multiple cars parked along it. The proposal of 160 houses will create a large influx of cars travelling down this road, leading to road safety concerns.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	J Hasse	Response-00875	Increased traffic means increased accidents.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Jim Smith	Response-00741	An increased volume of traffic will pass the new school on Brookside Road, especially in the morning. I genuinely fear this is just an accident waiting to happen. The additional traffic this proposal will bring just makes this more likely
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	John Harlow	Response-00619	As a house holder at no 24 Dale acre Way we see many vehicles travelling through the estate.. It is totally unacceptable to have any increase in the amount of traffic. The junction between Dale Acre Way and Bandy Lane is totally unsafe as there is ?no right of way? so drivers push their luck every day with dire consequences. I have witnessed many accidents and incidents at this junction. Dale acre Way is already up to capacity at peak times so any additional traffic would have a safety impact and also add emissions to the air quality. At peak times in the morning, traffic is queued at the roundabout on Mansfield road from Dale Acre Way, from Morley direction and also long queues on Bishops Drive. An increase in any traffic is just not acceptable, on the grounds of environmental constraints and safety.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	John Montgomery	Response-00622	Refer to notes added under the heading of Traffic Congestion.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Jonathan Park	Response-01191	Area is already constrained with narrow roads in and out of the estate causing potential further dangerous occurrences. The roundabout serving the estate from Mansfield road has already seen numerous accidents and the increase of traffic will likely contribute to more
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Jon Lewis	Response-00347	The development already has excessive traffic running through it and the proposed additional housing will further increase this. The development has a large amount of children which use this route for local buses to and from school
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Justine Dean	Response-00844	The roads are already dangerous to cross. Cars get fed up of queuing and then speed if there is ever a gap.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Justin Windsor	Response-01544	From my understanding, access to the proposed new estate is through the current durose country park estate, this brings with it danger to the current population on ?DCP? including the children who enjoy the current safety of the estate as it will potentially bring up to ~300 extra cars through the estate to the proposed entrance. Not only does this bring a risk to the walking/active public but also brings largely increased risk to the road network on DCP as the estate was not built for that sustained level of traffic, there are no painted road markings, the corners to the branching streets off of Dale Acre Way are too sharp for a sustained increase in traffic, and accidents will be inevitable!
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Kara Crossley	Response-00865	There are already multiple accidents that happen in Breadsall village as a result of the traffic calming points in the village and the volume of traffic that use the village as a through fare every day
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Karen Read	Response-00923	I am concerned that road safety will be an issue for pedestrians and vehicles cyclists etc due to increased traffic how does the policy reduce this impact
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Karen Smith	Response-00635	There is far too much traffic in the area. The roads are not designed for the speed at which people travel on them and the pavements are inadequate, indeed in some areas there are none.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Kimberley Woodward	Response-01445	It's a disaster waiting to happen the speed people go down Dale Acre Way without another development using this same road. Especially with children playing on the estate. It is only a matter of time before an accident happens and it is always a worry to me of a car ploughing into my house as I live on the corner of the junction!

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Kirstin Woodward	Response-01043	The traffic on Mansfield Road is constant. The pavements are too narrow for pedestrians, allowing only single-file walking. This is especially difficult for people with pushchairs, wheelchairs, or dogs, and for those walking with elderly individuals?as I often do. It feels very unsafe. This is a 40 mph road with limited crossing points. For example, to reach the nearest bus stop heading towards Derby, we have to cross Mansfield Road between Elmwood Drive and Lime Avenue. This section is on a bend and lacks a designated crossing. As traffic has increased, there are fewer gaps, making it difficult?and dangerous?to cross safely, especially with vehicles traveling at 40 mph.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Laura Louca	Response-01266	Road safety will be significantly negatively impacted. It is inevitable Breadsall Village will be used as a cut through for even more people than already do (Oakwood, Hilltop, New Redrow Estate, New Persimmon Estate) You are pushing more and more traffic past a primary school and pre-school that sit very close to Brookside Road in the village. Not school crossing, no lollipop person etc. it?s very worrying. The junction out of the top of Breadsall Village is a notorious hotspot for accidents too.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Lee Wheatley	Response-01492	1. Increased Traffic Volume and Vulnerable Road Users: o An increase in the number of dwellings or commercial premises will inevitably lead to a higher volume of traffic, including cars, vans, and potentially larger vehicles. This increased traffic poses a greater risk to vulnerable road users, particularly pedestrians (including children walking to school and elderly residents), cyclists, and horse riders, who are known to use the lanes and roads around Breadsall and Breadsall Hilltop. This is particularly important around high-risk establishments such as the Maggies Day Nursery and Breadsall Community Primary School. 2. Impact on Existing Road Layout and Design: o Breadsall features narrower, more traditional village roads, some without continuous pavements. Increased traffic on these roads would make walking and cycling more dangerous due to reduced visibility and increased conflict with vehicles. o Breadsall Hilltop, owing to the main road being more and more gridlocked at peak times, more road users are using side roads as a rat run which will only be exacerbated by hundreds of additional cars and lead to more frequent near misses and accidents. 3. Increased Risk at Junctions and Access Points: o Higher traffic volumes will put greater strain on existing junctions within Breadsall and Breadsall Hilltop, as well as where local roads meet main routes like the A608. Increased queuing and driver frustration could lead to more risky manoeuvres and accidents. 4. Potential for Increased Speeding: o Increased traffic flow on less congested stretches of road, particularly those connecting Breadsall and Breadsall Hilltop or leading out of the villages, could lead to some drivers increasing their speed, further endangering pedestrians and cyclists. 5. Impact on School Travel Routes: o With a potential increase in the number of families, the routes to Breadsall Community Primary School will likely see more pedestrian and cycle traffic. Increased vehicular traffic on these same routes could significantly compromise the safety of children traveling to and from school. 6. Emergency Vehicle Access: o Increased traffic congestion, as discussed in the previous section, could also impede the timely access of emergency vehicles (ambulances, fire engines, police cars) to properties in Breadsall and Breadsall Hilltop, potentially putting lives at risk. 7. Lack of Specific Road Safety Assessments: o The Core Strategy Review Amendment should be accompanied by detailed Road Safety Assessments that specifically analyse the potential impact of increased development on the safety of all road users in Breadsall and Breadsall Hilltop. These assessments should identify potential hazards and propose concrete mitigation measures. The current proposals appear to lack this level of detailed analysis.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Linda Morris	Response-00867	The junctions of Brookside Road/Lime lane onto the A608 have already caused traffic accidents with at least one fatality therefore any increase in traffic as a result of this planning will make matters worse. Children are encouraged to walk to school and the pavements around the vicinity of the school are extremely narrow therefore the volume and speed of the through drivers increase the potential for a serious accident.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Lisa Stone	Response-01018	You already cannot safely cross these roads, lots of small children around and a park area right next to this main road, increasing cars and roadways is just asking for trouble
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Lorna Coope	Response-00364	Since re-surfacing the pavements along Mansfield Road, the drop curbs have been removed to enable crossing for the nursery. Mansfield road is an incredibly busy road and it has become increasingly difficult to cross the road from the jitty between Binscombe and Mansfield Road. There is a crossing further down the road, towards the new estate but this creates a 5-10 minute detour.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Lucy Lewis	Response-01459	Small, unsuitable roads for extra traffic. Decreasing safety for residents, children and animals using the road. Not designed for through traffic
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Mady Hall	Response-00788	There will be far more cars driving through the estate when we currently have a nice community where children can play
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Mandy Cooling	Response-00312	In light of comments I've made about the concerns around traffic congestion, this brings with it the risk of road safety. Whilst A608 is a 40mph road Brookside Road in Breadsall, which is the cut through which is increasingly used, is only 30mph but people speed up and down that road, even with the traffic calming measures and even more concerning now that the school is on the road. If this development were to go ahead, I'd envisage that there would be a need for traffic lights at the bottom of Bishops Drive to replace the roundabout
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Margaret Stafford	Response-01231	This development will inevitably affect Breadsall Village as no further roads are being proposed. The Lime Lane junction onto the A608 and Brookside Road is a dangerous junction , and there have been several fatalities here since the initial application to build more houses in the area. Breadsall Village has seen a huge increase of traffic coming through the village during the day and night since the housing developments along Mansfield Road and Breadsall Hilltop. The village 30mph speed limit is frequently not adhered to by drivers passing through, and we have had an increased number of road traffic accidents, some of which have required emergency services presence. Information about these accidents can be obtained from the Local Breadsall Parish Council. It is already very difficult (especially during peak rush hour times) to get out of Croft Lane on to the A61. At the very least a new road should be built from the Mansfield Road A608 down to the Morrisons Island on to the A61 to try and stop Breadsall Village being the rat run from the A38/A61 to the Mansfield Road area and beyond.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	marion Morris	Response-00870	The junctions of Brookside road/Lime lane onto the A608 have already been subject to traffic accidents (with one fatality) therefore any increase in traffic as a result of this planning will make matters worse. Children are encouraged to walk to school however the footpaths down Brookside road and on the A608 are extremely narrow so the increased volume of speeding drivers increase the potential for serious pedestrian accidents.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Mark Herbert	Response-01285	This leads into a main route into Derby from Heanor etc, already very busy, goes past a nursery school which will only get busier with parents dropping kids, already had a few accidents extra traffic will make it worse
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Martin Harrison	Response-01395	I object to the proposed development due to significant road safety concerns. The increased traffic volume from a single access point will heighten the risk of accidents in an already busy area. Local roads, including the A38, Mansfield Road, and routes through Breadsall and Oakwood, are not designed to safely accommodate further pressure. This poses a danger to drivers, cyclists, and pedestrians alike.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Masheda Chowdhury	Response-01339	1. Increased Traffic on Residential Roads: ? The proposed continuation of Hungerhill Crescent and enhancements to Dale Acre Way will funnel significantly more traffic through quiet, residential streets that are not designed for heavy or increased traffic volumes. ? Many of these roads are narrow, have limited visibility, and are already used by pedestrians, school children, and cyclists. 2. Existing Congestion and Limited Access: ? Dale Acre Way and nearby junctions already experience congestion, particularly during peak school and commuter times. ? Additional traffic from 160 homes would compound these issues, leading to longer delays and potentially unsafe driving behavior as drivers become impatient. 3. Impact on Pedestrian Safety ? Especially School Routes: ? Hungerhill Crescent and Dale Acre Way are commonly used by children walking to local schools and nurseries. ? Without comprehensive and enforced traffic calming measures, the additional vehicle volume significantly increases the risk of accidents involving pedestrians. 4. Lack of Safe Crossing Points and Footpath Concerns: ? There is a lack of safe pedestrian crossings along key parts of the route affected by the development. ? Breadsall Footpath 24 must be safeguarded, but increased traffic in the vicinity may make access to this route dangerous or discourage its use, especially by vulnerable groups. 5. Emergency Vehicle Access Concerns: ? Increased congestion may hinder access for emergency vehicles, particularly during peak times or in inclement weather. ? The continuation of Hungerhill Crescent may not be wide or robust enough to support both normal and emergency use with significantly higher volumes of cars. 6. No Clear Traffic Impact Assessment for Surrounding Roads: ? The development proposal refers only generally to ?necessary enhancements? without providing a detailed, publicly available Traffic Impact Assessment. ? Until this is independently assessed and made available, approving the development would be premature and pose risks to current and future road users. Recent traffic survey highlight figure that over 7,000 vehicles already use nearby routes daily
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Matt	Response-00604	Goes hand in hand with the congestion more cars more accidents
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Megan Byrne	Response-01432	Major impact see letter on other notes
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Michael Albinson	Response-00790	The road is too tight to allow 200 plus cars extra up and down it. 3 accidents have already occurred
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Michael Grignon	Response-01335	Due to the traffic congestion already in the area , road safety is already compromised, adding more housing to already congested area will only decrease road safety
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Michael Poplar	Response-00565	The continued overloading of inadequate roads obviously has an impact on safety, causing impatience and frustration.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Mollie	Response-01549	Increased vehicle movements adjacent to the existing primary school and community centre create heightened collision risk for pupils and pedestrians. The absence of new footways or crossing facilities in the scheme is unacceptable.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Monique Johnson	Response-00663	Pavements are narrow in the village and drivers are often going above the speed limit. It is dangerous for pedestrians and even more so with a children, prams or dogs. The increase in traffic will have a detrimental effect on safety.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Mrs Bullock	Response-00966	As the pavements are narrow, there?s not enough space to walk safely now, more cars etc would make it unsafe for pedestrians.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Mrs Francoise Poplar	Response-00602	Obviously the greater the strain on the system and the people using it, the greater the risk to safety.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Mr SJ Read and Mrs S E Read	Response-01225	Road safety in Breadsall village would be adversely affected because of the increased congestion referred to in the previous section
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Mr Softley	Response-00344	This ?plan? will increase traffic volume significantly on the Durose estate on narrow roads that are not designed to cope with it. This will only reduce safety and increase the likelihood of accidents.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Mrs Sarah Morley	Response-01515	Since the two new housing estates were built a few years ago, this road is now extremely congested at peak times. When trying to pull out of a junction, this at times already feels dangerous and unsafe, let alone if another 160 houses were going to be using this road too. And even more if the safe guarded land has houses built on it
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Nicholas lloyd	Response-00356	Given that Acorn Way and it's a joining roads are a primary route for emergency services, any additional congestion could impede their response times, potentially compromising public safety. Therefore, I urge the planning authority to consider these concerns and reject the application to prevent further strain on an already overburdened road network.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Norma HASWELL	Response-01384	Over recent years, since Persimmon and Redrow built houses in Breadsall Hilltop, the number of cars cutting through Breadsall Village has increased exponentially. Now that our village school has relocated to Brookside Road, the main artery leading to Pektron Island (which connects to the A38) I genuinely fear for the safety of village residents, children and parents who need to cross the road.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Oakwood Ward Councillors Eyre, Muthall and Trehwella	Response-01359	We do not believe that adding 160 houses to the Durose Country Park Estate, which does not have white lines at all junctions as it is designed to be a small and quiet CP Estate, is in any way suitable or reasonable.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Patrick Baker	Response-01349	The Village school is situated on Brookside Road which has become a busy cut through for traffic from the A608 to the A61 or into Derby. Additional traffic from new housing will add to an already overloaded road at busy times with children crossing
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Philip Booth	Response-00683	the main road A608 is a 40 mph zone and more children and families in the area would make this a higher risk for safety.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Rachael	Response-00332	Volume of traffic is already high with the two current house developments, road safety is a concern with parked cars, children will be unable to play safely.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Rachel Taylor	Response-00938	As per previous comment, there is already heavy traffic streaming through the village, not adhering to the 30mph speed limit and often with little caution or respect for the village, residents or type of road.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Richard Hewitt	Response-01464	The Breadsall Village, Hilltop and Lime Lane have numerous scenic walks and therefore additional road traffic in a heavily used pedestrian environment will create more safety risks. The junction between Lime Lane and Brookside Road at Hilltop A608 has seen numerous accidents over many years, with one motorcyclist losing their life. The Greenway (used by many walkers) runs between Breadsall and the Morley Hayes, crosses the A608 at this junction. There is no way to stop the traffic and therefore pedestrians run the risk of injury each time they cross the road. Even without the additional traffic, it is already a junction that requires extreme care and caution.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Richard Johnson	Response-00697	Speeding traffic is already a safety issue with cars using the village as a by-pass and frequently witnessed speeding.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Richard Kingham	Response-00849	Huge increase in speeding drivers, and volume of traffic from Persimmon and Redrow estates making it more dangerous to enter or exit side roads such as Elmwood Drive safely. Island to bishops drive and Mansfield road constantly blocked to a standstill at peak times. Pedestrians having to walk into the road as pavements aren't wide enough for increased foot traffic either.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Richard Stone	Response-01029	Getting out of Elmwood Drive is already a nightmare due to traffic everyday, there is poor visibility coming out of this junction. Adding even more cars to this road will make this tight area down the hill even worse.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Richard Straw	Response-01412	My kids play out on the street safely at the moment you are planning on running a road right by my house.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Rowe	Response-01299	Children often playing outside riding the bikes etc on Hungerhill Close. Traffic through Breadsall is already like a rat run.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Roy Ling	Response-01243	It is now very difficult to cross Brookside Road Breadsall Village, an increase in traffic would lead to safety problems particularly with children going to and from school.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Ruth Duxbury	Response-00301	More traffic has already led to higher amount of accidents at the junctions at lime lane and the A608 and casualties. Also Brookside Road is used as a cut through to the A61 and A38. Cars often speed down this road even though there is a school at the bottom of the road.
			Sally	Response-00873	Roads are already congested through the village with poor parking and speeding!
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Samantha Watts	Response-00869	The safety of Breadsall Village's roads is already a serious concern, with frequent accidents and near misses at key junctions such as Croft Lane/Brookside Road/Rectory Lane. The existing road infrastructure struggles to cope with current traffic levels, and additional housing would significantly increase the number of vehicles using these routes, escalating the risk of further collisions. High traffic volumes and excessive speeds through the village make roads particularly hazardous for pedestrians and cyclists. With limited traffic-calming measures in place, introducing more vehicles without adequate safety improvements will only heighten the danger.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Sam Saunders	Response-01557	The plan to extend Hungerhill Close to provide vehicular access into the site would substantially increase traffic volumes on a residential street that is currently not designed to accommodate heavy flows. This increase is likely to cause congestion and elevate the risk of accidents. Furthermore, the surrounding roads, particularly Dale Acre Way and the A609 Hill Top, already experience considerable traffic during peak hours. Adding hundreds of additional vehicle trips daily could overwhelm the capacity of key junctions, potentially leading to longer queues, frustrated drivers, and a higher likelihood of collisions. Pedestrian safety is also at risk, as current footways along Hungerhill Close and Dale Acre Way are limited in width or absent in places, making it hazardous for those on foot. Children, in particular, would face increased danger, especially when walking to nearby schools or using local footpaths like Breadsall Footpath 24. The lack of safe crossing points and traffic calming measures compounds these risks, putting vulnerable pedestrians at greater risk of injury. Cyclists are another group that may be affected, as increased traffic without dedicated cycle lanes could result in dangerous conflicts on roads adjacent to popular routes such as the Great Northern Greenway. Without robust measures, the proposed development could undermine efforts to promote safe, active travel. In summary, without a comprehensive transport assessment and appropriate infrastructure improvements, the development risks exacerbating traffic congestion and compromising the safety of motorists, pedestrians, and cyclists alike.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Sandra Perry	Response-00307	More road users; speeding on Brookside road has significantly increased through Breadsall village.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Sarah Hewitt	Response-01461	Constant flow of traffic through the village past the village school.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Scarlett Hamblin	Response-00398	There are no traffic lights to enable safe crossing of hilltop. We do not need to add any more speeding drivers to the roads.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Scott Watson	Response-01284	Breadsall Village's roads are already burdened with safety concerns, with frequent accidents and near misses occurring at key junctions, such as Croft Lane, Brookside Road, and Rectory Lane. The existing infrastructure is struggling to handle current traffic levels, and further residential development will inevitably add more vehicles, heightening the risk of collisions. Speeding and heavy traffic through the village pose ongoing threats, particularly to pedestrians and cyclists. Without adequate traffic-calming measures, introducing additional vehicles would further compromise road safety and place more strain on an already overstretched network.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Sharon Coward	Response-00348	More traffic on already busy roads which were not built to carry such a large amount of traffic will put both road users & pedestrians at risk.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Silvia Mircic	Response-00884	This proposal raises significant concerns about the increase in traffic volume, particularly along Brookside Road, a relatively narrow road not designed for heavy use, and as a consequence heightened risks for both drivers and pedestrians.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	simon morris	Response-00866	The junctions of Brookside road/Lime lane onto the A608 have already been subject to traffic accidents (with one fatality) therefore any increase in traffic as a result of this planning will make matters worse. Children are encouraged to walk to school however the footpaths down Brookside road and on the A608 are extremely narrow so the increased volume of speeding drivers increase the potential for serious pedestrian accidents.
	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Stephen and Janet Allis	Response-01221	speeding through Breadsall village needs 20 mph

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Steven furness	Response-01516	See traffic comments. It is very busy around the school. This development will increase traffic.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Stuart Brown	Response-00771	People including young children currently use dale acre way to walk and play etc. increased housing that will use dale acre way as through road will have safety implications for the road users and pedestrians.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Susan Dundon	Response-00396	It will make roads worse
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Thomas Bateman-Wong	Response-00985	See Traffic
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Thomas Monkhouse.	Response-01318	Traffic through Breadsall village has seen a major increase in volume with few observing the 30 mph speed limit, and some travelling well over the limit. Similarly the 7 ton weight seems to be regularly ignored. The proposals will worsen this situation.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Tom Parker	Response-01398	Huge concern with the current amount of houses never-mind anymore. The amount of cars that drive through daily and park on kerbs/blocking junctions is very dangerous when there are children out playing.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Tony Hawkins	Response-01532	The consultation states that access will be from Hungerhill Crescent. This is incorrect as it is actually Hungerhill Close. This would mean opening a road which is currently a Close ?dead end? to a through road. This road is not suitable nor wide enough to carry further traffic safely. Such new road would pass over a public footpath used by the local community gaining access to the Great Northern Greenway and Breadsall village by foot. This route is also used by school children who attend the school in the village further volumes of traffic would make this unsafe. The consultation states that access will also be provided from Dale Acre Way, again this road is in fact a ?dead end?. Such access would mean crossing an existing pathway used as mentioned above and the design of the estate in providing recreational space will be changed dramatically and no longer would be able to be enjoyed in the way that the estate does now. The road is also narrow and could not deal with increased volumes of traffic safely. The island to the entrance of the estate is all ready congested and un safe due to unclear road markings. Adding a further 160 dwellings could potentially create 300 plus cars using a small road to pass through an existing small estate reducing the air quality further. Building on green belt will reduce the amount of open space which naturally provides better air quality.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Tracey Turner	Response-00334	Heavy traffic around the traffic island at Dale Acre Way has seen many instances road rage due to level of traffic and poor signage. In the evenings it's used as a race track!
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Road Safety	Wobbina Bugg	Response-00846	Traffic in Breadsall Village is already too heavy.it tails back from the Pektron roundabout to the café and causes accidents.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Abbie quinn	Response-00616	As a teacher I am aware that local primary and secondary schools are almost if not at capacity from new housing in the area including Durose and Persimmon across from Breadsall.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Adam Millward	Response-00418	Are you planning to build more schools as part of this expansion? At the very least a nursery and primary / junior school should be built.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Alexander lee	Response-01439	Quite frankly it is becoming a joke to get a school place at a 1st or even 2nd choice. This will only make the problem worse.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Alex Cargill	Response-01834	*Schools Further overloading
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Alistair Crawford	Response-01404	I work in education and have led specialist schools across the East Midlands and also sit on a number of national groups advising DfE policy. Derby currently has a significant lack of specialist School places meaning that many learners with significant level of needs are placed outside of the city which is most importantly less than ideal for the young person and their family and secondly comes at a significant cost to the LA and therefore tax payer (please take time to look at High needs block funding and the significant deficits and debt in both Derby city and Derbyshire). Clearly no thought to additional provision is in place which means more young people / families will suffer and already huge (tens of millions of pounds) of debt will continue to spiral.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Amber Hubbard	Response-00845	Local schools are already at capacity there is no plan to address this. Also no additional pre school capacity
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Andrea R Rowley	Response-01230	Existing education resources and facilities are already very over stretched. What plans are in place to increase capacity to accommodate the extra people coming into the area?
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Andrea wightman	Response-00354	So what schools are all of these children supposed to go to? All schools in the area, with the exception of da Vinci, are full
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Andy Madeley	Response-00381	Schools are already overcrowded, with all these developments, where will the kids be educated.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Angela Smyth	Response-00296	There are two schools in Breadsall and Oakwood. They both have a small catchment and are at capacity.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Ann Sherlock	Response-00410	The map used is out of date and the local schools are already at capacity, with one local school having a waiting list for every single year. Adding the current proposal will be extremely detrimental to the local schools, and it is disappointing that the public have been intentionally lied to in relation to how the current proposal will affect the area, missing two extremely large housing estates and falsely portraying a smaller population and impact the housing proposal will have.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	A O Smith	Response-01798	There is no provision in the proposals to support the infrastructure needed , such as schools
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Beverly Jordan	Response-01330	Two estates have been established without a school so further infrastructure needs in this area will result in increase pressure in this area
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Brendan Hargreaves	Response-00629	not enough schools in the area
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Cameron Coope	Response-00369	Primary school and secondary schools in the area are already nearly full in most year groups.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Carl Hill	Response-00670	No schools in the area no greater intake for Breadsall Village school.. no spaces at the only school in Oakwood and senior schools all a travel away
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Carol Westcott	Response-00973	Schools are at full capacity and new builds means children do not get places in their satellite position impacting on distance people have to travel to take their children to school meaning more cars on the road



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Carys Whomsley	Response-01438	I am writing to register my strong objection to the above-mentioned planning application, both in its original and revised form. Despite the removal of the area adjacent to the A61 in the amended proposal, I believe that the proposed development remains deeply inappropriate and harmful for the following reasons: 1. Contravention of Policy CP18 and Loss of Green Wedge The proposed site lies just outside the designated Green Belt, but crucially directly abuts existing woodland and open countryside, forming part of the vital green corridor along the Great Northern Greenway. This area functions as a green buffer, enhancing ecological connectivity, supporting biodiversity, and providing visual and recreational amenity to local residents, walkers, and cyclists. Despite claims of woodland retention, the development threatens the integrity of this space. Proximity to new housing would increase human pressure on the natural environment, likely leading to degradation of woodland, fragmentation of habitats, and a reduction in wildlife corridors. No Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) assessment appears in the application documents, raising concerns about whether the legally mandated 10% net gain can or will be achieved. Biodiversity enhancements delivered off-site would do nothing to mitigate local ecological loss, thereby undermining environmental sustainability in the area. Moreover, the site lies adjacent to land recently released from the Green Belt and under consideration for housing allocation by Erewash Borough Council. The cumulative impact of developing both sites would be devastating: a continuous sprawl from Derby through to Breadsall, resulting in the elimination of the settlement gap and permanent damage to the character of the Great Northern Greenway. 2. Environmental, Infrastructural, and Policy Concerns The proposal directly contradicts the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Paragraph 143, particularly the goals of preventing urban sprawl and protecting the openness of Green Belt land. It also ignores the findings of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA 359), which previously deemed the site unsuitable for residential development due to accessibility and environmental limitations. The development is completely incompatible with the objectives of the Breadsall Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2019?2029, particularly the aims to: Preserve the rural character and prevent urbanisation; Avoid coalescence with the Derby conurbation; Safeguard wildlife and ecological features; Control flood risk and infrastructure strain; Protect valued green spaces and visual vistas.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Carys Whomsley	Response-01438	Breadsall has already experienced increased flooding, attributed to upstream developments like Persimmon Estate and Breadsall Hilltop, which lie within the same water catchment area. Any additional development would worsen this issue, placing homes and infrastructure at risk. Furthermore, the proposal relies on access through two existing public footpaths within the Redrow estate and offers no concrete infrastructure improvements. The A608 is already over-congested, and no plans are presented to handle increased traffic or to safeguard children commuting to local schools. 3. Loss of Community and Ecological Value This land offers more than just open space?it is a much-loved and well-used amenity for the local community. It serves as a peaceful escape for informal recreation and nature engagement, and its visual and environmental contributions to the neighbourhood are significant. Its destruction would represent a major loss in local character and quality of life. The proposal underestimates the pressure on existing services, lacks detailed mitigation plans, and fails to explain how proposed footpaths will link meaningfully into existing routes. Nearby Local Wildlife Sites will be impacted
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Chris Harris	Response-01521	Not enough capacity already
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Chris Hopkinson	Response-01396	Building Erewash housing joined onto an existing derby city estate will add more pressure to derby city
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Chris Lunn	Response-01410	Schools are already doubling their intakes for the next academic year and I am speaking from personal experience. No extra teachers are being employed and no additional accommodation or resources are being provided. Schools will become oversubscribed and children required to travel further, out of area, to obtain a school place. This will result in additional vehicles and journeys being made, an increase in pollution and longer, more stressful days for the children. This goes very much against Derby Council?s goals for sustainable travel to improve air quality and reduce carbon. Ultimately it is the children and their education who will suffer. This pattern is only set to repeat itself across the area as the numbers of children rises exponentially. The 160 new houses proposed are likely to total in the region of 500-650 adults and children. Most of these will require at some point, healthcare, leisure facilities, education and also the means to travel, either by car or public transport. Public transport, although technically available in the vicinity, is not accessible for everyone and does not necessarily run at convenient times. Buses in the area are well known to be infrequent and unreliable, hence I have to take my son to school by car, along with most parents who do not live close enough to walk. These numbers of houses are likely to produce 160-320 vehicles.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Clare Roters	Response-01553	School placements are few and far between in the area and no new schools are being built
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	David Byrne	Response-01433	It has been a real struggle finding suitable allocation for schooling and as such have been pushed to a school in darley abbey. Adding more residents will compound this problem
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Edward James Gregory	Response-00728	Schools are already at capacity, and Erewash does not provide schools in this area. Erewash should provide developments where it will service the residents, not assume other areas will provide this.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Elaine hodgkinson	Response-00854	Local schools are already over subscribed with only one small primary school in Oakwood.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Elena Maxim	Response-01573	There is already high demand for schools and nurseries around the area
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Emma Binns	Response-00843	There are not enough local schools to cope with new housing.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Emma Charlton	Response-01545	Local schools are at full capacity so this development is not sustainable in terms of local school places
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Emma Daniels	Response-00346	There is 1 small school in the area and already oversubscribed. Where are the children going to school?
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Emma Hawkins	Response-00813	The senior school which can be attend to by foot Da Vinic Academy is already at capacity serving a vast catchment area including Breadsall, Oakwood, Breadsall Hill Top and Chaddesden. The Breadsall village school is small with an intake of only 16 for reception

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Faye Wilkinson	Response-01129	Residents and members of the wider community are already struggling to find school places for their children. These plans include no suggestions to build schools or facilities for this already struggling community. There are also no plans to build schools anywhere within the local area. It is not environmentally friendly to expect parents to drive their children to schools in neighbouring towns and villages.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Gary Murfin	Response-00374	School capacity in the is already limited especially at the junior school in Oakwood there needs to be plans to ensure to local infrastructure can cope with new homes and people and children in the area , are new schools being built
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Gaynor Pawley	Response-00627	What are the plans to increase capacity of schools? With more children in the area especially with social housing, walking children along heavily congested routes to existing schools would pose a risk to serious accidents.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Ged Doherty	Response-01822	The area is already stretched beyond the limit for schools and to force through yet more development into such a small area is nonsensical and will have a considerable impact on those already resident.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Gemma Cotter	Response-01374	School provision around the Oakwood/ Breadsall area is already inadequate. Many children from these areas already have to be driven across to other areas such as Chaddesden, Spondon, Morley, Stanley, Allestree and Heanor. The nearest primary school is a mile away by the shortest route which is not suitable all year round due to lighting and footpath conditions. The realistic practical strategy will be for parents to choose to drive adding congestion to the A608, Stratford Road junction and into Breadsall Hilltop. There is a lack of suitable SEN provision for children in this area with children not being given allocated places at appropriate special schools that can meet their needs. Secondary school applications are precarious with choices made across a broad range of schools and being subject to demand in other suburbs of Derby and surrounding areas of Derbyshire. This undermines the community of this area of Derby as children living in close proximity to each other are schooled across a large geographical area.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Harry Mee	Response-00882	The school is small and very limited spaces are available as it is. 190 houses would mean that less spaces are available in the school for current residents as well as new/potential.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Helen Walker	Response-00325	There has always been a problem with schools around this area, Oakwood never had the schools it was promised when it was built my children are all grown up but my granddaughter goes to the same school they went to in Allestree as there are no good schools in this area and a lack of places
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Hulland. Bdverley	Response-00496	More good quality schools needed
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Jake Moore	Response-01202	The proposed development of approximately 160 new homes will significantly increase the number of families and children living in the area, placing unsustainable pressure on already stretched local schools. Primary and secondary schools in Oakwood and surrounding catchments are operating at or near full capacity, with limited options for expansion. Without clear, funded plans for additional school places, this development is likely to result in: Oversubscribed schools, forcing children to travel longer distances outside their local area; Overcrowded classrooms, negatively affecting the quality of education; Additional pressure on teachers and support staff, who are already managing high workloads; Increased traffic congestion due to parents driving children to schools further away. There is no guarantee that new residents will have access to local education, and the planning application does not include any proposals to expand or build new school infrastructure to accommodate this growth. Approving the development without addressing this shortfall would be irresponsible and contrary to the need for sustainable, community-focused development. The 230 houses that redrow built in 2020 has already place a strain on these issues above with no provision for additional schooling when they were built in 2020.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	James Roberts	Response-00673	The proposal makes no consideration to school capacity, so obviously 160 extra households will put additional strain on the schools in the area given they are already undersized, understaffed, and underfunded (a general issue across the country)
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	James skivington	Response-00359	Schools are very hard to get into in the local area already. The only school available are schools in the catchment area that are not the best schools
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Jamie Branagan	Response-00335	Adding 160 homes will clear add more strain in the current school services offered. 160 homes equates to c350-500 people, im sure many of which will be families and require school places. Because you're proposing this build on the edge of your boundary line it's Oakwood school that will be put under strain NOT Erewash. The closest Erewash school (Breadsall CoE) has only recently been built and can't increase its current capacity due to constraints on the building.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Janet O'Brien	Response-01835	There is no provision to support the extra housing in terms of schools,
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Janette Glenn	Response-00422	Existing schools already have to turn away applications from local children, within walking distance. The new development will worsen the issue.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Jason Reader	Response-00320	No mention of additional school provision, Breadsall village primary is already over subscribed.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Jeanette Kent	Response-00402	Schools in the area are already over subscribed, more houses means more childrens not being able to get into the choice of schools. Over crowded classrooms etc
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Jessica Softley	Response-01408	Additional housing will put an additional demand on school places. As someone looking to start a family in the near future, nursery and school places are of concern.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	John Harlow	Response-00619	School capacity is very restricted in this area with little or no extra capacity.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	John Hudson-Peat	Response-01833	The lack of infrastructure to service new developments are none existence (shops/schools/GPs etc) just take a look at the recent developments close by.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Jon Lewis	Response-00347	The majority of the local schools are all ready over subscribed, the additional housing will only make this worse and result in even more children having to travel longer distances to and from school
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Justine Dean	Response-00844	There is already a lack of capacity in the local schools. Please build another to cater for this

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Justin Windsor	Response-01544	We currently live in the area and have seen much disruption regarding school selections. The most local primary schools are already at max capacity and families from the area are already having to look at schools outside of the Oakwood/breadsall hilltop district, some as far as allestree.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Kara Crossley	Response-00865	The local primary school has only just moved to new grounds to accommodate the amount of children needing placement. There are no additional local schools to accommodate a growing population
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Karen Read	Response-00923	with current plans to build 190 houses there is currently no spare capacity within the existing education system where do you propose to build new schools
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Karen Smith	Response-00635	The local hospitals and doctors are over subscribed with extra service users
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Keerthi	Response-01450	There is only one primary school in this catchment area and even that has got ofsted ratings in the lower end. There should be increased resources for children before we add new houses.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Kev Rodgers	Response-00897	Well, that's part of the reason everyone has cars - 'we' build houses, but hardly ever the necessary supporting infrastructure. Where will children go to school?
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Kimberley Woodward	Response-01445	There isn't enough choice for schools and catchments as it is in this area without more houses and more people.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Kirstin Woodward	Response-01043	The reality is that there is no capacity in the local primary or secondary schools. I tried but resulted in both my children having to attend schools outside the area, which meant I had to drive them as part of my daily commute. As they got older, they had to rely on two buses each way to get to school. This problem still persisted after 20 years. I still see many children being transported by car or catching buses to schools across the city. It's unfortunate that the area lacks a strong school identity, with children wearing uniforms from various schools across Derby rather than having a shared local school community.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	K Munson	Response-00631	Having previously objected to housing increases in this area on this issue where there is a significant shortage of school places this would only exacerbate the problem Infrastructure FIRST schools roads GP surgeries then build affordable housing
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Laura Louca	Response-01266	Despite adding around 385 homes already in the area and proposing a further ~666 (plus those on Acorn Way) you have introduced. I knew schools or extended those already in the area. If half of all of the new homes contain just one child that's over 500 children requiring a school place - where..?
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	L Burton	Response-00342	The children in our area did not get into their chosen local school within walking distance. Many are driving 20-30 minutes to find a school as they are oversubscribed and the local catchment school has many complaints.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Lee Wheatley	Response-01492	1. Current School Capacity: o Primary Schools: The primary school serving Breadsall is Breadsall CoFe VC Primary School. ? According to The Good Schools Guide, Breadsall CoFe VC Primary School has approximately 114 pupils. ? Information from the Get Information about Schools service indicates the school has a capacity of 112 pupils. This suggests the school is currently operating very close to, or at, full capacity. o Secondary Schools: Students from Breadsall and Breadsall Hilltop typically attend secondary schools in the wider Derby area. The increased housing in Breadsall will add to the pressure on secondary school places across the region. Potential secondary schools include those within both Derby City and southern Derbyshire. 2. Age Demographic: The age demographic of the current estate is mostly that of younger families and it's reasonable to assume this would be the same of the new estate. This would see an increase in the pressure placed upon existing schools. 3. Impact of Increased Population: o The proposed development will lead to a substantial increase in the number of school-age children. This will exacerbate existing capacity issues and create new challenges: ? Oversized Classes: With limited capacity, schools may be forced to increase class sizes beyond recommended levels. This can negatively affect the quality of education, as teachers have less time to devote to individual students. The current pupil-to-teacher ratio at Breadsall CoFe VC Primary School is reported as 22:1. An increase in this ratio would be detrimental. ? Shortage of School Places: A lack of sufficient places may mean that children are unable to attend their local school and have to travel further afield. This can disrupt family life, increase transportation costs, and reduce children's sense of community. ? Increased Pressure on Resources: Existing schools may struggle to cope with the increased demand for resources, including teaching materials, classroom space, and support staff. This can lead to a decline in the overall quality of education. 4. Accessibility of Schools: o The location of new housing in relation to existing schools is crucial. ? Breadsall CoFe VC Primary School is located on Brookside Road in Breadsall. The accessibility of this school from new development sites needs to be carefully assessed. ? For secondary schools, the increased distance for some students, combined with potential traffic congestion, could lead to longer journey times and difficulties for parents. o Increased traffic congestion, a likely consequence of new development, will make school drop-offs and pick-ups more challenging and potentially less safe. 5. Early Years Provision: o The availability of nursery places and early years childcare is also a concern. New housing developments will generate increased demand for these services and, having a toddler myself, know that placements within the area are already strained. 6. Funding and Resources: o Expanding school capacity requires significant investment. ? Additional funding will be needed to build new classrooms, hire more teachers, provide necessary resources, and maintain the quality of education. ? The Core Strategy Review Amendment must clearly outline how this funding will be secured and allocated. It should not place an undue burden on existing residents or the schools themselves. 7. Impact on Existing Community: o Expanding schools can have implications for the existing community. ? Increased traffic around
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Linda Morris	Response-00867	d schools can cause disruption and safety concerns. ? The expansion of school facilities may require the use of green space or other community resources.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Linda Morris	Response-00867	When the new school was built Derby stated they didn't need further places and the school is at capacity. So what will happen if further houses are built the secondary schools in the area are also over subscribed and no sixth form is in the locality
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Lisa Stone	Response-01018	All local schools are full to the brim with pupils if there isn't enough space to build in schools etc to accommodate the additional people then it's not the right space to build on.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Lorna Coope	Response-00364	Parents are having to send their children to schools in Little Eaton, Spondon, Chaddesden, Morley and Smalley as Park View and Breadsall Primary do not have capacity to serve the residents. Are there plans in place to increase school capacity to suit the existing new build estates and the proposed ones?
			Lucy Lewis	Response-01459	Already very low number of children getting into Breadsall C of E due to capacity!
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	lynne hollis	Response-01234	Local schools are already at capacity, and this development will add further strain. Without investment in expanding educational facilities, overcrowding could impact the quality of education for current and future students.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Mandy Cooling	Response-00312	Any such development must surely need to include plans for critical infrastructure to support the influx of hundreds more residents such as plans for doctors? surgeries (which are already groaning under the weight of thousands of patients), schools etc.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Margaret Stafford	Response-01231	Existing education resources and facilities are already overstretched. I cannot see any proposal to add additional infrastructure as part of this proposal.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Martin Harrison	Response-01395	I object to the proposed development due to the pressure it will place on local school capacity. Schools in the area are already operating at or near their limits. An increase in population from the new development would overwhelm these facilities, affecting the quality of education and access for current and future residents.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Masheda Chowdhury	Response-01339	1. Local Primary and Secondary Schools Already at or Near Capacity: ? Schools in the Oakwood and Breadsall area ? including Breadsall CE Primary, Parkview Primary, and Lees Brook Academy ? are already fully subscribed or oversubscribed in several year groups. ? Adding 160 new homes could mean dozens of additional children, without any corresponding increase in classroom space or staffing. 2. No Guaranteed Provision of Additional School Places: ? The policy does not include any commitment to build new educational facilities or expand existing schools in the area. ? There is no indication that developer contributions (e.g. via Section 106 agreements or Community Infrastructure Levy) will be directed toward education. 3. Disruption to Educational Access and Increased Pressure: ? If local schools cannot accommodate new pupils, families may be forced to send children to schools outside the area, leading to longer travel distances, family disruption, and increased car usage. ? This also affects current residents who may lose local school priority due to new demand. 4. Lack of Forward Planning for Early Years and SEND Provision: ? The policy makes no mention of nursery, early years, or special educational needs and disabilities (SEND) provision. ? These services are already under significant strain, and new development without mitigation will further disadvantage vulnerable children and families. 5. Safeguarded Land Suggests More Growth ? Without Education Planning: ? The identification of an additional 14.6 hectares of safeguarded land implies further residential expansion. ? Yet there is no strategic education plan tied to these long-term growth areas, creating a cumulative and unsustainable pressure on school infrastructure. I am already concerned for my own child's school placement and lack of availability when she reaches school age in 2027.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Megan Byrne	Response-01432	The addition of new housing in this location will inevitably increase demand for school places at both primary and secondary level. Local schools are already facing capacity pressures, and there is currently no clear indication within the application documents of how this development would contribute to addressing that shortfall. Without a robust plan to expand school capacity or secure adequate funding for additional educational provision, the proposed development risks placing further strain on local schools, potentially to the detriment of current and future pupils. This could negatively impact educational outcomes and overall community well-being. I urge the Council to ensure that the implications for local education provision are fully assessed and addressed before any planning permission is granted.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Melissa Little	Response-00389	As I resident of Oakwood, there are a limited number of schools in the immediate area. Parents are sometimes not able to get there child/children into the preferred school location due to the number of people. This is hugely inconvenient to working parents. Increasing the number of families in the area will only put additional pressure on our already limited schooling resource.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Michael Albinson	Response-00790	We have already had to accept our kids couldn't get into local schools due to the population in the area. We have to travel to 2 separate locations 1 being little Eaton and the other being Heanor just to get our kids in schools
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Michael Grignon	Response-01335	With two housing projects already in existence with no new schools , surgeries or other amenities to support these communities, this is a recipe to disaster
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Michael Poplar	Response-00565	There is no school capacity, even the recent school built in Breadsall village is up to full capacity. Additionally it primarily takes children from the Oakwood area thus increasing traffic. Increasing school capacity within Oakwood rather than a drive from it would have been more sensible.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Mollie	Response-01549	Breadsall Church of England Primary School, Morley Primary and All Saints? CE Primary in nearby Breadsall are currently at or above 95% capacity (DFE July 2023). A sudden influx of school?age children from 200+ new dwellings would necessitate costly temporary classrooms or force children to travel out of area. The Long Eaton School is oversubscribed in key year groups; parents already face disappointment at first preference. This development offers no on?site education contribution or land allocation for a new school.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Monique Johnson	Response-00663	This is also a major problem as Breadsall primary school and Oakwood are already at capacity. So where would the children living on the new estate go?
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Mrs Bullock	Response-00966	The local school is full now
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Mrs Francoise Poplar	Response-00602	As far as I'm aware all local schools are up to capacity including the recently constructed school in Breadsall, which mainly serves children from the Oakwood estates. Virtually all these children travel to school by car adding to the traffic problems.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Mr SJ Read and Mrs S E Read	Response-01225	The new development would clearly generate additional demand for school places but there is no specific provision for this.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Mr Softley	Response-00344	Where are the extra schools in Oakwood for this development? There seems to be no plan with Derby City council to accommodate the extra demands. It is very concerning as someone in the stages of starting a family that so many developments are proposed on our doorstep with no apparent plan beyond picking some empty fields on a map.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Mrs Sarah Morley	Response-01515	The schools are already over run with the number of houses already in this area. There are over 450 houses that have been recently built and no extra school were build to accomodate this, where are the children in the new houses going to go to school?
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Mr Stephen Langton	Response-00025	There is a clear principle that developments within Erewash borough should not be relying upon and using school facilities supplied and funded by the adjacent Derby City Council. This development should be considered to be an extension to the Erewash settlement of Breadsall, and NOT an extension to Derby city. Breadsall village will require the necessary investment for school places and other infrastructure to support this development by Erewash Borough Council
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Nathan Cooke	Response-00896	Schools in the local area are already near capacity.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Nicholas Lloyd	Response-00356	I object to this planning application on the grounds that the proposed development will place additional pressure on local schools, which are already operating at or near full capacity. The introduction of 500 new homes is projected to increase the local child population, thereby intensifying demand for school places. This surge could lead to overcrowded classrooms, reduced educational quality, and limited access to preferred schools for existing residents. While developers may offer financial contributions to mitigate these impacts, such measures often fall short of addressing the full extent of the strain on educational infrastructure. The National Planning Policy Framework emphasizes the importance of ensuring that developments do not undermine the ability of existing communities to access essential services, including education. Without a comprehensive plan to expand school facilities or increase capacity, this development poses a significant risk to the quality of education available to all local children.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Oakwood Ward Councillors Eyre, Mulhall and Trehwella	Response-01359	We have seen little to no information provided in the consultation documents with regards to schooling. We would like this information.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Paige Skivington	Response-00366	The schools are already struggling with the level of need for spaces. They're oversubscribed and the people in the area are not getting into schools in the area. There are already so many of us, myself included who have had to go out of the area for a school which impacts families jobs and time and will not be able to cope with any more people needing spaces.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Paul Wilkes	Response-01527	There should not be anymore developments until Oakwood has the facilities to cope with additional pupils. My son and his wife had to leave Oakwood as they were not able to find a school for their children.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Philip Booth	Response-00683	I have not seen any plans for additional School capacity. I would expect the children from this site would use Derby City schools, how would this work as the burden would fall at the City not Erewash?
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Rachael	Response-00332	It is incredible difficult for families to get their preference school, often having to travel a distance to get their children into Good or Outstanding provision. The number of families needing to appeal due to missing out on over subscribed schools due to the increase of families in the current housing estates. Adding another 160 dwelling will put far too much pressure on an already struggling education system.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Richard Johnson	Response-00697	The new school capacity will be insufficient considering the increase in children living in the existing new development and the proposed new future developments.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Richard Kingham	Response-00849	Me myself have had to send my daughter to a School 30 mins away in the car due to the over crowding of classrooms locally. Over 600 homes built within 1-1.5 miles and not new schools.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Richard Straw	Response-01412	Not enough school capacity in the local area
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Roy Ling	Response-01243	Breadsall Village Primary is now up to full capacity extra housing would lead to problems with child education.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Ruth Duxbury	Response-00301	Schools in the area are already stretched. Budget restrains often mean schools struggle to afford staff and maintain the quality of meals.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Sam Saunders	Response-01557	The addition of approximately 160 new homes is likely to bring dozens of school-age children to the area, increasing demand for places at nearby primary and secondary schools. Current data shows that schools within the Parkside cluster, which includes Breadsall Church of England Primary School and Morley Primary School, are already operating close to or at full capacity. For example, recent figures indicate that these schools collectively serve around 1,200 pupils, with limited spare places available. The pressure on school places is exacerbated by ongoing population growth in Derbyshire and surrounding areas, making the allocation of new places increasingly difficult. Without additional investment in school infrastructure or expansion of existing schools, the local education system may be unable to accommodate the influx of new students from the development. This could result in children being forced to attend schools further away, disrupting their education and daily routines. Furthermore, local secondary schools also face capacity constraints, with many already oversubscribed. The development?s proposal lacks clarity on how it intends to address these issues, including whether contributions toward expanding school facilities or funding new educational provision will be made. The impact on school capacity is a critical consideration, particularly for families moving into affordable housing within the development. Ensuring adequate educational provision is essential to prevent negative consequences on children?s learning experiences and the broader community. Therefore, without clear commitments to address school capacity, this development risks placing unsustainable strain on local educational resources.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Sara Cotton	Response-00370	Our schools are over subscribed
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Saravan P	Response-01448	We are already finding it hard to find admission for the children in the schools of our choice. This development will make it even more hard.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Scarlett Hamblin	Response-00398	I myself have two children who were allocated their third choice school due to the schools in my surrounding area being oversubscribed. I have to make the journey twice daily to chaddesden to drop off and collect my children. Schools do not have the capacity for the increased number of children.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Sharon Coward	Response-00348	The development is in erewash borough but the nearest schools are mostly in the derby city council area meaning pressure on school places for derby city residents.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Shui-Yee Bateman-Wong	Response-00984	Not enough school places nearby
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Simon Ferrad	Response-00853	There is insufficient school capacity already in the area - this will worsen the situation
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	simon morris	Response-00866	When the new primary school in Breadsall was built Derby City stated that no further places were required because there was sufficient elsewhere in the catchment, however these new housing estates will now mean that further pressure for school places is necessary with no new facilities available.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Stephen and Janet Allis	Response-01221	another school needed
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Susan Dundon	Response-00396	The schools are already over subscribed
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Tom King	Response-00734	Local schools already over subscribed
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Tom Parker	Response-01398	It is already incredibly hard to get children into their preferred schools, often having to travel miles to get their children into good or outstanding provision. Adding more properties to this area will only make this worse, and will put too much pressure on the local education system.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Tony Hawkins	Response-01532	The senior school which can be attend to by foot Da Vinic Academy is already at capacity serving a vast catchment area including Breadsall, Oakwood, Breadsall Hill Top and Chaddesden. The Breadsall village school is small with an intake of only 16 for reception. Lees Brook is not within walking distance and is also at capacity.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Tracey Turner	Response-00334	My children attend a school 12 miles away! You are increasing the already stretched school capacity.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	School Capacity	Wobbina Bugg	Response-00846	It will impact on school capacity.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Adam Garner	Response-00613	Durose park is already busy enough with vehicles daily. There are often queues at peak times to get on and off the durose estate without adding more. Most homes are 2 cars therefore the increase could be 320 extra cars.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Adam Millward	Response-00418	Traffic is already bad on the A608 in the mornings for the daily commute into Derby, already made worse with the existing new build houses that have been built recently. You will be standstill already up to and past the round about all the way to Brian clough way.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Adelle Cavanagh	Response-00392	The A608 is regularly congested during peak times as it is without extra housing contributing more traffic
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Alexander lee	Response-01439	Traffic is already awful during rush hours with the air feeling polluted. This will be made even worse !
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Alex Cargill	Response-01834	* further road congestion on Croft lane, and Brookside road Breadsall already gridlocked at rush hours
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Alex Pilcher	Response-00792	Already a bottleneck of traffic coming from Heanor direction towards the Meteor centre and vice versa and fast traffic coming off the main road onto another housing estate will only exacerbate the issue.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Alistair Crawford	Response-01404	The traffic levels at Peak times have considerably increased following the recent housing developments on the A608, making it difficult and unsafe to enter onto the road in either direction. Any further traffic load will only exasperate this situation in both directions and through the village of breadsall a ?rat run? for traffic heading for the A38
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Amy Govan	Response-01419	Durose country park is already heavily congested due to narrow roads and resident parking, I am concerned about adding extra traffic to this and the safety of other road users and pedestrians
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Andrea R Rowley	Response-01230	This development will affect Breadsall Village and surrounding roads. The Lime Lane junction onto the A608 and Brookside Road is a dangerous junction , and there have been several fatalities here since the initial application to build more houses in the area. Breadsall Village has seen a huge increase of traffic coming through the village during the day and night as a result of housing development along the Mansfield Road and Breadsall Hilltop area. The village 30mph speed limit is frequently not adhered to by drivers passing through, and we have had an increased number of road traffic accidents, some of which have required emergency services presence. Information about these accidents can be obtained from the Local Breadsall Parish Council. It is already very difficult (especially during peak rush hour times) to get out of Croft Lane on to the A61. At the very least before fany further housing development is considered, a new road should be built from the Mansfield Road A608 down to the Morrisons Island on to the A61 to try and stop Breadsall Village being the rat run from the A38/A61 to the Mansfield Road area and beyond
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Andrew David Williams	Response-00796	Any increase in housing in this area will mean further increase in traffic through Breadsall village as traffic finds ways through to the A61 and A38. The croft lane /A61 intersection is completely jammed with traffic at peak times between 7am and 9-30am every weekday and sometimes weekends. Furthermore the road through Breadsall village is already takes significant traffic and speeding is an increasing issue. The junction at Brookside Road and Church Lane has seen many near misses due to speeding and general visibility issues and the footpaths are extremely narrow for walking giving increased risk of accidents especially with Mums and children accessing the school and for disabled vehicles
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Andy Madeley	Response-00381	The A608 is already incredibly busy, with a lot of accidents, during rush hour traffic, it clogs up traffic coming out of Oakwood ( Bishops drive) so additional traffic will just compound the issue.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Angela Clarke	Response-01400	Being only one way in and out of Durose site and the proposed news site will cause residents of both sites difficulty in particular certain times of the day exciting and entering the site. The roads are narrow so passing parked cars will also increase residents difficulty getting round the site, and if this is only proposed way to access the new site it means construction traffic driving and potentially parking up in residential streets increasing risk to the residents and ability to access their properties.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Angela Smyth	Response-00296	The roads around the area are congested already due to the two new housing estates already built in the area by Derby City Council - one at the end of Bishops drive and one at the top of Mansfield and lime lane.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Ann Sherlock	Response-00410	The map used is out of date and there is already increased traffic due to the Alport Heights estate and Durose estate (both estates and established roads connected to them are conveniently missing off the map used, and perhaps intentionally misleading).
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Anya andrews	Response-00605	Traffic in and around the area is already so congested. This is going to make the roads even more busy.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	A O Smith	Response-01798	Traffic levels and volume have and will increase ,particularly at commuter and school times with long queues at both A61 and A608 exits. Speeding traffic is also prevalent.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Ashley Syll	Response-00397	This will increase traffic through a congested zone, especially for an additional 160 houses. Circa 160-200 cars using an access via Hungerhill Close (not crescent as described?)
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Ben Martin	Response-00787	The planned access to the site can only be achieved by cutting through 2 designated and widely used public footpaths located in the existing Redrow estate at Breadsall Hilltop from the A608. There are no provisions in place to handle the increase in traffic that the already over congested A608 road will face and nothing to address the safety of children who cross on a daily basis for school access. There are no provisions in place to handle the increase in traffic that the already over congested A608 road will face
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Bethan Eddy	Response-00976	People use it Breadsall as a cut through to get to the A38. This will increase this further
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Bethany Seivewright	Response-01563	The road layout is not set up for an additional 160 houses, the traffic is already bad enough and people speed coming up to the roundabout causing concerns for safety
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Beverly Jordan	Response-01330	More pressure on present surrounding roads and roads through Breadsall village
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Brendan Hargreaves	Response-00629	There is far too much traffic on the roads around this area with all the other new developments and we don't want anymore
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Bridgette Cussens	Response-00390	Oakwood is already busy with the new estate at the bottom, adding more near Acton way would make traffic horrendous and put extra pressure on the roads, this will see an increase in accidents which is already high on that stretch of road
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Carl Hill	Response-00670	Already hard to get out of Elmwood Drive? also recent deaths at Lime Lane junction down to Breadsall Village - the impact of the existing new housing has not been taken in to consideration
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Carol Hart	Response-01830	I have represented Breadsall as the Derbyshire County Councillor since late 2004. This in 2004 was still a reasonably quiet village but starting to have problems being used as a 'rat run' for drivers wanting to access the A38 one way and the M1 the opposite way. Over the years there have been major developments on the boundary of Breadsall, namely on the Oakwood area, the Persimmon development and more recently the Durose Development. There is still a proposal for another 90 homes on Lime Lane, again on the boundary of Breadsall. The village is slowly disappearing and being overwhelmed by big housing developments. It is not only the massively increased traffic through the village but major flooding problems have been occurring. Despite repeated efforts to try to control this there are problems every time it rains and matters have got considerably worse since the new developments have taken place. Adding this extra development would only increase the problems of traffic and possibly flooding.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Carol Westcott	Response-00973	The road A608 will be vastly effected it is a very busy link road for villages through to Heanor
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Carys Whomsley	Response-01438	I am writing to register my strong objection to the above-mentioned planning application, both in its original and revised form. Despite the removal of the area adjacent to the A61 in the amended proposal, I believe that the proposed development remains deeply inappropriate and harmful for the following reasons: 1. Contravention of Policy CP18 and Loss of Green Wedge The proposed site lies just outside the designated Green Belt, but crucially directly abuts existing woodland and open countryside, forming part of the vital green corridor along the Great Northern Greenway. This area functions as a green buffer, enhancing ecological connectivity, supporting biodiversity, and providing visual and recreational amenity to local residents, walkers, and cyclists. Despite claims of woodland retention, the development threatens the integrity of this space. Proximity to new housing would increase human pressure on the natural environment, likely leading to degradation of woodland, fragmentation of habitats, and a reduction in wildlife corridors. No Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) assessment appears in the application documents, raising concerns about whether the legally mandated 10% net gain can or will be achieved. Biodiversity enhancements delivered off-site would do nothing to mitigate local ecological loss, thereby undermining environmental sustainability in the area. Moreover, the site lies adjacent to land recently released from the Green Belt and under consideration for housing allocation by Erewash Borough Council. The cumulative impact of developing both sites would be devastating: a continuous sprawl from Derby through to Breadsall, resulting in the elimination of the settlement gap and permanent damage to the character of the Great Northern Greenway. 2. Environmental, Infrastructural, and Policy Concerns The proposal directly contradicts the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Paragraph 143, particularly the goals of preventing urban sprawl and protecting the openness of Green Belt land. It also ignores the findings of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA 359), which previously deemed the site unsuitable for residential development due to accessibility and environmental limitations. The development is completely incompatible with the objectives of the Breadsall Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2019-2029, particularly the aims to: Preserve the rural character and prevent urbanisation; Avoid coalescence with the Derby conurbation; Safeguard wildlife and ecological features; Control flood risk and infrastructure strain; Protect valued green spaces and visual vistas.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Carys Whomsley	Response-01438	Breadsall has already experienced increased flooding, attributed to upstream developments like Persimmon Estate and Breadsall Hilltop, which lie within the same water catchment area. Any additional development would worsen this issue, placing homes and infrastructure at risk. Furthermore, the proposal relies on access through two existing public footpaths within the Redrow estate and offers no concrete infrastructure improvements. The A608 is already over-congested, and no plans are presented to handle increased traffic or to safeguard children commuting to local schools. 3. Loss of Community and Ecological Value This land offers more than just open space? it is a much-loved and well-used amenity for the local community. It serves as a peaceful escape for informal recreation and nature engagement, and its visual and environmental contributions to the neighbourhood are significant. Its destruction would represent a major loss in local character and quality of life. The proposal underestimates the pressure on existing services, lacks detailed mitigation plans, and fails to explain how proposed footpaths will link meaningfully into existing routes. Nearby Local Wildlife Sites will be impacted
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Charlotte	Response-00458	Traffic across the Hilltop, Oakwood junction already busy and congested at peak times. Additional roads will add to this problem.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Chris Beaumont	Response-00841	Breadsall village already suffers from the ?rat run? as a though road with many cars speeding through the village despite calming measures put in which almost seem to add to the need to speed up to get round them opposed to stopping and being held up for a few seconds. .
	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Chris C	Response-01106	The roads through the estate are generally narrow which increases the safety risk with an increased volume of traffic
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Chris Harris	Response-01521	The A608 is already too busy
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Chris Hopkinson	Response-01396	Hugerhill close will not cope with the extra traffic
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Chris Lunn	Response-01410	Road safety is another area of vital importance. As above, 160-320 additional vehicles flowing through the development and out into the Redrow estate, especially at peak times, will cause a build-up of traffic as it tries to enter Mansfield Road/Hilltop at the Dale Acre roundabout. It is already extremely dangerous getting out of Windmill Place due to traffic travelling too quickly and its proximity to the roundabout. Another 100-150 cars would undoubtedly cause accidents as people will take risks to compete with an already congested road system. Pedestrians will be vulnerable as they try to cross heavy traffic. These extra vehicles will cause additional pollution, noise and potentially increase the incidence of respiratory problems ? thus returning to the issue of inadequate healthcare facilities. Hungerhill Close, the road proposed to take the traffic flow on and off the proposed development already becomes congested as parked cars are an issue. With so many additional vehicles all having to use this route, the situation for pedestrians, many with young children, will become even more dangerous. Large vans, emergency vehicles and bin lorries will all have to use this road. Bin lorries, stopping every few metres to empty household waste will cause congestion and utter chaos at peak times. Cars will be discharging harmful emissions whilst waiting to get around large vehicles at the same time as small children are walking past. More health problems will undoubtedly arise.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Christine Goodwin	Response-00642	I am most concerned about the potential increase in traffic through Breadsall village on roads which are already used as a rat run by the latest two developments on Breadsall Hill Top. It appears that very little thought is given to the impact these ill thought out developments have on Breadsall village where there are only unclassified roads not intended for the amount of traffic which now passes through the village.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Christopher Chambers	Response-00175	Has the local authority carried out traffic surveys following the consent for the developments built on the site opposite and further toward Breadsall Hilltop (from the proposed area)? Traffic is nose-to-tail at many times throughout the day and virtually gridlocked at peak periods. The village of Breadsall is used extensively to avoid the main road route through the development area and is soon likely to be in need of a bypass road to alleviate the traffic congestion caused by the repeated granting of planning consent in the same area! This development will do nothing to improve the situation or the lives of those residents living in the once idyllic village.
	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Claire cordery	Response-01494	Will create more cars in the area on the road.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Clare Roters	Response-01553	Congestion is already a problem at times and really impacts the surrounding area. The estate durose estate has small roads where we already struggle with cars from the existing estate
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Colin Brewster	Response-00576	As a resident of Breadsall Village I am well aware of the increased traffic this development will have on the parish. There is no alternative route being put in place to mitigate this situation and once again, as with the Persimmon and Durose developments, all traffic needing to access the A61 and A38 has little choice but to pass through the village. The situation has become dangerous and this development will only serve to make things worse. A solution needs to be found before any further development is allowed to go ahead.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Dana Demidoff	Response-00634	Inadequate road infrastructure
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Darren adams	Response-00874	The traffic throughout the village has dramatically increased in volume sense the New housing development in Oakwood, if this development goes through no doubt it will cause even more traffic and pollution
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	David Byrne	Response-01433	Traffic across dale acre way is already congested and the roads in and around bishops drive in the mornings and evenings can cause significant delays and often result in lateness dropping my boy to school.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	David Duxbury	Response-00305	The original plan for Oakwood included a direct connection to the a61, which has never been built. Congestion and speeding on Brookside Road continues to be a significant problem which will be made worse by the development. Additional proposed developments on land adjacent to lime lane, and recent extensions to Oakwood, have already made the issue worse.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Diane Bakhda	Response-01411	I am a resident of Breadsall village. We are already blighted by the huge volume of traffic that passes through our village. Where we have footpath, they are often very narrow. I have often experienced frightening occasions when traffic driving far too fast, desperate to avoid stopping at the chicanes, passes within inches of my body. Many of our residents are elderly and not too steady on their feet and so are extremely nervous about walking anywhere nearby. It can take a very long time to cross Brookside Road. I am fearful that, if this development goes ahead, the volume of traffic through the village will increase even more and our decreased air quality will become even worse.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Edward James Gregory	Response-00728	The area already suffers from traffic congestion, and safety issues due to speed and number of vehicles
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Elaine hodgkinson	Response-00854	There is already bad congestion all the way from the junction with Mansfield Rd with particularly dangerous sections at the right hand junction next to Slice of India and the Lime lane and Breadsall junctions where there have been fatalities. It will badly increase the number of cars travelling through the residential area of Oakwood.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Elena Maxim	Response-01573	Concerns around traffic building up. Roads too small and difficult to pass through
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Emma Binns	Response-00843	More traffic through our already congested village. Long queues to get out at Pektron island in a morning already.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Emma Charlton	Response-01545	As a resident of Brookside Road where cars exceed 30mph, the increase in traffic is going to result in a fatal RTC soon. It's already treated as a racetrack with no measures to reduce this other than dangerous chicanes.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Emma Daniels	Response-00346	Area is already congested enough in peak and even non peak hours now. It's almost impossible to cross the road safely with no traffic calming measures or lights to do so.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Emma Hawkins	Response-00813	The consultation states that access will be from Hungerhill Crescent. This is incorrect as it is actually Hungerhill Close. This would mean opening a road which is currently a Close ?dead end? to a through road. This road is not suitable nor wide enough to carry further traffic of 300 plus cars and the safety of current users will be impacted . Such new road would pass over a public footpath used by the local community gaining access to the Great Northern Greenway and Breadsall village by foot. This route is also used by school children who attend the school in the village further volumes of traffic would make this unsafe. The consultation states that access will also be provided from Dale Acre Way, again this road is in fact a ?dead end?. Such access would mean crossing an existing pathway used as mentioned above and the design of the estate in providing recreational space will be changed dramatically and no longer would be able to be enjoyed in the way that the estate does now. The road is also narrow and could not deal with increased volumes of traffic safely, the estate connects to the A608 which is all ready congested with being the main route from Derby to Heanor with existing traffic delays around the island and difficulty trying to join the A609 from Stratford Road. Additional traffic will increase this greatly. Traffic will also increase along the already congested A61 and there will be a significant increase of through traffic via Breadsall Village which is against the Breadsall Parish Council Village Neighbourhood plan 2019-2029 point 12. There are currently planning applications for for the land south of Breadsall Hill Top and Lime Lane. Which will all have an affect on traffic in the area.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Faye Wilkinson	Response-01129	It is highly unlikely that junctions on Dale Acre can be made safer, they are small residential junctions that are already very close to homes. Roads are already busy with parked cars on the pavements and roads due to homes having more cars than driveway space. Congestion is already bad enough during rush hour on Mansfield Road out of the Durose Estate towards the city centre. More homes in the area would add to this and cause dangerous situations.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Fiorella Di Fina	Response-01123	Traffic will worsen and Will make the area noisier and more polluted
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Gary Murfin	Response-00374	The traffic in and out of Oakwood is already bad at times due to Oakwood being a big estate already, this new development and the one on Acorn way will obviously make it worse
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Gaynor Pawley	Response-00627	As a resident living on the A608 I can say since the recent 3 development along this already busy road, with another currently being built; the traffic load has significantly risen. Another significant development with more planned in the future would make this area total gridlock.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Ged Doherty	Response-01822	Traffic in the area has increased considerably with 2 large developments within a mile of our spot in the middle, and road safety concerns are much heightened, especially at peak times, as there is simply too much traffic using that road, and to add to that with the proposed developments would exacerbate the situation intolerably. It would also cause even more traffic to divert through Breadsall again raising congestion, pollution and safety concerns.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Gemma Cotter	Response-01374	The A608 is already subject to regular congestion at peak times and difficult to divert during incidents or road works. The absence of local school provision and services in easy walking distance would greatly increase traffic flows at peak times. The section of the A608 between The Paddock and Stratford Road is particularly steep and narrow. The pavement barely fits two pedestrians. The carriageway is frequently affected by the H1 bus stopping or cyclists struggling with the hill, and it is difficult for other road users to safely overtake to keep traffic flowing. The Greenway mixed use route goes a long way round the hill gradient, is not legally connected to the site (footpath rather than bridleway) and is unsuitable for efficient commuting to avoid the difficulties of cycling in the A608. It has also proved unsafe for lone women to use in recent weeks and on previous occasions where violent assaults have taken place.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	George Langton	Response-01385	My main concern is the likelihood of increased traffic flow through Breadsall Village from Brookside Road to Croft Lane, caused by drivers from Breadsall Hilltop seeking a short cut to the A38. There is already a high level of traffic through the village, particularly at peak times, causing potential danger to children at the new Breadsall C of E Primary School and congestion at the Pektron Island. In the mornings, residents of Breadsall Village wishing to turn left at the Pektron Island on to Frank Whittle Way towards the city centre and the Meteor shopping area face a long wait now, and the proposed new housing can only make this worse. A new road linking Breadsall Hilltop to Frank Whittle Way would go some way to reducing this, but obviously the steep terrain would make this a challenge.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Georgina	Response-00343	More traffic then thr roads can handle
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Gillian Montgomery	Response-00625	There is a lot of traffic NOW coming and going along Dale Acre Way , surely having more vehicles is not a good idea !!! Expanding the estate in this way can surley have a negative impact eg the air quality and the nature in the surrounding area. Also the safety aspect for children and pets . The roads around the estate are too small to cope with all this extra traffic .
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Gillian Pearson	Response-00303	Very concerned that further housing above Breadsall Village will increase traffic volumes along Brookside Road with attendant pollution, road safety issues and noise.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Harry Mee	Response-00882	Draycott roads do not have the capacity for 190 houses. The congestion would affect people coming in and out of the village and decrease the amount of visitors to amenities.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Harvey Pearson	Response-01307	Increased traffic through Breadsall village causing issues as has been noticed since previous housing developments in the area
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Helen Foster	Response-00650	Congestion in Breadsall village is already a significant problem, particularly following the development of housing at Lime Lane and Dale Acre Way. The village has turned into a 'rat-run' for Oakwood residents seeking access to the A61 and A38, and during peak times, both road safety and air quality are severely impacted.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Helen Walker	Response-00325	There is far too much traffic already and by adding on these houses to this area it will mean the area will become a car park, since the other houses which were built in recent years on the fields which surround Oakwood it is impossible to leave the Oakwood estate at certain times in the morning and trying to get home at night
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Hulland. Bdverley	Response-00496	Congestion and noise Already enough houses and not fair on residents already there
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Ian Lockwood	Response-01491	Traffic congestion in Breadsall village is already a major concern, especially since the housing developments at Lime Lane and Dale Acre Way. The village has effectively become a shortcut for Oakwood residents heading to the A61 and A38, leading to serious issues with road safety and air quality during peak hours.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Jack Bointon	Response-00969	Traffic congestion will be dramatically worsened. The major road running through Hill Top has already got bad traffic, but if this proposal is accepted, then the road will be even worse.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Jake Moore	Response-01202	An increase of potentially 300?400 vehicles (based on national car ownership averages) will place considerable strain on local roads, increasing congestion, pollution, and risk to pedestrians and cyclists?particularly near existing residential roads that are not designed for high volumes of traffic.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	James Bellaby	Response-00337	The roads are already congested, especially at the new redrow roundabout and lime lane junction.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	James Roberts	Response-00673	Dale Acre Way & Hungerhill Close are not suitably sized to manage with the increased traffic load for 160 households worth of vehicles. Given multiple people already park on the curb or on the road on both roads given lack of driveway space for the number of vehicles in the household, the road can regularly become only wide enough for one vehicle at a time. Adding 160 households trying to pass this each morning and evening is just going to cause daily congestion and a significant increase in local pollution and hence reduction in air and living quality
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	James skivington	Response-00359	Traffic is already terrible in this area
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Jamie Branagan	Response-00335	You're tagging this proposed development onto the existing estate and routing the traffic through Dale Acre Way and the Bishops Drive Roundabout. This area is already heavily congested with traffic and you're adding to this problem. Leaving it with the Oakwood ward and residents to deal with.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Janet Brewster	Response-00577	As a resident of Breadsall Village I am aware of the increased traffic this development will have on the parish. There is no alternative route being put in place to mitigate this situation and once again, as with the Persimmon and Durose developments, all traffic needing to access the A61 and A38 has little choice but to pass through the village. The situation has become dangerous and this development will only serve to make things worse. A solution needs to be found before any further development is allowed to go ahead.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Janet Jones	Response-00895	There?s already too much through traffic in the village
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Janette Booth	Response-00295	Traffic out of Breadsall Village is already ridiculous on working days. People continue to use it as a cut through. More houses = more congestion
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Janette Glenn	Response-00422	Mansfield Rd is already congested at peak times. As the proposed development is only served by the H1 bus, residents are likely to use their own cars and add to the existing problems.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Jared Smyth	Response-00894	The roads are congested in the area already due to the existing housing estates. Two of which are not on your planning document
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Jason Reader	Response-00320	I live in Breadsall village, I will object to development like this unless the developer is made to alleviate both the number and speed of vehicles driving through my village.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Jeanette Kent	Response-00402	Traffic is already a nightmare during most times of the day
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Jessica Softley	Response-01408	The proposal of 160 houses will increase traffic congestion both within the Durose Country Park estate on the proposed access roads, and within the local area.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	J Hasse	Response-00875	It will increase the traffic on Mansfield Rd and surrounding area.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Jim Smith	Response-00741	This will only increase the volume of traffic that uses Brookside Road Breadsall, as a ?rat run?
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	John Harlow	Response-00619	As a house holder at no 24 Dale acre Way we see many vehicles travelling through the estate.. It is totally unacceptable to have any increase in the amount of traffic. The junction between Dale Acre Way and Bandy Lane is totally unsafe as there is ?no right of way? so drivers push their luck every day with dire consequences. I have witnessed many accidents and incidents at this junction. Dale acre Way is already up to capacity at peak times so any additional traffic would have a safety impact and also add emissions to the air quality. At peak times in the morning, traffic is queued at the roundabout on Mansfield road from Dale Acre Way, from Morley direction and also long queues on Bishops Drive. An increase in any traffic is just not acceptable, on the grounds of environmental constraints.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	John Hudson-Peat	Response-01833	The siting of these houses will cause further traffic using Breadsall Village (Brookside road/Croft lane) as a "rat run" into Derby City and beyond.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	John Moffat	Response-01289	Development here will generate even more traffic to cut through Breadsall to the A38. Not at all good.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	John Montgomery	Response-00622	Dale Acre Way cannot support anymore increases of traffic volumes safely. Existing residents especially children would be at risk. A new access off the main A609 is required to support the 160 additional homes. Please allow common sense to prevail.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	John O?Brien	Response-01796	The traffic levels at Peak times have considerably increased following the recent housing developments on the A608, making it difficult and unsafe to enter onto the road in either direction. Any further traffic load will only exasperate this situation in both directions and through the village of breadsall a ?rat run? for traffic heading for the A38
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Jonathan Park	Response-01191	Mansfield road is already heavily congested and new houses with increased traffic flow will only exacerbate this issue
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Jon Lewis	Response-00347	There is already excessive traffic on dale acre way and through the Durose Country park development. During rush hour there are considerable delays getting off the development at the bishops drive roundabout

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Julie and Michael Coulton	Response-01811	Breadsall Village is a conservation area and should not be subjected to more traffic. DEFINITION of a conservation area is: an area of notable environmental or historical interest or importance which is protected by law against undesirable changes. Another housing development will create more noise and fume pollution. This is an undesirable change.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Julie Herbert	Response-01282	Breadsall hilltop is already queued back on a daily basis, this is going to make it a lot worse.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Justine Dean	Response-00844	Traffic is already horrendous on the Mansfield road as this is the main road to hearon and the villages. This will add to congestion, worsening the air quality in the area and making the roads less safe to cross.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Justin Windsor	Response-01544	The surrounding road network can not sustain another ~300 cars through the durose country park as planned for entry, accidents will be inevitable! The entrance onto the main road via the roundabout is not adequate enough to sustain the level of traffic a new estate would bring with it, it's already a challenge to enter onto the new estate due to surrounding traffic so an exception increase of traffic will just increase the difficulty!
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Kara Crossley	Response-00865	Breadsall village is already used as a through fare and does not have the infrastructure to maintain the volume of traffic that more houses would bring
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Karen Read	Response-00923	Any housing built in the proposed area of breadsall hill top will substantially increase traffic flow along the adjacent 608 road This will result in a significant health and safety risk to adjacent residents the current road condition is not suitable for increased traffic has there been a traffic survey carried out for the proposed land reclassification from green belt to grey belt The amount of extra traffic will impact upon pollution and climate change that you are also trying to control through government policy has there been surveys on the impact to the environment
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Karen Smith	Response-00635	Traffic in this area is already substantial and the roads are used as race tracks by many
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Karen Webster	Response-00420	The existing roads cannot cope with any additional traffic, even adding junctions won't ease the queues on the main roads.
			Kate barlow	Response-00351	Too much congestion in an area already built up without any real idea to solve this issue
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Katie Hulland	Response-00382	This will add to traffic congestion particularly at commuter times
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Keerthi	Response-01450	As Durose County Park grows more, I believe the traffic volume increases. The roads are not wide enough to support 160 more houses. Increases volume in same road area will definitely cause a road safety issue as well. The planned access to the site can only be achieved by cutting through 2 designated and widely used public footpaths located in the existing Redrow estate at Breadsall Hilltop from the A608. There are no provisions in place to handle the increase in traffic that the already over congested A608 road will face and nothing to address the safety of children who cross on a daily basis for school access.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Kev Rodgers	Response-00897	There is already an existing traffic flow problem on the A608 as drivers return to their homes during late afternoon. This sometimes stretches from the junction of Mansfield Road / Bishops Drive right back down the A608 as far as the Chester Green area. Along with the proposed housing development on land to the rear of Elmwood Drive, this will lead to yet more congestion and traffic fume pollution in the area as well as significant homeward journey times.
			Kimberley Woodward	Response-01445	It is already busy and congested enough on Dale Acre Way without another development using this road.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Kirstin Woodward	Response-01043	Our home is directly on Mansfield Road. We have lived here for 25 years, and the amount of traffic has increased massively during that time. I have timed how long it takes to leave my property and get to work?it can take up to 10 minutes during the morning and evening rush hours. The traffic on Mansfield Road is constant. The pavements are too narrow for pedestrians, allowing only single-file walking. This is especially difficult for people with pushchairs, wheelchairs, or dogs, and for those walking with elderly individuals?as I often do. It feels very unsafe. Over the years, there have been many accidents outside our house, and in the past five years, we have seen more frequent shunts and near misses.
			K Munson	Response-00631	Traffic volume is already too high for our roads
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Laura Louca	Response-01266	Getting out of Breadsall Cillage onto the Pektron Island can often take in excess of 10 mins and getting out of the top of the village can be just as congested. Adding more vehicles to this is going to add to the problem. The A609 leading down to the Meteor is constantly queuing and Frank Whittle Road is terrible during rush hour and pretty much every weekend (worse when there is a match at Pride Park). The roads around here were not designed to take this much traffic. Significant changes on these roads must be seriously considered way before proposing more houses.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	L Burton	Response-00342	Traffic is already particularly bad between Breadsall and Oakwood and Breadsall and Derby, even on the main road out of the estate alone.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Leah McCormack	Response-01481	Roads on Dale Acre Way and Hungerhill close will not cope with an extra 300 cars with no other entry and exit roads onto the new build estate. Cars already park on corners of junctions and on the road causing issues for pedestrians crossing and hazards for drivers already

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Lee Wheatley	Response-01492	The proposed Core Strategy Review Amendment raises significant concerns regarding increases in traffic congestion in and around the Breadsall Hilltop and wider area. My objections are based on the following points: ? Increased Volume on Local Roads: Any new developments or changes in land use patterns outlined in the amendment are likely to generate a higher volume of vehicular traffic. Breadsall Hilltop is a residential area with existing traffic flows, and an increase would lead to significant increased congestion, particularly during peak hours for commuting, school runs, and deliveries. This would negatively impact the daily lives of residents, causing delays, frustration, and increased journey times. The road network in the area is already heavily congested during morning and late afternoon peaks (around 8am till 9:30am and 5pm till 6:30pm). ? Strain on Existing Infrastructure: The current road infrastructure in the vicinity of Breadsall Hilltop is already operating at its capacity during certain times. The Core Strategy Review Amendment needs to clearly demonstrate how the existing road network can accommodate any projected increase in traffic without causing unacceptable levels of congestion. There is a lack of detail on specific infrastructure improvements planned to mitigate the impact of increased traffic. ? Impact on Air Quality and Noise Pollution: Increased traffic congestion directly correlates with poorer air quality due to idling vehicles and stop-start traffic. Residents of Breadsall Hilltop would likely experience a deterioration in air quality, potentially impacting their health and well-being. Similarly, increased traffic flow and congestion can lead to higher levels of noise pollution, disrupting the peaceful residential character of the area. ? Safety Concerns: Congestion can lead to driver frustration and potentially an increase in risky driving behaviours. Increased traffic volume, particularly if not adequately managed with traffic calming measures, can pose a greater risk to pedestrians and cyclists in the area. The amendment lacks sufficient detail on how pedestrian and cyclist safety will be ensured in the face of potential traffic increases. It's also worth noting that the existing Redrow estate (where I live) is virtually pedestrianised in parts with many low kerbs. There is also a high volume of cars parking on the roadways which makes access very difficult, this would likely only get worse with the addition of hundreds of new homes being accessed through this estate. ? Lack of Sustainable Transport Solutions: The Core Strategy Review Amendment should prioritise and detail sustainable transport solutions to mitigate potential traffic congestion. This includes investment in public transport, promotion of cycling and walking infrastructure, and measures to encourage the use of less polluting forms of transport. The current proposals lack sufficient emphasis on these crucial aspects.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Linda Morris	Response-00867	Any increase in housing in Oakwood/Breadsall hilltop will increase the volume of traffic that will use Brookside Rd/ Croft Lane as a cut through to the A61/A38. Breadsall Village has a new school on Brookside Road and any increase in traffic will lead to a conflict of parking parents and inpatient computers. The traffic calming does not discourage through traffic it just leads to a convoy effect which causes delays to village residents journeys. At rush hour Croft lane exit onto A61 is very congested with long tail backs into the village which causes additional problems with stationary cars at the traffic calming.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Linda Smith	Response-01799	It is quite obvious that the two authorities take no effort to examine what the other has planned and my village is supposed to bear the brunt of these decisions. The amount of traffic which now uses Brookside Road as some sort of rat run far exceeds any traffic planning which may have been projected years ago. The road and its understructure of sewerage and piping was never designed to absorb so much daily through put.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Lisa Stone	Response-01018	Already living just off of Mansfield road the traffic is horrendous! It's constantly backed up and impossible to get out to turn onto the main road during rush hours, adding more houses and more traffic will just continue to cripple it. Walking the dog along the main road it's just fumes in the air no oxygen so add more traffic equals more idling cars and more fumes subjecting all the current residents to lower life expectancy. great plan. Not.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Lorna Coope	Response-00364	The junction at the bottom of lime lane and traffic heading towards the paddock on Mansfield Road is already very congested during busy periods. The knock on effect spreads further into the estate. Adding more housing without any work to improve infrastructure will create huge problems for residents.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Lucy Lewis	Response-01459	Unsuitable roads to be used as a through route
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	lynne hollis	Response-01234	While I appreciate the need for new housing, I have serious concerns about the impact this development will have on traffic congestion and accessibility in the area. The village is already experiencing significant issues with increased traffic, making it increasingly difficult for residents to enter and exit safely. The existing infrastructure is struggling to accommodate current levels of traffic, and the addition of more homes will only exacerbate this issue. Without appropriate traffic management measures or improvements to road access, the development will contribute to further congestion and potential safety hazards for both drivers and pedestrians. I urge the council to reconsider the approval of this development or implement appropriate measures to ensure traffic flow is properly managed and I hope the council takes into account the impact on local residents.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Mady Hall	Response-00788	The traffic from Durose roundabout already backs up down towards lime lane and also into oakwood
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Mandy Cooling	Response-00312	Breadsall village is already a cut through for traffic to/from A38 ? this is likely to significantly increase and there appear to be no plans to ease traffic flow. This side of Derby frequently gets gridlocked as it is. The plans do not appear to allow for significant changes to the roads to enable traffic to move freely. I'd envisage that it would require significant development in the transport links to make this a viable proposition and there is no indication of such proposals. If this development were to go ahead, I'd envisage that there would be a need for traffic lights at the bottom of Bishops Drive to replace the roundabout and mechanism to slow down traffic on Brookside Road in Breadsall

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Margaret Stafford	Response-01231	This development will inevitably affect Breadsall Village as no further roads are being proposed. The Lime Lane junction onto the A608 and Brookside Road is a dangerous junction , and there have been several fatalities here since the initial application to build more houses in the area. Breadsall Village has seen a huge increase of traffic coming through the village during the day and night since the housing developments along Mansfield Road and Breadsall Hilltop. The village 30mph speed limit is frequently not adhered to by drivers passing through, and we have had an increased number of road traffic accidents, some of which have required emergency services presence. Information about these accidents can be obtained from the Local Breadsall Parish Council. It is already very difficult (especially during peak rush hour times) to get out of Croft Lane on to the A61. At the very least a new road should be built from the Mansfield Road A608 down to the Morrisons Island on to the A61 to try and stop Breadsall Village being the rat run from the A38/A61 to the Mansfield Road area and beyond.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	marion Morris	Response-00870	Any increase in housing in Oakwood/Breadsall Hill top will increase the volume of traffic that will use Brookside road/croft lane as a cut through to the A61/A38. Breadsall village has a new school on Brookside road and any further increase in traffic will lead to a conflict of parking parents and impatient commuters. The traffic calming does not discourage through traffic it only leads to a convoy effect which causes delays to village residents journeys. At rush hour Croft lane exit onto the A61 is very congested with long tail backs into the village which cause additional problems with stationary cars at the incoming traffic calming island.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Mark Herbert	Response-01285	Hill top is already very congested at peak times as it's a main through route this will only exasperate the situation, which will create more air and noise pollution.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Martin Harrison	Response-01395	I strongly object to the proposed development near my home due to the serious traffic implications. The area already suffers from heavy congestion, especially during peak hours on the A38, Mansfield Road, and the surrounding routes through Breadsall and Oakwood. Adding further traffic from a new development with only one entrance will worsen an already critical issue, impacting safety, journey times, and local infrastructure.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Mary Hincley	Response-00297	This development will see an increase of traffic through Breadsall village causing greater congestion and queuing at both Croft Lane and Brookside Road junctions.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Masheda Chowdhury	Response-01339	The existing traffic congestion and inadequate infrastructure to support additional housing. In Breadsall, a traffic survey indicated that 7,000 vehicles used local routes daily, a number believed to have since increased, exacerbating concerns about road safety and congestion.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Matt	Response-00604	Already at a max issue for congestion in all directions
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Megan Byrne	Response-01432	Major impact see letter on other notes
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Melissa Little	Response-00389	The main access road is already a very busy road, there are a number for car accidents that happen on the main road. Additional traffic from work vehicles and eventually residents would be hugely detrimental the those who already live in the Oakwood/Breadsall Hill Top area.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Michael Albinson	Response-00790	I live on Hungerhill close and the increased traffic will be a nightmare. No roadmarkings will cure the Dale acre junction on to Hungerhill. 3 cars have already been hit on Hungerhill with out the increased traffic. With kids playing this is a danger if created to a through road let alone the residents that bought a house in a closed/ dead end road for the ease of traffic
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Michael Grignon	Response-01335	The traffic in the area is already congested due to the housing developments already completed in the surrounding area
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Michael Poplar	Response-00565	All the roads in the area are congested and an enormous amount of all new traffic generated by new housing developments is now directed through Breadsall village on a small unclassified village road, which is now effectively acting as Derby's northern ring road due to the lack of any alternatives. The originally planned link road from the end of Bishops Drive to the Morrisons roundabout on Frank Whittle Way has never been constructed and there appears to be no intent to do so.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Mollie	Response-01549	The addition of new housing will inevitably result in a significant increase in traffic. Local roads, many of which are already congested during peak hours, are not equipped to handle the additional volume of vehicles. This will lead to: ? Longer commute times and increased air pollution. ? Greater risk of accidents on roads not designed for higher capacity. ? Pressure on existing public transport systems, which are already stretched. Existing Bottlenecks. Breadsall Hill Top Road and Morley Lane already experience heavy queues at peak times. Adding several hundred homes will push daily flows well beyond capacity, leading to longer jams on the A609 and rat?running through residential streets.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Monique Johnson	Response-00663	Traffic is already heavy through the village with cars queuing practically from the Booker roundabout to the village cafe and this will make it even worse
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Mr Dominic Carter	Response-01405	Adding an additional 160 properties will add severe traffic and vehicles on the Durose Estate. Most houses have at least two cars. Creating these 160 properties will add over an extra 300 vehicles coming to and from the estate. Not only increasing pollution, but ruining landscape, increasing traffic and adding additional pressures on an already busy roundabout.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Mrs. Dorothy Monkhouse.	Response-01371	Since the recent development on Lime Lane-Breadsall Hilltop we have seen a major increase in traffic through Breadsall Village. Few people observe the speed limit and the 7ton weight limit seems to be regularly ignored' When the development was approved it was promised that there would be anew link road from Bishops Drive down to Morrisons roundabout. THIS HAS NOT HAPPENED1 Without this link road traffic through the village would be untenable.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Mrs Bullock	Response-00966	Breadsall village is to small to accommodate more traffic, it's terrible now as it is

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Mrs Francoise Poplar	Response-00602	Traffic levels rise and rise with every new housing development, yet nothing is ever done to help with this. There was originally a link road promised between the bottom of Bishops Drive going down to Sir Frank Whittle Way at Morrisons, but of course this has been conveniently forgotten in the rush for maximum houses for minimum spend. Most of the new traffic now goes through Breadsall village down to the Pectron roundabout there being no other viable way to travel to and from the West, putting a massive strain on the system.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Mr SJ Read and Mrs S E Read	Response-01225	Local traffic congestion has recently been made worse by extensive housing development in the adjoining areas of Oakwood within Derby City. Development of this site will simply make matters worse. This applies particularly to the roads in Breadsall village where much of the traffic generated by the new development would inevitably flow in order to access the A61 and A38. The roads within Breadsall are already overloaded with through traffic and the proposed development would simply make matters worse .
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Mr Softley	Response-00344	The areas around the proposed site are already heavily burdened with traffic at peak times. This does not appear to have been well thought through with significant other Derby City council proposed developments in the area. The strategy is frankly inept.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Mrs Sarah Morley	Response-01515	Since the two new housing estates have been built, during peak times the traffic is already extremely congested. The road could not cope with another 160 houses adding to this. The road was never built to hold the number of cars the new houses will bring on top of the already over amount of houses
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Nathan Cooke	Response-00896	Traffic in this area is already unable to cope with the local roads, this development will only add to the issue.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Nathan Latymer	Response-00361	The traffic in this area is awful as it is, with no need for it to be made any worse by adding loads of houses.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Neal Flint	Response-01220	Breadsall cannot cope with and should not be expected to take any more traffic as most of the traffic from the development will come through the village. All junctions in the area cannot cope with extra traffic, at certain times it is almost impossible to exit of croft lane onto and around pektion island as well as the dangerous junction at brookside road and lime lane and these are a few amongst many in the area.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Nicholas lloyd	Response-00356	I object to this planning application on the grounds that the proposed development will significantly exacerbate existing traffic congestion on Acorn way and it's a joining roads, which is already operating beyond its capacity. The addition of 500 new homes will introduce a substantial volume of vehicular traffic, including private cars and delivery vehicles, onto a road that frequently experiences delays and is prone to bottlenecks, particularly during peak hours. This increased traffic flow poses a heightened risk to pedestrian and cyclist safety, as the current infrastructure lacks adequate provisions for non-motorized users. Furthermore, the development's impact on local air quality and noise levels could adversely affect the well-being of nearby residents. Given that Acorn Way is a primary route for emergency services, any additional congestion could impede their response times, potentially compromising public safety. Therefore, I urge the planning authority to consider these concerns and reject the application to prevent further strain on an already overburdened road network.?
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Norma HASWELL	Response-01384	The traffic congestion at peak times is already out of control. Additional housing will bring further pressure as well as significant environmental impact from pollution.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Oakwood Ward Councillors Eyre, Mulhall and Trehwella	Response-01359	Traffic Congestion on the A608 (not the A609 as your documents INCORRECTLY state), is very regular. This development would only add to that. The Durose Country Park Estate was constructed to be just that, not a linking road to an expanded estate.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Patrick Baker	Response-01349	At present traffic from the new Derby Hilltop developments are passing through the village as the access road initially planned to link through to Morrisons/A38 was removed from Derbys plans. Additional housing on Breadsall Hilltop will increase this further
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Paul Walker	Response-00651	This will create additional congestion and add to the existing problem of Breadsall Village being a rat run. Plans were never followed through to build a link road to the Meteor Centre
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Paul Walsh	Response-00341	I firmly reject this, there is only one exit from this estate onto a very busy main road already, adding more houses would be a terrible idea.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Philip Booth	Response-00683	Traffic in this area is already at breaking point.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Prathap Paulson Junjuri	Response-01393	Traffic congestion
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Rachael	Response-00332	Significant traffic concerns already around the local area, during peak times traffic is dangerous and congested, the carriageway of Hungerhill Close not being fit to manage a significant increase in volume of traffic.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Rachel Taylor	Response-00938	Heavy traffic, which doesn't adhere to the 30 mph speed limit already streams through the village on a daily basis, 7 days per week. Additional housing will only increase this issue.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Richard Hewitt	Response-01464	Breadsall village is already used as a cut through from Oakwood and the newer development between Lime Lane and the Windmill Pub. Further additional homes in the Lime Lane area will create more congestion at pinch points in Breadsall Village and the Sir Frank Whittle junction between Mansfield Road and Hampshire Hill. These two junctions alone see huge tailbacks at during morning, lunchtime and evening rush hour. In recent months, Sir Frank Whittle Way has even become gridlock at the weekends, on one recent saturday (mid morning) it took me 20 minutes to travel its length from Breadsall village to Pentagon Island. Most houses on average have 2 cars per family, which will mean a minimum of 200 additional cars leaving and returning to the area.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Richard Johnson	Response-00697	Already traffic congestion through the village is a problem. Many cars follow the main road route though the village and frequently speed breaking the 30mph speed limit. This is easy to witness . Additional housing developments will only make this worse.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Richard Kingham	Response-00849	Traffic systems currently since the introduction of the Persimmon and RedRow estates is unable to cope. In a morning I can be sat idle at the junction of Elmwood drive for upwards of 10 minutes before being able to get out safely. The volume that now uses Mansfield road is ridiculous. Constant queues increasing pollution, more speeding/dangerous drivers, surprised nobody's been killed yet. The pavements are not fit for purpose an dangerous for users as too narrow, and there are now more pushchair users, mobility scooter users and cyclists using them meaning people having to walk into the road to get by. The island at the top of the hill which connects to bishop's drive isn't fit for purpose and is continuously blocked by traffic users creating further back logs. Unless a new main road is being put in somewhere, the current infrastructure can't cope.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Richard Stone	Response-01029	The junction to Mansfield Road, the road-about from the A608 to A61, Sir Frank Whittle Road going on to the A38 get backed up terribly every day. These roads are most likely the roads that will get used by these houses and are already nearly at breaking point, they can not handle anymore cars let alone another 300 potential cars. There would need to significant changes to road system all round this area before more houses should be even considered.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Richard Straw	Response-01412	There's going to be too much traffic
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Rowe	Response-01299	Hungerhill Close not suitable for two way traffic
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Roy Ling	Response-01243	The two developments off the A608 road, Persimmon and Redrow have dramatically increased traffic through Breadsall Village. Further development would increase traffic to an unsustainable level.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Ruth Duxbury	Response-00301	Traffic is already very heavy in this area and more housing allocation will worsen this. There is already heavy congestion on the A61 and through Breadsall Village
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Sally	Response-00873	Already congested
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Samantha Watts	Response-00869	The existing traffic congestion in Breadsall Village is already severe, with frequent queues along Croft Lane leading to the A61. The junction at Croft Lane/Brookside Road/Rectory Lane has seen numerous accidents, with many additional near misses reported, posing a significant safety risk to residents and road users. Furthermore, Breadsall Village is regularly used as a cut-through route, with excessive speeds exacerbating the dangers on local roads. Introducing further housing will inevitably increase traffic volume, worsening congestion and heightening the risk of accidents in an already strained infrastructure. Given these concerns, additional development in the area would further compromise road safety and traffic flow.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Sam Saunders	Response-01557	The proposed continuation of Hungerhill Close (NOT Crescent) and traffic increases on Dale Acre Way and the A609 Hill Top are likely to cause, increased congestion on narrow residential roads not designed for heavy traffic flow, meaning road safety risks, especially for pedestrians and children and lack of traffic modelling for peak-time congestion and cumulative development pressures in the area. That if the development is fully completed, let alone the traffic and heavy goods vehicles which will cause unlimited chaos during the development.
			Sandra Perry	Response-00307	Already too much traffic coming through Brookside Road breadsall
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Sara Cotton	Response-00370	Our roads can't cope with more traffic
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Sarah Hewitt	Response-01461	The traffic levels queuing along the A610 into Derby are horrendous at rush hour already. Breadsall village has already become a 'rat run?', it takes 20 minutes to leave the village during rush hour & I have noticed the problem is occurring at 5pm rush hour as well. You will increase this problem & ruin our beautiful village even more.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Saravan P	Response-01448	Mansfield road that connects breadsall hilltop to Derby city is already congested in the mornings and evenings pretty much on a daily basis. This development will make it worse.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Scarlett Hamblin	Response-00398	Each day the traffic is backed up along bishops drive and hilltop. We do not need anymore traffic added to the roads. This will increase the risk of traffic accidents and also increase the amount of congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Scott Watson	Response-01284	The current traffic conditions in Breadsall Village are already at a critical level, with severe congestion regularly causing lengthy queues along Croft Lane leading to the A61. The junction at Croft Lane, Brookside Road, and Rectory Lane has been the site of numerous accidents, with frequent near misses further highlighting the significant safety risk for residents and road users. Additionally, Breadsall Village serves as a common cut-through route, where excessive speeds compound existing hazards on local roads. Any further residential development will inevitably increase traffic volume, intensifying congestion and further compromising road safety in an already overstretched infrastructure. Given these persistent concerns, approving additional housing in this area would exacerbate existing risks and further strain the local road network.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Sharon Coward	Response-00348	The area is already impacted by traffic congestion & more traffic from this development will make this even worse. The roads to be used will impact Derby city council who will receive no council tax from these properties but would have to maintain the infrastructure putting a burden on derby city council tax payers.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Shui-Yee Bateman-Wong	Response-00984	Small road hungerhill already dangerous at the junction. More cars and traffic will cause more accidents
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Silvia Mircic	Response-00884	Congestion in Breadsall village is already a significant problem, particularly following the development of housing at Lime Lane and Dale Acre Way. The village has turned into a 'rat-run' for Oakwood residents seeking access to the A61 and A38, and during peak times, both road safety and air quality are severely impacted.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Simon Ferrad	Response-00853	Mansfield Road is already heavily congested - this will make that situation much worse
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	simon morris	Response-00866	Any increase in housing in Oakwood/Breadsall Hill top will increase the volume of traffic that will use Brookside road/croft lane as a cut through to the A61/A38. Breadsall village has a new school on Brookside road and any further increase in traffic will lead to a conflict of parking parents and impatient commuters. The traffic calming does not discourage through traffic it only leads to a convoy effect which causes delays to village residents journeys. At rush hour Croft lane exit onto the A61 is very congested with long tail backs into the village which cause additional problems with stationary cars at the incoming traffic calming island.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Siu Lap Lau	Response-00606	Now always traffic on A6 roundabout.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Stella Beaumont	Response-00842	There?s already far too much traffic coming through the village and travelling far too fast for safety
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Stephen and Janet Allis	Response-01221	congestion through Breadsall village rat run
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Stephen Brown	Response-01832	3) Traffic. This has increased considerably though Breadsall village as a result of recent developments. The road was never designed for this purpose and the traffic level is inconsistent with the road provisions, including the location of a primary school in the middle of the village. Any plans of this nature should include better road links between Oakwood and Hilltop through to the A61 and A38. Breadsall bypass roads have been considered in the past, but what about linking Bishops Drive (or thereabouts) more directly to say the Morrisons roundabout? With these current proposed developments there must be opportunities here to improve this access for all, but it surely needs to be included within the plan.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Steven furness	Response-01516	There is already access traffic through Breadsall village on Brookside Road. Specifically around the new school. We should not be encouraging for road traffic and the new development will contribute to an increased traffic flow.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Stuart Brown	Response-00771	If the development goes ahead then there will be a significant increase in traffic through dale acre way which will include heavy construction traffic. This will increase noise pollution and mud on the roads etc. and also impede on kerbside parking which will directly affect my property. Further information is required regarding the planned traffic enhancements to dale acre way. Increased traffic could also have an impact on property values of the current estate
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Susan Dundon	Response-00396	It will add to congestion
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Thomas Bateman-Wong	Response-00985	160 houses worth of traffic, usually with 2 cars each, all filtering through Dale Acre Way/Hungerhill Road will cause chaos. The crossroads where Dale Acre Way meets Hungerhill Road and Beards Wood Drive is already dangerous enough without such an influx of cars going through. The roundabout immediately outside Durose Country Park is already a nightmare.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Thomas Monkhouse.	Response-01318	With all the existing and proposed housing developments no developer appears to have improved or proposed any improvements to the local road system.
			Tom Antrobus	Response-00308	I fear the already persistent traffic on Brookside Road at peak times would only get worse
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Tom Parker	Response-01398	Ridiculous amount of traffic already in the area and in and around the estate. Huge issue with people not using their driveways and parking on kerbs. The estate wouldn?t manage with anymore cars driving through unless significant changes were made to the roads.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Tony Hawkins	Response-01532	The consultation states that access will be from Hungerhill Crescent. This is incorrect as it is actually Hungerhill Close. This would mean opening a road which is currently a Close ?dead end? to a through road. This road is not suitable nor wide enough to carry further traffic of 300 plus cars and the safety of current users will be impacted . Such new road would pass over a public footpath used by the local community gaining access to the Great Northern Greenway and Breadsall village by foot. This route is also used by school children who attend the school in the village further volumes of traffic would make this unsafe. The consultation states that access will also be provided from Dale Acre Way, again this road is in fact a ?dead end?. Such access would mean crossing an existing pathway used as mentioned above and the design of the estate in providing recreational space will be changed dramatically and no longer would be able to be enjoyed in the way that the estate does now. The road is also narrow and could not deal with increased volumes of traffic safely. the estate connects to the A608 which is all ready congested with being the main route from Derby to Heanor with existing traffic delays around the island and difficulty trying to join the A609 from Stratford Road. Additional traffic will increase this greatly. Traffic will also increase along the already congested A61 and there will be a significant increase of through traffic via Breadsall Village which is against the Breadsall Parish Council Village Neighbourhood plan 2019-2029 point 12. There are currently planning applications for for the land south of Breadsall Hill Top and Lime Lane. Which will all have an affect on traffic in the area.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Tracey Turner	Response-00334	Congestion is already an issue so the increased housing will make this even worse a.s unbearable.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Vanessa Calderone	Response-01065	It will add to the already very busy road through the village
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Wobbina Bugg	Response-00846	Most of this estates traffic adds to the congestion in Breadsall Village as they try to get to the A38 Traffic already is too heavy from the other developments in the area,



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Traffic Congestion	Zora Wilson	Response-01575	Objection to Proposed Development ? Conflict with Policy CP18 (Green Wedges) I note that this application has been amended to exclude the development adjacent to the A61. However I still wish to raise strong objections to the proposed development (both in its amended form and original form) on the grounds that it conflicts with Policy CP18 concerning Green Wedges. Although the site lies just outside the designated green belt surrounding Breadsall, it directly abuts existing woodland and open countryside, forming an important part of the green corridor along the Great Northern Greenway. The application site provides valuable habitat for wildlife and functions as an essential green buffer. Its loss would significantly reduce ecological connectivity and visual amenity, impacting local biodiversity and the quality of life for residents, walkers, and cyclists who currently use and enjoy this open space. The site is actively appreciated by the community as a visual break in built development and as a wildlife corridor connecting to other open areas. While the outline proposal includes the retention of woodland, there are serious concerns that development will increase pressure on these areas, potentially leading to degradation over time. I am concerned that the proposed development does not provide an adequate buffer to the woodland corridor and built development will sit too close and will detrimentally impact the existing woodland. There is no BNG Assessment listed in the application documents on the portal so it appears that it hasn't yet been done. How can there be any confidence that the proposal would be able to satisfy the statutory requirement to deliver 10% net gain. Any BNG delivery off site or through the purchase of biodiversity units elsewhere, dilutes the benefit of 10% net gain as the biodiversity is lost here in this locality and the significant environmental impact is here. Crucially, the proposed development sits adjacent to land at Breadsall recently released from the green belt, which Erewash Borough Council is considering for housing allocation. If both sites are developed, the cumulative impact will be substantial?leading to the loss of meaningful green space, erosion of the rural character of the Great Northern Greenway, and the elimination of the settlement gap between Breadsall and the wider Derby conurbation. For these reasons, I urge the Council to reject the proposal in order to uphold the principles of Policy CP18 and protect the integrity of this important green wedge.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Type of Housing	Adam Garner	Response-00613	Social housing, whilst necessary brings trouble to what's a nice area.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Type of Housing	Adam Millward	Response-00418	Again an affluent area does not want social housing next to 600k homes. Developers are forced to build social housing next to affluent homes and all that happens is you get anti social behaviour in what could be a very nice estate. Speaking from experience here where in my housing estate the council recently decided a piece of green field could be used for some social housing, anti social behaviour is now rife in what was a nice neighbourhood.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Type of Housing	Andrew David Williams	Response-00796	If housing is to be built then this must be housing which considers all aspects of the local community and includes bungalows and quality family accommodation. It is not an area that is suitable for housing associations and must be used for private ownership. .
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Type of Housing	Ann Sherlock	Response-00410	The map used is out of date. Adding the current proposal will be extremely detrimental to the local area no matter what housing is built, and it is disappointing that the public have been intentionally lied to in relation to how the current proposal will affect the area, missing two extremely large housing estates and falsely portraying a smaller population and impact the housing proposal will have.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Type of Housing	Ben Martin	Response-00787	Breadsall Parish Council neighbourhood plan 2019 to 2029 state that all new developments, replacement buildings and extensions are constructed with high-quality materials, using designs that are compatible with the adjoining development and the parish in general. A new build estate does not fit with this. Erewash also does not have the shortage of housing that is seen elsewhere in the UK.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Type of Housing	Beverly Jordan	Response-01330	The present estates have already urbanised the countryside landscape of the Breadsall hilltops area a further extension and estate this would further impinge on the remaining small countryside
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Type of Housing	Carys Whomsley	Response-01438	I am writing to register my strong objection to the above-mentioned planning application, both in its original and revised form. Despite the removal of the area adjacent to the A61 in the amended proposal, I believe that the proposed development remains deeply inappropriate and harmful for the following reasons: 1. Contravention of Policy CP18 and Loss of Green Wedge The proposed site lies just outside the designated Green Belt, but crucially directly abuts existing woodland and open countryside, forming part of the vital green corridor along the Great Northern Greenway. This area functions as a green buffer, enhancing ecological connectivity, supporting biodiversity, and providing visual and recreational amenity to local residents, walkers, and cyclists. Despite claims of woodland retention, the development threatens the integrity of this space. Proximity to new housing would increase human pressure on the natural environment, likely leading to degradation of woodland, fragmentation of habitats, and a reduction in wildlife corridors. No Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) assessment appears in the application documents, raising concerns about whether the legally mandated 10% net gain can or will be achieved. Biodiversity enhancements delivered off-site would do nothing to mitigate local ecological loss, thereby undermining environmental sustainability in the area. Moreover, the site lies adjacent to land recently released from the Green Belt and under consideration for housing allocation by Erewash Borough Council. The cumulative impact of developing both sites would be devastating: a continuous sprawl from Derby through to Breadsall, resulting in the elimination of the settlement gap and permanent damage to the character of the Great Northern Greenway. 2. Environmental, Infrastructural, and Policy Concerns The proposal directly contradicts the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Paragraph 143, particularly the goals of preventing urban sprawl and protecting the openness of Green Belt land. It also ignores the findings of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA 359), which previously deemed the site unsuitable for residential development due to accessibility and environmental limitations. The development is completely incompatible with the objectives of the Breadsall Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2019?2029, particularly the aims to: Preserve the rural character and prevent urbanisation; Avoid coalescence with the Derby conurbation; Safeguard wildlife and ecological features; Control flood risk and infrastructure strain; Protect valued green spaces and visual vistas.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Type of Housing	Garys Whitnistry	Response-01498	Breadsall has already experienced increased flooding, attributed to upstream developments like Persimmon Estate and Breadsall Hilltop, which lie within the same water catchment area. Any additional development would worsen this issue, placing homes and infrastructure at risk. Furthermore, the proposal relies on access through two existing public footpaths within the Redrow estate and offers no concrete infrastructure improvements. The A608 is already over-congested, and no plans are presented to handle increased traffic or to safeguard children commuting to local schools. 3. Loss of Community and Ecological Value This land offers more than just open space?it is a much-loved and well-used amenity for the local community. It serves as a peaceful escape for informal recreation and nature engagement, and its visual and environmental contributions to the neighbourhood are significant. Its destruction would represent a major loss in local character and quality of life. The proposal underestimates the pressure on existing services, lacks detailed mitigation plans, and fails to explain how proposed footpaths will link meaningfully into existing routes. Nearby Local Wildlife Sites will be impacted
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Type of Housing	Clare Roters	Response-01553	Flats and larger houses would block the beautiful views and countryside we have
		Type of Housing	Edward James Gregory	Response-00728	Unsuitable for green belt / green separation
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Type of Housing	Elaine hodgkinson	Response-00854	Any housing must be as environmental as possible with solar panels, swift bricks and hedgehog highways.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Type of Housing	Emma Charlton	Response-01545	We have a real fear of the amount of antisocial behaviour that allocated social housing brings with it as personal victims of crime from a well known local who falls within that category
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Type of Housing	Emma Hawkins	Response-00813	Not enough affordable housing
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Type of Housing	Gary Murfin	Response-00374	The percentage of houses being built and being called affordable is not enough, and even the ones being called affordable are not very affordable
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Type of Housing	Harry Mee	Response-00882	Draycott village is beautiful and villages like this are hard to come across nowadays. We don't want to ruin the quaint and traditional village with ugly new build houses that you can see in any city/town/village.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Type of Housing	Hulland. Bdverley	Response-00496	NO to More housing
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Type of Housing	Jake Moore	Response-01202	If the development does not include accessible homes (e.g. for elderly residents or those with mobility issues), or lacks single-storey homes/bungalows, it fails to support inclusive living and long-term community needs. If the housing type consists primarily of large, detached homes, this will do little to meet the demand for affordable, accessible, or smaller dwellings that are essential for first-time buyers, young families, and elderly residents. The lack of diversity in housing types risks creating a homogenous, car-dependent estate that does not support a sustainable or inclusive community. While any provision of affordable housing is welcome, the remaining majority % of the development appears to be geared toward market-rate housing, the type and cost of which may be inaccessible to the majority of local residents, particularly first-time buyers, young families, and older residents looking to downsize. This approach fails to support the creation of a balanced, inclusive community and risks becoming a commuter enclave rather than a genuinely integrated neighbourhood. Without a clear commitment to delivering a diverse mix of housing types ? including smaller, more affordable homes, accessible homes for disabled residents, or accommodation suitable for older people ? the development is unlikely to meet the true housing needs of the area. Moreover, the location of the site, on the very edge of Derby City but under the jurisdiction of Erewash Borough Council, raises additional concerns. If the local housing need arises from Derby's population, then it is essential that the proposed homes reflect the specific demographics and requirements identified in Derby City Council's housing strategy, which the current proposal does not appear to do. Conversely, if the homes are intended to meet Erewash's housing need, this location ? remote from the borough's main population centres ? is geographically and strategically unsuitable.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Type of Housing	James Roberts	Response-00673	I have no issue with a continuation of the type of houses on the existing estate, but better consideration is needed to parking than is currently provided in the existing estate. Every road has multiple cars parked on the curb due to lack of drive space, and this situation will only continue if the same design of estate is used for the expansion
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Type of Housing	Jamie Branagan	Response-00335	Simply not required in this area. Hilltop North has seen 2 major estates built in the past 10 years. This has already impacted traffic, the environment, services and created real flooding issues for Breadsall Village. Adding 160 Houses will only exacerbated the problems.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Type of Housing	Jeanette Kent	Response-00402	We already have a problem with crime encroaching on Oakwood from affordable housing on the Lime Lane estates without more from here.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Type of Housing	Jonathan Park	Response-01191	Concerns about the type of housing including social housing that can potentially attract anti social behaviour to an area that is relatively low on crime and an already quiet estate, ruining people's enjoyment of their house and the surrounding areas and also affect the resale value of people who currently live in the area and own their own home
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Type of Housing	Karen Read	Response-00923	i strongly object to the proposed policy change on the basis that new dwellings to be constructed will not be in keeping with the adjacent breadsall village please clarify how the authorities planning department intends to deal with this issue whilst retaining the picturesque character of the area
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Type of Housing	Kirstin Woodward	Response-01043	There is already a good range of housing in this area, covering all needs. We have housing in all price brackets, types (bungalow, semi, flats, detached) etc, ownership (rented, owned etc).
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Type of Housing	K Munson	Response-00631	Affordable housing is the priority
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Type of Housing	Laura Louca	Response-01266	None of the new estates seem to be adopted by the council meaning anyone that moves to one of these new builds must pay a management fee to maintain the area. This is simply the new ?lease hold? scam, despite labelling them affordable and family friendly you are adding another monthly bill to peoples already stretched budget. A bill that will inevitably increase regularly.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Type of Housing	L Burton	Response-00342	We experience a lot of problems on the estate due to social housing including noise complaints, car damage and breaking in, poor behaviour. We have a group for everyone on the estate and can report it comes from the social housing
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Type of Housing	Lee Wheatley	Response-01492	I am deeply concerned that the Amendment, as it stands, could lead to over-development in the wider area, which will inevitably detract from the established character of Breadsall & Breadsall Hilltop. Our area is valued for its semi-rural feel, distinct architectural style and green spaces. The introduction of large-scale housing developments in neighbouring areas risks eroding this character and creating a sense of being overwhelmed by continuous urban sprawl. I am also concerned about the potential for future increased housing density within Breadsall Hilltop itself. While the current amendment may focus on Erewash, I fear that it could set a precedent or create pressure for more intensive development within our established community in the future, further altering its character and putting additional strain on local resources. I suspect this was also a factor in the rejection of similar developments in the area over the past couple of years. The potential loss of green spaces and amenity in the broader area due to new housing is also a significant concern. Breadsall Hilltop residents value the proximity to Breadsall and the Great Northern Greenway. Development that encroaches upon these areas diminishes the quality of life for all residents in the vicinity.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Type of Housing	Lisa Stone	Response-01018	We already get significant trouble from neighbouring Chaddesden in the new housing estate as they come over and trash the park area with litter, fires, throwing stones at houses, fires in the woodland next to it, attacks on the greenway, we don't need more houses for them to target. The houses already existing in the new build are steep in the price and the planned ones are again extremely high prices, this is a small city with little affluence it's the wrong area for mega expensive houses
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Type of Housing	Lorna Coope	Response-00364	There has been an increase in antisocial behaviour, drug misuse and street crime since the introduction of the existing housing estates. More housing, especially the necessary social housing, runs the risk of increasing these problems.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Type of Housing	Martin Harrison	Response-01395	I object to the proposed development as it does not reflect the character or aesthetic of the surrounding area. The scale, design, and density of the planned housing are out of place and would negatively impact the visual appeal and identity of the local community. Developments should complement, not clash with, the existing environment.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Type of Housing	Masheda Chowdhury	Response-01339	1. Insufficient Affordable Housing Provision: ? The proposal includes only 10% of homes as on-site affordable home ownership, with a financial contribution toward off-site affordable housing instead of delivering up to 20% affordable homes on-site. ? This reduced on-site affordable housing falls short of the housing needs for lower-income families in the local community. 2. Lack of Diverse Housing Mix: ? The planning overview does not specify a range of housing types (e.g., family homes, smaller starter homes, accessible housing for elderly or disabled residents). ? Without a balanced mix, the development risks failing to meet the needs of all demographics in the area, potentially excluding younger families or elderly residents who need suitable accommodation. 3. Risk of Over-Development and Poor Design: ? Concentrating 160 homes on 8.2 hectares could lead to high-density development that might not fit the character or infrastructure capacity of the existing Oakwood and Breadsall neighborhoods. ? The development should incorporate design standards that ensure appropriate density, green space, and community facilities. 4. Lack of Clarity on Housing Tenure and Long-Term Affordability: ? The proposal's reliance on financial contributions for off-site affordable housing raises concerns about whether affordable homes will remain accessible in the long term. ? On-site affordable housing provision should include secure tenure arrangements to prevent displacement or future affordability issues. 5. Absence of Support for Specialist Housing Needs: ? There is no mention of specialist housing options such as supported living, care homes, or housing adapted for disabled residents. ? Meeting diverse housing needs is essential for a sustainable, inclusive community. Both derby city council and Derbyshire county council have a long waiting lists for affordable housing.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Type of Housing	Melissa Little	Response-00389	N/a
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Type of Housing	Michael Poplar	Response-00565	This is not yet detailed, but if it's as badly designed as the recent developments it doesn't bode well.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Type of Housing	Mrs Francoise Poplar	Response-00602	No scheme is shown but the sheer numbers proposed show that it would be dense development with no quality open spaces.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Type of Housing	Rachael	Response-00332	Unsuitable for the area. No further housing is required. Houses are the current estates have been for sale for months and not sold. Further housing isn't required in this area.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Type of Housing	Richard Kingham	Response-00849	The initial plan was for around 14 homes and no social housing Which would have been manageable but the new proposal is not fit for purpose. There has been an increase of police visits to the Redrow estate and Persimmon since the inception of their social housing.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Type of Housing	Richard Straw	Response-01412	The type of housing will not match the current estate and would decrease my house value
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Type of Housing	Sam Saunders	Response-01557	The proposal to provide 10% on-site affordable home ownership and a financial contribution toward off-site affordable housing raises concerns about meeting local housing needs. The limited proportion of affordable homes may not adequately address demand from low- and middle-income families in Breadsall and Oakwood. Additionally, the mix and design of housing types should reflect the community's demographic, including accessible homes for the elderly and larger family-sized properties. Without clear commitments to diverse and truly affordable housing, the development risks failing to provide a balanced, inclusive community that supports local social and economic needs.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Type of Housing	Sandra Perry	Response-00307	Houses are ugly and being built with very small, if any gardens. People seem to want to live in a more ?semi-rural? area but there is little or no provision for growing flowers and food. The current development is ugly, orange, cheap-looking boxes blighting the landscape
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Type of Housing	Scarlett Hamblin	Response-00398	new build houses unfortunately are not built to last unlike houses that were built previously we do not want dilapidated rundown houses in a few years to be our surrounding environment. New build houses are also not affordable for first time buyers.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Type of Housing	Tom Parker	Response-01398	Further housing isn't necessary. Multiple homes have been up for sale for months on the estate and haven't sold.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Abbie quinn	Response-00616	This will destroy the wildlife behind our house that backs onto the greenway. A lovely part of nature kept between us and Breadsall.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Adam Garner	Response-00613	The area this goes up is used daily by the community for walking and cycling etc, and the area is full of wildlife. Local Green spaces are what attracts to the area. access is currently granted through the middle of the proposed plot toward the green way and surrounding fields.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Adam Govan	Response-01416	Objection to Proposed Development ? Conflict with Policy CP18 (Green Wedges) I note that this application has been amended to exclude the development adjacent to the A61. However I still wish to raise strong objections to the proposed development (both in its amended form and original form) on the grounds that it conflicts with Policy CP18 concerning Green Wedges. Although the site lies just outside the designated green belt surrounding Breadsall, it directly abuts existing woodland and open countryside, forming an important part of the green corridor along the Great Northern Greenway. The application site provides valuable habitat for wildlife and functions as an essential green buffer. Its loss would significantly reduce ecological connectivity and visual amenity, impacting local biodiversity and the quality of life for residents, walkers, and cyclists who currently use and enjoy this open space. The site is actively appreciated by the community as a visual break in built development and as a wildlife corridor connecting to other open areas. While the outline proposal includes the retention of woodland, there are serious concerns that development will increase pressure on these areas, potentially leading to degradation over time. I am concerned that the proposed development does not provide an adequate buffer to the woodland corridor and built development will sit too close and will detrimentally impact the existing woodland. There is no BNG Assessment listed in the application documents on the portal so it appears that it hasn't yet been done. How can there be any confidence that the proposal would be able to satisfy the statutory requirement to deliver 10% net gain. Any BNG delivery off site or through the purchase of biodiversity units elsewhere, dilutes the benefit of 10% net gain as the biodiversity is lost here in this locality and the significant environmental impact is here. Crucially, the proposed development sits adjacent to land at Breadsall recently released from the green belt, which Erewash Borough Council is considering for housing allocation. If both sites are developed, the cumulative impact will be substantial?leading to the loss of meaningful green space, erosion of the rural character of the Great Northern Greenway, and the elimination of the settlement gap between Breadsall and the wider Derby conurbation. For these reasons, I urge the Council to reject the proposal in order to uphold the principles of Policy CP18 and protect the integrity of this important green wedge.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Adam Millward	Response-00418	There is so much wildlife in this area I grew up walking these fields, to get onto the old railway lines. First thing developers do is tear down trees near to building plots. It happened further up the A608 on the other new build site, they tore all the old chestnut trees down that lined the road for an attenuation pond. Those trees were hundreds of years old and housed so much wildlife and created much bio diversity. There is also bog land if memory serves me right which is absolutely vital for bio diversity.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Adelle Cavanagh	Response-00392	We have already lost huge parts of our local green spaces to make way for new housing. The impact on local wildlife cannot be underestimated.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Alexander lee	Response-01439	Objection to Proposed Development ? Conflict with Policy CP18 (Green Wedges) I note that this application has been amended to exclude the development adjacent to the A61. However I still wish to raise strong objections to the proposed development (both in its amended form and original form) on the grounds that it conflicts with Policy CP18 concerning Green Wedges. Although the site lies just outside the designated green belt surrounding Breadsall, it directly abuts existing woodland and open countryside, forming an important part of the green corridor along the Great Northern Greenway. The application site provides valuable habitat for wildlife and functions as an essential green buffer. Its loss would significantly reduce ecological connectivity and visual amenity, impacting local biodiversity and the quality of life for residents, walkers, and cyclists who currently use and enjoy this open space. The site is actively appreciated by the community as a visual break in built development and as a wildlife corridor connecting to other open areas. While the outline proposal includes the retention of woodland, there are serious concerns that development will increase pressure on these areas, potentially leading to degradation over time. I am concerned that the proposed development does not provide an adequate buffer to the woodland corridor and built development will sit too close and will detrimentally impact the existing woodland. There is no BNG Assessment listed in the application documents on the portal so it appears that it hasn't yet been done. How can there be any confidence that the proposal would be able to satisfy the statutory requirement to deliver 10% net gain. Any BNG delivery off site or through the purchase of biodiversity units elsewhere, dilutes the benefit of 10% net gain as the biodiversity is lost here in this locality and the significant environmental impact is here. Crucially, the proposed development sits adjacent to land at Breadsall recently released from the green belt, which Erewash Borough Council is considering for housing allocation. If both sites are developed, the cumulative impact will be substantial?leading to the loss of meaningful green space, erosion of the rural character of the Great Northern Greenway, and the elimination of the settlement gap between Breadsall and the wider Derby conurbation. For these reasons, I urge the Council to reject the proposal in order to uphold the principles of Policy CP18 and protect the integrity of this important green wedge.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Alex Pilcher	Response-00792	Building even closer to the Greenway which has / did have an area of biodiversity not commonly found in other areas will only negatively impact the conservation.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Alistair Crawford	Response-01404	Green Belts are important for wildlife as they provide crucial habitats and act as corridors connecting various wildlife sites. As residents within the so-called 'safeguarded' area we witness the everyday environmental and ecological benefits. The area hosts and sustains a variety of species such as bats, nesting partridge, migrating swallows, stoats, owls, buzzards, foxes and is a regular hunting ground for the Derby peregrine falcons. They also offer green spaces for urban dwellers to enjoy nature using the various footpaths. Which if this development is allowed will turn footpaths in nature to a mere commute from one side of the urbanisation to the other. Enjoying country walks is a well documented supplement to mental health. Part of this Green Belts which has been 'safeguarded' for housing under this latest review has previously under government grants been segregated from cattle grazing land to provide a nature reserve with a wide range of species and floodplains which have been needed due to the added flood danger following the previous housing developments on the A608.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Amy Govan	Response-01419	Objection to Proposed Development ? Conflict with Policy CP18 (Green Wedges) I note that this application has been amended to exclude the development adjacent to the A61. However I still wish to raise strong objections to the proposed development (both in its amended form and original form) on the grounds that it conflicts with Policy CP18 concerning Green Wedges. Although the site lies just outside the designated green belt surrounding Breadsall, it directly abuts existing woodland and open countryside, forming an important part of the green corridor along the Great Northern Greenway. The application site provides valuable habitat for wildlife and functions as an essential green buffer. Its loss would significantly reduce ecological connectivity and visual amenity, impacting local biodiversity and the quality of life for residents, walkers, and cyclists who currently use and enjoy this open space. The site is actively appreciated by the community as a visual break in built development and as a wildlife corridor connecting to other open areas. While the outline proposal includes the retention of woodland, there are serious concerns that development will increase pressure on these areas, potentially leading to degradation over time. I am concerned that the proposed development does not provide an adequate buffer to the woodland corridor and built development will sit too close and will detrimentally impact the existing woodland. There is no BNG Assessment listed in the application documents on the portal so it appears that it hasn't yet been done. How can there be any confidence that the proposal would be able to satisfy the statutory requirement to deliver 10% net gain. Any BNG delivery off site or through the purchase of biodiversity units elsewhere, dilutes the benefit of 10% net gain as the biodiversity is lost here in this locality and the significant environmental impact is here. Crucially, the proposed development sits adjacent to land at Breadsall recently released from the green belt, which Erewash Borough Council is considering for housing allocation. If both sites are developed, the cumulative impact will be substantial?leading to the loss of meaningful green space, erosion of the rural character of the Great Northern Greenway, and the elimination of the settlement gap between Breadsall and the wider Derby conurbation. For these reasons, I urge the Council to reject the proposal in order to uphold the principles of Policy CP18 and protect the integrity of this important green wedge.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Andrea R Rowley	Response-01230	This sizeable housing development will destroy part of the Green Wedge and cause disruption to nature and woodland areas. It is important to preserve these areas as once they are destroyed and built upon, they are never replaced and wildlife habitats are lost.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Andrea wightman	Response-00354	It is absolutely disgusting to be building more houses in this area, the wildlife will be hugely affected.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Andrew David Williams	Response-00796	Building on land already identified as greenbelt has a negative impact on wildlife and biodiversity. Before any consultation on greenbelt land is considered all brown and grey belt land should be utilised. The land being evaluated in this proposal is alongside the Derby greenway which is a natural habitat for many different fauna and flora. Any further damage to the greenbelt land will natural have a major impact on the local wildlife .
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Andy Madeley	Response-00381	There is a green wedge between chaddesden woods and breadsill, this development will impact on that and also further reduce the habitat further of the wildlife.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Angela Clarke	Response-01400	Increased risk to the wildlife with decreased habitat and disruption from building work.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Angela Smyth	Response-00296	This housing is being built on a Green belt where multiple creatures live including hare's, hedgehogs, foxes and many bird species.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Ann Sherlock	Response-00410	The map used is out of date and the wildlife has already been negatively impacted in recent years due to the Alport Heights estate and Durose estate (both estates and established roads connected to them are conveniently missing off the map used in this proposal, and perhaps intentionally misleading the public who would presume there is a larger green space left than actually is). Adding the current housing proposal to the already overloaded housing in the area will be extremely detrimental to the wildlife and biodiversity, and it is extremely disappointing that the public have been intentionally lied to in relation to how the current proposal will affect the area. There is not the green space available that is being portrayed, and this will have an even bigger impact on the local wildlife and biodiversity than is currently being displayed on the proposal.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Anya andrews	Response-00605	Local wildlife is going to be continued to be destroyed.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Ashley syll	Response-00397	Severly limits area to south of proposed allocation
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Ben Martin	Response-00787	The proposed development site is also a crucial breeding and feeding ground for, and not limited to Buzzards, Kestrels and Barn Owls. It would also lead to excessive destruction of mature hedgerow that surrounds the proposed site, further negatively impacting the wildlife in the greenbelt area who use these as wild life corridors and increasing pollution in the area.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Bethany Seivewright	Response-01563	Concerned over the wildlife with it being so close to the great northern Greenaway
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Beverly Jordan	Response-01330	Increase in air pollution will directly affect wildlife in a previously marked Greenbelt area where wildlife has the opportunity to thrive
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Brendan Hargreaves	Response-00629	all the wildlife that will be killed and future wildlife in the area
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Bridgette Cussens	Response-00390	Oakwood housing is getting bigger and bigger, much larger than the place can deal with. Putting this strain on the wildlife would be extremely detrimental, leaving minimal space for wildlife to prosper
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Carl Hill	Response-00670	Buzzards, Deer and other wildlife will not have enough habitat now

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Carol Westcott	Response-00973	The site has lots of trees and bushes for birds and wildlife with the new housing estate that has been built at Dale acre road we have already lost lots of nature, with hardly any lawns and bushes. Where are the wildlife going to go.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Carys Whomsley	Response-01438	I am writing to register my strong objection to the above-mentioned planning application, both in its original and revised form. Despite the removal of the area adjacent to the A61 in the amended proposal, I believe that the proposed development remains deeply inappropriate and harmful for the following reasons: 1. Contravention of Policy CP18 and Loss of Green Wedge The proposed site lies just outside the designated Green Belt, but crucially directly abuts existing woodland and open countryside, forming part of the vital green corridor along the Great Northern Greenway. This area functions as a green buffer, enhancing ecological connectivity, supporting biodiversity, and providing visual and recreational amenity to local residents, walkers, and cyclists. Despite claims of woodland retention, the development threatens the integrity of this space. Proximity to new housing would increase human pressure on the natural environment, likely leading to degradation of woodland, fragmentation of habitats, and a reduction in wildlife corridors. No Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) assessment appears in the application documents, raising concerns about whether the legally mandated 10% net gain can or will be achieved. Biodiversity enhancements delivered off-site would do nothing to mitigate local ecological loss, thereby undermining environmental sustainability in the area. Moreover, the site lies adjacent to land recently released from the Green Belt and under consideration for housing allocation by Erewash Borough Council. The cumulative impact of developing both sites would be devastating: a continuous sprawl from Derby through to Breadsall, resulting in the elimination of the settlement gap and permanent damage to the character of the Great Northern Greenway. 2. Environmental, Infrastructural, and Policy Concerns The proposal directly contradicts the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Paragraph 143, particularly the goals of preventing urban sprawl and protecting the openness of Green Belt land. It also ignores the findings of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA 359), which previously deemed the site unsuitable for residential development due to accessibility and environmental limitations. The development is completely incompatible with the objectives of the Breadsall Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2019?2029, particularly the aims to: Preserve the rural character and prevent urbanisation; Avoid coalescence with the Derby conurbation; Safeguard wildlife and ecological features; Control flood risk and infrastructure strain; Protect valued green spaces and visual vistas.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Carys Whomsley	Response-01438	Breadsall has already experienced increased flooding, attributed to upstream developments like Persimmon Estate and Breadsall Hilltop, which lie within the same water catchment area. Any additional development would worsen this issue, placing homes and infrastructure at risk. Furthermore, the proposal relies on access through two existing public footpaths within the Redrow estate and offers no concrete infrastructure improvements. The A608 is already over-congested, and no plans are presented to handle increased traffic or to safeguard children commuting to local schools. 3. Loss of Community and Ecological Value This land offers more than just open space?it is a much-loved and well-used amenity for the local community. It serves as a peaceful escape for informal recreation and nature engagement, and its visual and environmental contributions to the neighbourhood are significant. Its destruction would represent a major loss in local character and quality of life. The proposal underestimates the pressure on existing services, lacks detailed mitigation plans, and fails to explain how proposed footpaths will link meaningfully into existing routes. Nearby Local Wildlife Sites will be impacted
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Charlotte	Response-00458	Greenway belt and surrounding areas should be protected.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Chris C	Response-01106	The open spaces and access to wildlife areas is an important part of the area. Removal of this plus the likely damage caused through the building work negatively impacts the environment and quality of life for residents. Even now after construction of Durose estate building materials and rubble can still be found, this will only get worse with the proposed construction.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Chris Harris	Response-01521	This will be adversely impacted by these additional properties
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Chris Lunn	Response-01410	This land is a greenbelt/green wedge area and, as such, it is immensely important that it should remain so. These appear to be terms with which the council is either unfamiliar or for which they have total disregard. The proposed area is designated as a ?birds and bees? field which aims to increase the wildlife population, promote biodiversity and help to combat the effects of climate change and is integral to the Great Northern Greenway which was designed to enhance the quality of life for local residents. The field and track are heavily used by many people. Dog walkers, picnic-ers and people who just want to escape the stresses of life and reconnect with nature. The area provides essential habitat for many different species whose populations are already declining at an alarming rate. Hedgehogs and rabbits, once prolific in the area, are now a rarity. By proceeding with this development, the Council is eroding the very greenery that the Greenway was designed to protect. The Redrow housing estate cannot be without blame for this and no further habitat loss should be incurred. This proposed development completely undermines Erewash council?s approach to the importance of preserving greenbelt and green wedge land for current and future generations to enjoy. To replace the natural beauty of the area by developing this land for housing will permanently end the visual contrast between the urban and rural areas and set a precedence for all future developments. It would cause irreparable damage to the landscape, disrupt wildlife corridors and erode a space that absorbs carbon and helps to improve air quality. I would like to draw your attention to your campaign ?Wild About Erewash?. In it you encourage people to get involved as it: Improves health and wellbeing, improves biodiversity and reduces our carbon footprint. It certainly makes for interesting reading, especially as you appear to have reneged on every point. You have clearly lost interest in everything you maintained was at the heart of your approach to the welfare of the local area and its residents. Possibly this was just an agenda to win the local election on behalf of Labour? It certainly begs the question of just how many other points you intend to retract? Your rewilding sites may not have included the land to the north of Breadsall Hilltop but that would be because it didn?t need rewilding in the first place.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Claire cordery	Response-01494	Will effect wildlife and remove the green area. There are already new houses in the area.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Clare Roters	Response-01553	We have sighted kestrels, foxes, pheasants, bats, field mice and other animals on the durose estate itself. More damage to the greenway and woodland areas would remove their homes, food source and safety. There are also farm animal close by like cows who need to be protected from fumes and noise.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Colin Brewster	Response-00576	The proposed site is currently designated as Green Belt, which was put in place for a reason. It is home to an abundance of ground-based wildlife and visiting birds, it provides coalescence between the city and Breadsall Village. This final piece of countryside, right on the boundary, should not be lost to development. It has remained as Green Belt for many years now and should stay as such
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Coral Bradley	Response-00862	Please do not build on this land. It's next to a beautiful wood that lots of people use and visit to look at the wildlife. We have already had two housing estates built close to us in the last few years. We can't cope with more impact on the environment and other factors like doctors etc. we would urge you to look elsewhere for housing
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Dana Demidoff	Response-00634	This is surely an important health not just for wildlife but for people's mental health
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Darren adams	Response-00874	Since the old railway line has been converted into a public footpath with a deformation of trees, I believe this has had a major effect on the wildlife has made a noticeable difference
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	David Byrne	Response-01433	Greenbelt land is already becoming less and less, this development will further erode it
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	David Duxbury	Response-00305	The development will impact the biodiversity in the surrounding areas and access to green corridors. Developments adjacent to the proposed land and adjacent to lime lane have already impact the area significantly.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Edward James Gregory	Response-00728	The area already suffers from traffic congestion, and safety issues due to speed and number of vehicles, so any increase will impact air quality, and reduce the amount of green space and hedgerows for animals
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Elaine hodgkinson	Response-00854	There is already lot of biodiversity along the Greenway which be impacted by this new development.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Elena Maxim	Response-01573	There wouldn't be any
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Emma Binns	Response-00843	Isn't this allocated area a wetland area that already has flooding and bogging issues? There will also be animals and birds living in this area that will be affected.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Emma Hawkins	Response-00813	The proposed development will adversely affect the wildlife in the area forcing them into a much smaller corridor. Light pollution will negatively impact this much smaller corridor namely the Great Northern Greenway and also the farming animals next door. The land provides breeding grounds for all types of wildlife including foxes, rabbits, insects, birds including buzzards, owls and bats. this would be lost. There is also a natural pond at the bottom right corner of the land and this and the wildlife within will be adversely affected by a through road if not lost. The proposal ignores the Breadsall Parish Council Village Neighbourhood plan 2019-2029. Key points of are: ? 1 - Protect and enhance the rural character of the parish and prevent urbanisation. ? 2 - Enforce the requirements of the Green Belt to prevent inappropriate development and avoid coalescence with the Derby conurbation. ? 9 - Improve measures to control existing flood risks within the parish and resist any new development that may increase existing flood risks. ? 11 - Identify key wildlife and biological features within the parish and take appropriate steps to preserve them. ? 12 - Mitigate the effect of the large volume of through traffic in the village and aim to prevent any growth in through traffic.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Faye Wilkinson	Response-01129	Wildlife have already had their habitats limited by the building of Durose Country Park, this would reduce their habitats further. The wildlife will be threatened further either driving them out into the residential areas or worse, giving them no chance of survival.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Gary Murfin	Response-00374	A lot the green land in the area will be gone if the current building plans in the area go ahead
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Gaynor Pawley	Response-00627	Once this area has been built on there will be a permanent loss of wildlife. The development would encroach on land which has seen foxes, badgers, bats, owls and other important wildlife, which is gradually having it's habitat and feeding grounds reduced. also the proximity to the green way would further reduce the biodiversity.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Ged Doherty	Response-01822	Between the village of Breadsall and the land in question is the Great Northern Greenway, which is a fabulous amenity used by many members of the community for walking, running and cycling, enabling the users to enjoy a countryside walk so close to the city of Derby. It is also a great place to observe a whole variety of species of wildlife. Allowing the land to be developed would not only devalue the Greenway from its outlook consideration (who wants to walk through a housing estate?) but would also ruin the habitat of many of the species of wildlife, forcing them to migrate elsewhere and possibly in some cases even perish.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Gillian Pearson	Response-00303	Once the habitat has been destroyed the wildlife/natural habitat will be gone for ever.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Harry Mee	Response-00882	Greenbelt land retains the countryside that we have left. Destroying this, is destroying the habitat for wildlife and biodiversity.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Helen Foster	Response-00650	This area lies in close proximity to an SSSI (LNR on the Great Northern Greenway) and woodland (Willowholt and Mill Plantations) which play host to a number of species including but not limited to: of brown-eared and pipistrelle bats, common toads, trout, smooth lizards, badgers, foxes, woodpeckers, swallows, martins, tawny owls, barn owls, (wild) bee hives and rare orchids (common spotted/heath spotted). Furthermore one residence on Brookside road close to the proposed site contains a maternity roost of over 200 soprano pipistrelle bats which use the woodland and proposed site as a feeding ground. In section 9.5 of the Breadsall Neighbourhood Plan it states: 'it is proposed that a number of smaller sites should be designated as Local Green Spaces as they provide habitat for wildlife, including protected species, such as whiteclawed crayfish, water vole, badgers and bats. These sites are as follows: 1 Dam Brook and banks 2 Boosemoor Brook and banks 3 Croft Wood 4 Willowholt Plantation 5 Mill Plantation' ...and later in the section: '2 Prevention of development on sites of special importance. Given the absence of pressure for anything other than small-scale development in the parish there is no justification for development of any of the sites identified above as local wildlife sites and Local Green Spaces. These should therefore be protected from development unless the wildlife ceases to occupy the site in question. The SSSI already enjoys strong protection through national policy.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Helen Walker	Response-00325	So you think it is acceptable to kill all the wild life around and remove their habitat, and create a concrete jungle, we have lost so much wildlife in recent years and it is trying to find food where ever it can we often have foxes trying to find food where we live in Oakwood.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Hulland. Bdverley	Response-00496	Chaddesden wood is beautiful, do I not destroy this With more housing, more people and traffic, find another area, enough houses in Oakwood . Will spoil it. Also, big Not enough good schools, only ones with room , poor reports
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Ian Lockwood	Response-01491	This area is situated close to a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), specifically the Local Nature Reserve (LNR) on the Great Northern Greenway, as well as the Willowholt and Mill Plantations?woodlands that support a rich variety of wildlife. Species observed here include, but are not limited to: brown long-eared and pipistrelle bats, common toads, trout, smooth lizards, badgers, foxes, woodpeckers, swallows, martins, tawny owls, barn owls, wild bee hives, and rare orchids such as the common spotted and heath spotted varieties. Notably, a residence on Brookside Road near the proposed development site contains a maternity roost of over 200 soprano pipistrelle bats, which rely on the adjacent woodland and proposed site as a vital feeding ground. Section 9.5 of the Breadsall Neighbourhood Plan highlights the ecological value of this area, proposing that several smaller sites be designated as Local Green Spaces due to their role in supporting wildlife, including protected species like white-clawed crayfish, water voles, badgers, and bats. These designated sites include: Dam Brook and its banks Boosemoor Brook and its banks Croft Wood Willowholt Plantation Mill Plantation The same section further states: ?Prevention of development on sites of special importance. Given the absence of pressure for anything other than small-scale development in the parish, there is no justification for the development of any of the sites identified above as local wildlife sites and Local Green Spaces. These should therefore be protected from development unless the wildlife ceases to occupy the site in question.? The SSSI already benefits from strong national policy protections, reinforcing the case against development in this sensitive ecological area.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jake Moore	Response-01202	The proposed development site currently serves as a vital green corridor for local wildlife, supporting birds, small mammals, pollinators, and potentially protected species. This area contributes significantly to: Habitat connectivity between Oakwood and surrounding natural areas. Local biodiversity and ecosystem resilience. The wellbeing of residents who benefit from proximity to green, undeveloped land. The development threatens to destroy these habitats, with no clear ecological compensation or biodiversity net gain outlined in the planning documents. The loss of this site would be irreversible and directly conflicts with national and local environmental goals.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	James Bellaby	Response-00337	More house, less places for the very important echo system.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	James Harvey	Response-00324	I do not think having this build will help the limited wildlife we have from this beautiful spot
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	James Roberts	Response-00673	The land marked for building works is currently used by various wildlife, so it is a given that the works will reduce biodiversity and drive away wildlife. I am particularly concerned about the potential impact to the greenway. Even with a 'transition' planned, given how wet and boggy the land being proposed to build on gets during the winter, filling the area with asphalt and concrete will just drive the water into the greenway, eroding away the greenery and damaging the path (as is seen elsewhere on the greenway)
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jamie Branagan	Response-00335	The existing estate has already squeezed wildlife into a narrow corridor between hilltop A608 and the A61. Stripping more land to concrete over will only remove more natural habitat for field mice, badgers, birds and bats, etc. Not to mention valuable natural green space for the current residents of Oakwood.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Janet Brewster	Response-00577	The proposed site is currently designated as Green Belt. It is home to many species of wildlife including a large variety of birds, in fact it is a wildlife haven. With the increased number of people, especially children, now living in the immediate area, it is important that this area remains Green Belt for all to enjoy.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Janet O'Brien	Response-01835	Green Belts are important for wildlife as they provide crucial habitats and act as corridors connecting various wildlife sites. As residents within the so-called ?safeguarded? area we witness the everyday environmental and ecological benefits. The area hosts and sustains a variety of species such as bats, nesting partridge, migrating swallows, stoats, owls, buzzards, foxes and is a regular hunting ground for the Derby peregrine falcons. They also offer green spaces for urban dwellers to enjoy nature using the various footpaths. Which if this development is allowed will turn footpaths in nature to a mere commute from one side of the urbanisation to the other. Enjoying country walks is a well documented supplement to mental health. Part of this Green Belts which has been ?safeguarded? for housing under this latest review has previously under government grants been segregated from cattle grazing land to provide a nature reserve with a wide range of species and floodplains which have been needed due to the added flood danger following the previous housing developments on the A608.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Janette Glenn	Response-00422	The proposed development encroaches further towards Breadsall village, removing vital green fields and biodiversity corridors for wildlife.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jared Smyth	Response-00894	There are many animals in the surrounding woods that would be affected
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jason Reader	Response-00320	The Breadsall Greenway is an important wildlife corridor in the area, it should remain completely untouched and a buffer placed around it. Until I see plans to leave it totally intact with additional green space I object.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jeanette Kent	Response-00402	Lack of wildlife areas are a real concern. We are taking up more and more of the countryside instead of building in brown field sites, empty buildings should be knocked down and built upon before taking more and more countryside. There are regular Red Kites, Buzzards, song thrushes etc within the area defined that would all be displaced if this goes ahead.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jessica Softley	Response-01408	Within the proposed build area and on and around the Great Northern Greenway there is lots of wildlife, including animals, birds and bats. Building upon this land and right up to the Great Northern Greenway footpath will impact these habitats and the biodiversity.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	J Hasse	Response-00875	We don't want to lose any wildlife, there's enough planning applications in for Breadsall already.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	John Harlow	Response-00619	The wildlife and biodiversity needs as much help as possible not additional building sites What type of surveys have taken place to first of all discover what wildlife?.which includes bird, animals, insects, needs to be protected? The Greenway has many diverse species of tree/ shrub that need protection.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	John Moffat	Response-01289	Further erosion / destruction of what once was the Green Wedge will seriously impact the wildlife corridor that currently stretches from the open countryside around Morley right into the centre of Derby at the cricket ground and Pentagon Island
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	John O'Brien	Response-01796	Green Belts are important for wildlife as they provide crucial habitats and act as corridors connecting various wildlife sites. As residents within the so-called 'safeguarded' area we witness the everyday environmental and ecological benefits. The area hosts a variety of species such as bats, nesting partridge, migrating swallows, stoats, owls, buzzards, foxes and is a regular hunting ground for the Derby peregrine falcons. They also offer green spaces for urban dwellers to enjoy nature using the various footpaths. Which if this development is allowed will turn footpaths in nature to a mere commute from one side of the urbanisation to the other. Enjoying country walks is a well documented supplement to mental health. Part of this Green Belts which has been 'safeguarded' for housing under this latest review has previously under government grants been segregated from cattle grazing land to provide a nature reserve with a wide range of species and floodplains which have been needed due to the added flood danger following the previous housing developments on the A608.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jonathan Park	Response-01191	Destruction of the fields and green areas will significantly decrease the biodiversity of the area
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Julie Bates	Response-01326	The proposed development site is also a crucial breeding and feeding ground for, many animals ? and not limited to Buzzards, Kestrels and Barn Owls. It would also lead to excessive? ? destruction of mature hedgerow that surrounds the proposed site, further negatively? ? impacting the wildlife in the greenbelt area who use these as wild life corridors . It will be devastating to lose this green space for all wildlife
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Justine Dean	Response-00844	Cutting off more greenfield will reduce wildlife in the area - the hedgehogs, birds and foxes are already reduced by the 2 costing new housing estates
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Justin Windsor	Response-01544	This proposal along side the proposal for a new housing estate on the adjacent field is hugely restricting the open space required for the local wildlife, over the years, the space for rare breeds of birds as well as standard wildlife has been whittled down to just a few open areas and these proposals further limit the space and will inevitable cause wildlife to vacate the area.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Kara Crossley	Response-00865	The countryside has already been destroyed enough with the development of the houses on Breadsall hilltop and adding more houses will only destroy the countryside and wildlife further! It won't be classified as the countryside at the rate housing developments are being built
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Karen Read	Response-00923	There will only be concrete no place for wildlife. there must be surveys to assess the damage to our already fragile wildlife can you please share with us the results of any ecology survey results that have been carried out when you picked this site
			Karen Smith	Response-00635	The proposed land is a haven for flora and fauna with many unusual species such as newts
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Katie Hulland	Response-00382	The more houses and less green space makes it harder for wildlife to maintain habitats and cross different areas
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Kev Rodgers	Response-00897	As always, with developments like this, wildlife will be displaced - butterflies, birds and mammals will have to find new homes. There is a badger sett on the very northern tip of the proposed development, although it does not always appear to be in use. I have personally witnessed a weasel, a badger, foxes, a barn owl, a woodcock and also heard tawny owls on the proposed development site. Do you plan to ensure wildlife supporting initiatives, such as swift / nest boxes and hedgehog corridors to be incorporated in to the housing?
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Kimberley Woodward	Response-01445	Taking up more green space to build more housing, meaning local flora and fauna have less space to live. Would be upsetting more green space and habitats. Before you know it it will be like living in London central.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Kirstin Woodward	Response-01043	The proposed development is located in an area rich in wildlife and biodiversity. The surrounding fields provide a safe and important habitat for a wide range of species. I have personally seen foxes, rabbits, and many birds, including a breeding pair of lesser spotted woodpeckers, lapwings, and even the peregrine falcon from the cathedral, which uses the area as a hunting ground. This green space is also a valuable amenity for the thousands of families living nearby. Every day, hundreds of people use the area for walking, running, and cycling, enjoying the peace and beauty of the countryside. Many residents chose to live here, in what was promoted as a 'Country Park?', specifically because of its proximity to nature and wildlife.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	K Munson	Response-00631	Our wildlife in the area has already been compromised this potential development will only aggravate the situation
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Lara Small	Response-01262	I'm personally grateful that the decision was made to build Durose Country Park, I now live in a home probably built on allocated as Green Belt Land. I see the irony in my objection to further development and I'm trying to avoid a 'Not In My Back Yard?' attitude. I understand the housing crisis won't fix itself unless more homes are built. I seek to urge the planning team to consider how to get the most value out of the of the fields available in the area, and I'm not sure if the awkward triangle North of Breadsall Hilltop really achieves that. Fitting in sufficient houses to make it profitable seems disproportionate to the effort in getting access to the fields, levelling the sloped land, cutting through protected hedgerows, pressurising the Great Northern Greenway, establishing a road network and critically, establishing water catchment & run off areas that will be critical to ensuring the inhabitants of Breadsall Village stay flood free. One of the wonderful things about Derby, and part of the reason why I've chosen to settle here, is due its lack of heavy city intensity, As a proud Rolls-Royce employee, a huge amount of employee wealth is poured into Derby and its surrounding areas. Perhaps, this is also the reason why further housing is being considered; its becoming a more attractive place to live, but I urge you to ensure the city remains in balance with the green space around it. May I offer my very best wishes for your future plans and development of Derby, and may I urge you to consider the balance and impact of all options.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Laura	Response-00379	Local area perfect for the community to keep fit on family walks. Wildlife would be burdened. Also not enough bins for litter as is.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Laura Louca	Response-01266	You are continually building on the homes and food sources of our valuable wildlife. You use the excuse of ?no mow may? to leave grass verges on the side of busy roads to help the wildlife - this isn?t where wildlife want to live/eat - they need the fields, hedgerows, trees, shrubs, wildflowers, grasses etc
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	L Burton	Response-00342	There are many bats in the area and a lot of wildlife on the green belt
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Leah McCormack	Response-01481	Objection to Proposed Development ? Conflict with Policy CP18 (Green Wedges) I note that this application has been amended to exclude the development adjacent to the A61. However I still wish to raise strong objections to the proposed development (both in its amended form and original form) on the grounds that it conflicts with Policy CP18 concerning Green Wedges. Although the site lies just outside the designated green belt surrounding Breadsall, it directly abuts existing woodland and open countryside, forming an important part of the green corridor along the Great Northern Greenway. The application site provides valuable habitat for wildlife and functions as an essential green buffer. Its loss would significantly reduce ecological connectivity and visual amenity, impacting local biodiversity and the quality of life for residents, walkers, and cyclists who currently use and enjoy this open space. The site is actively appreciated by the community as a visual break in built development and as a wildlife corridor connecting to other open areas. While the outline proposal includes the retention of woodland, there are serious concerns that development will increase pressure on these areas, potentially leading to degradation over time. I am concerned that the proposed development does not provide an adequate buffer to the woodland corridor and built development will sit too close and will detrimentally impact the existing woodland. There is no BNG Assessment listed in the application documents on the portal so it appears that it hasn?t yet been done. How can there be any confidence that the proposal would be able to satisfy the statutory requirement to deliver 10% net gain. Any BNG delivery off site or through the purchase of biodiversity units elsewhere, dilutes the benefit of 10% net gain as the biodiversity is lost here in this locality and the significant environmental impact is here. Crucially, the proposed development sits adjacent to land at Breadsall recently released from the green belt, which Erewash Borough Council is considering for housing allocation. If both sites are developed, the cumulative impact will be substantial?leading to the loss of meaningful green space, erosion of the rural character of the Great Northern Greenway, and the elimination of the settlement gap between Breadsall and the wider Derby conurbation. For these reasons, I urge the Council to reject the proposal in order to uphold the principles of Policy CP18 and protect the integrity of this important green wedge.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Lee Wheatley	Response-01492	1. Habitat Loss and Fragmentation: o New housing will inevitably require the conversion of existing land, which will include green fields, hedgerows and other habitats that support local wildlife. This direct loss of habitat reduces the space available for species to live, forage, and breed. o Development will also fragment existing habitats, creating barriers to wildlife movement and isolating populations. This can reduce genetic diversity and make species more vulnerable to local extinction. 2. Disturbance to Wildlife: o Increased human activity, noise, and light pollution associated with new development will disturb wildlife patterns. This can affect breeding success, foraging behaviour, and migration routes/wildlife corridors. Nocturnal animals are particularly sensitive to increased light pollution. o Construction activities themselves can cause significant disturbance through noise, dust, and the presence of heavy machinery, potentially displacing wildlife from surrounding areas. 3. Impact on Ecological Corridors: o Breadsall and Breadsall Hilltop are connected to the wider countryside by green spaces, hedgerows, or watercourses that act as important ecological corridors, allowing wildlife to move between different habitats. Development that severs and degrades these corridors will have a significant negative impact on biodiversity at a landscape scale.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Linda Morris	Response-00867	Taking a chunk of Green belt will affect the wildlife habitation and the flora and fauna.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Lisa Stone	Response-01018	There is a lot of wildlife currently in that area both in the woodlands and surrounding bushes areas and long grass, this will have a detrimental effect on the eco system and destroy many habits , I often seen rabbits in the fields, birds and prey and bats which will all disappear when there?s no food or habitat left.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	lynne hollis	Response-01234	I fully support CPRE Derbyshire?s concerns regarding the proposed development. Preserving the Green Wedge is essential for maintaining open space, supporting wildlife, and ensuring the wood remains connected to the countryside. Urban expansion should be carefully planned to protect these natural areas rather than isolate them. Ancient wood is a lovely place and should be protected at all cost.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mandy Cooling	Response-00312	This would appear to be a significant development on Green Wedge. It?s particularly concerning at a time when there is so much talk about the environmental impact that we are making and it?s disappointing that we aren?t seeing any innovative proposals to regenerate and redevelop areas rather than destroying even more green spaces and natural habitat for birds and animals. I note that you are planning to preserve the Greenway and ancient woodland but it?s not clear how you consider that is achievable with such a development. This area is a natural habit for example for rabbits, birds, trees etc. I?ve seen deer on the land which is proposed to be developed. The woods off the Greenway are a haven for bluebells in the spring. All of this would be decimated by this and other developments being considered by Derby City Council. It would, in effect, make the Greenway nothing more than a footpath devoid of much natural habitat which would be a significant loss. We do not know the environmental cost of such further erosion of natural habitat. I?m sure that there are concerns regarding the plans for drainage from these sites. I know from experience of previous developments that there can be unforeseen consequences particularly around flooding, caused by destroying natural drainage of the earth.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Margaret Stafford	Response-01231	This is a sizeable housing development and will destroy part of the Green Wedge and cause disruption to nature and woodland areas. It is important to preserve these areas as once they are destroyed and built upon, they are never replaced and wildlife habitats are lost. Brown and grey sites should always be considered before green belt areas.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mark Herbert	Response-01285	Taking up a animal corridor

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Martin Harrison	Response-01395	I object to the proposed development due to the potential harm to local wildlife and biodiversity. The area includes green spaces and habitats that support various species. Construction and increased human activity would disrupt these ecosystems, leading to habitat loss and a decline in local biodiversity that cannot easily be reversed.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mary Moffat	Response-01226	Loss of this green area would also mean a loss of wildlife and be detrimental to us all. So much of the Green Wedge above the Village has been built on and more is threatened to the South-West with a significant loss of bio-diversity. Therefore this green belt area now under consideration for development is one that is important to preserve.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Masheda Chowdhury	Response-01339	1. Proximity to Local Wildlife Site (ER 005) and the Great Northern Greenway: ? The development borders or interfaces directly with Local Wildlife Site ER 005 and the Breadsall Disused Railway corridor (Great Northern Greenway) ? both of which are valued for their biodiversity and serve as critical green infrastructure. ? These areas support diverse habitats, including protected and priority species (e.g., birds, bats, hedgehogs, amphibians, and invertebrates). 2. Inadequate Buffer Zones and Ecological Protections: ? The plan?s vague reference to a ?suitable interface? with the wildlife corridor lacks clarity and measurable commitments. ? Without strict buffer zones, lighting restrictions, and ecological monitoring, development poses a high risk of habitat fragmentation and light/noise pollution ? especially harmful to nocturnal and nesting species. 3. Destruction of Semi-natural Habitats and Hedgerows: ? The 8.2-hectare site likely includes important boundary hedgerows and grassland, which serve as wildlife corridors. ? Removal or disruption of these features would reduce habitat connectivity and violate Natural England?s guidelines on protecting biodiversity through planning. 4. No Published Ecological Impact Assessment (EclA): ? There is no publicly available Ecological Impact Assessment as part of this proposal. ? This is a serious omission, especially for land adjacent to a designated Wildlife Site ? without such a report, the ecological consequences cannot be fully understood or mitigated. 5. Cumulative Impact of Development and Safeguarded Land: ? The safeguarding of an additional 14.6 hectares for future development compounds the risk to local biodiversity over the long term. ? Piecemeal approvals without a landscape-scale ecological assessment will gradually degrade local ecosystems, contrary to national planning policy and Derbyshire?s Biodiversity Action Plan. 6. Threat to Local Conservation Goals and Net Biodiversity Loss: ? Development in this area may directly contravene local biodiversity policies, such as requirements to achieve Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) under the Environment Act 2021. ? No clear plan is in place to enhance habitats or replace those lost ? a fundamental requirement of responsible planning in ecologically sensitive areas. I have observed regularly foxes, newts, birds of prey, pollinators in the area. Derbyshire Wildlife Trust guidance, which supports protecting habitat corridors like the Great Northern Greenway.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Matt	Response-00604	Ruining wild land which helps the biodiversity and animals
	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Megan Byrne	Response-01432	Major impact see letter on other notes
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Melissa Little	Response-00389	Oakwood and the Breadsall area are continually being threatened with additional housing which is hugely detrimental to our local wildlife and biodiversity. Croft Wood can be seen adjacent to the proposed build site. A large number of animals and wildlife live within these areas and the surrounding fields provide a connection to this wildlife. Building on the land will be distressing and cut off some potential sources of food for these animals.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Michael Albinson	Response-00790	We have already seen a heavy reduction in wildlife in the area. This will continue to kill off the remaining
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Michael Grignon	Response-01335	It was only a couple of years ago that the council said it was prioritising its green belt in this area adding to wildlife and conservation protection . Breadsall would become a concrete jungle if this plan goes forward
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Michael Poplar	Response-00565	The current and proposed developments are constantly eroding green belt and green wedges of sufficient size to support both wildlife and biodiversity. The odd token greenways and pathways are not adequate.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Monique Johnson	Response-00663	We have already seen that certain species are no longer present in the village, for instance hedgehogs. Many birds are no longer coming as frequently. We need more green spaces, not building sites. Our village is small and cannot take all this turmoil. Nature is being squeezed out of the area. The Greenway alone is not sufficient.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mrs Francoise Poplar	Response-00602	The current green wedge of land within Erewash's Green Belt serves a vital purpose in helping wildlife and biodiversity to survive in proximity to what is otherwise a very built up urban environment.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mr Softley	Response-00344	Green space is home to all sorts of wildlife, this development will destroy that.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mrs Sarah Morley	Response-01515	The green belt areas and the safe guarded land are extremely important for wildlife. There are a wide range of wildlife that live in these areas. The area they have to live in, is continually being reduced more and more. Where will the wildlife go if you remove the green belt and safe guarded areas? The land can be seen for a fair distance and a lot of people enjoy the view and watching the wildlife
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Nathan Cooke	Response-00896	Loss of habitat to yet more housing
	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Neal Flint	Response-01220	Another large wildlife corridor would be lost along with good usable farm land.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Nicholas Lloyd	Response-00356	I object to this planning application on the grounds that the proposed development threatens local wildlife and biodiversity. The site in question supports a variety of species, some of which may be protected under UK law. According to the National Planning Policy Framework, development should not proceed if it results in significant harm to biodiversity that cannot be avoided, adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for. Without comprehensive ecological surveys and a clear mitigation strategy, the development could disrupt local ecosystems, leading to the loss of habitats and a decline in species populations. This is particularly concerning given the UK's ongoing biodiversity crisis, with many species already at risk. Therefore, I urge the planning authority to reject this application unless it can be demonstrated that the development will not adversely affect local wildlife and biodiversity.?

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Norma HASWELL	Response-01384	Development would potentially harm the openness of the Green Belt between Breadsall and the Derby urban area. Furthermore, the site's proximity to a nature conservation area and multi-user trail is a great cause for concern, as the biodiversity in the area.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Oakwood Ward Councillors Eyre, Mulhall and Trehwella	Response-01359	We would like to see the conclusions of a full study on the impact of this development.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Paige Skivington	Response-00366	All the animals that live in the field will lose their home.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Paul Walsh	Response-00341	I think the fields and wood should be left for wildlife to roam free, it is a beautiful walking area, not for more houses to ruin.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Paul Wilkes	Response-01527	We have lived in Oakwood for eight years and have seen a substantial reduction of wildlife since the Lime Lane extension was built. With Oakwood now being an area where one cannot see a doctor or dentist, one cannot find parking in the shopping centre perhaps it is time to either improve the facilities in Oakwood or give a reduction in Council Tax which already very high for what we receive.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Philip Booth	Response-00683	Multiple new sites have already been built encroaching on the wildlife corridor adjacent to the Greenway. This development would significantly effect the biodiversity. The is a badger set in the field and numerous other species use this area such as bats, barn owls, foxes. The natural pond for drainage which has been there for years will hold a variety of wildlife and this would then be surrounded on all sides.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Prathap Paulson Junjuri	Response-01393	Will affect already depleted wildlife and plants
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Rachael	Response-00332	Living in an area with a small allocation of green space immediately near us allows us to witness lots of wildlife, their habitats will be destroyed if this proposed build is to go ahead. We see many birds of prey, a wide variety of wildlife, badgers, hedgehogs, foxes, birds etc.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Richard Kingham	Response-00849	The fields for the proposed development are full of insects, rabbits, birds etc. We have only just started having birds come back to our area after the redrow development. This will remove a huge area of living ecosystem that will never return.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Richard Stone	Response-01029	This area has a huge amount of wildlife, particularly bats in this area, this will be destroying their areas as well as for the other creatures such as rabbits that use the grassland in this area.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Richard Straw	Response-01412	All the local wildlife that me and my family enjoy will be gone
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Roy Ling	Response-01243	This would affect wildlife in the area.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Ruth Duxbury	Response-00301	New housing developments put wildlife at risk. There is a wide variety of plants including bluebells and animals such as foxes and deer are commonly seen.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Samantha Watts	Response-00869	The proposed development threatens the rich biodiversity of Breadsall Village, which is home to a variety of wildlife, including protected species and essential habitats. The loss of green spaces and natural corridors will disrupt local ecosystems, reducing biodiversity and harming species that rely on these areas for survival. The removal of vegetation and increased human activity will negatively impact pollinators, birds, and small mammals, leading to a decline in local wildlife populations. Additionally, the development risks disturbing established habitats, including hedgerows and woodland areas that serve as crucial nesting and feeding grounds.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Sam Saunders	Response-01557	The proposed development at North of Breadsall Hilltop raises considerable concerns regarding the protection of local wildlife and biodiversity. The site lies adjacent to important natural features, including the Breadsall Disused Railway corridor, known as the Great Northern Greenway, which is designated as a Local Wildlife Site (ER 005). This area provides valuable habitat and a vital ecological corridor for a variety of species, supporting biodiversity within an increasingly urbanized landscape. The development threatens to disrupt these habitats, fragmenting the corridor and potentially leading to a loss of flora and fauna. Construction activities such as land clearance, earthworks, and increased human presence may cause disturbance, displacement, or harm to wildlife, including protected species. Without adequate mitigation, these impacts could lead to a decline in local biodiversity and the degradation of important ecosystems. The development must also consider the safeguarding of Breadsall Footpath 24, a public right of way that doubles as an ecological link, ensuring that both human and wildlife access is maintained. Post-construction, the introduction of housing and associated infrastructure could increase light, noise, and pollution levels, all of which have negative effects on wildlife behaviour and habitat quality. The loss of green space and woodland areas further reduces opportunities for foraging, nesting, and shelter. While the proposal mentions the inclusion of landscaping and woodland planting to create a visual buffer between urban areas and Breadsall village, this alone may not compensate for the ecological loss. Comprehensive biodiversity assessments and robust, legally binding mitigation and enhancement plans are essential to protect and promote local wildlife. Without these measures, the development risks causing irreversible damage to the area's natural heritage.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Sam Woods	Response-01576	I strongly object to the proposed development on the land adjacent to my home due to its significant and irreversible impact on local wildlife. This area serves as a vital habitat for a variety of birds, small mammals, and pollinators, many of which are increasingly threatened by urban expansion. The natural green space provides essential shelter, nesting grounds, and food sources that will be lost if construction proceeds. Disrupting this delicate ecosystem not only threatens biodiversity but also undermines the environmental value of our community. I urge you to reconsider the development plans in favor of preserving this important natural habitat.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Sandra Perry	Response-00307	More houses being built is encroaching on wildlife filled land. We used to hear the cuckoo every spring, and tawny owls at night. Urbanising the area has reduced the habitat for these amazing birds
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Sara Cotton	Response-00370	Our woodland is a nature reserve don't build on it
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Scarlett Hamblin	Response-00398	Our wildlife is already struggling. We have lots of native British wildlife that is on the brink of extinction. We need to protect and preserve these precious animals for our future generations. By increasing the amount of housing we are taking away valuable habitats from these animals.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Scott Watson	Response-01284	The proposed development poses a serious threat to the biodiversity of Breadsall Village, which supports a range of wildlife, including protected species and vital habitats. The destruction of green spaces and ecological corridors will disrupt established ecosystems, reducing biodiversity and endangering species that rely on these areas for food and shelter. Increased human activity and the removal of vegetation will have a detrimental effect on pollinators, birds, and small mammals, accelerating the decline of local wildlife populations. Furthermore, the development risks disturbing long-standing habitats such as hedgerows and woodland, which serve as essential nesting and feeding grounds.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Silvia Mircic	Response-00884	This area lies in close proximity to an SSSI (LNR on the Great Northern Greenway) and woodland (Willowholt and Mill Plantations) which play host to a number of species including but not limited to: of brown-eared and pipistrelle bats, common toads, trout, smooth lizards, badgers, foxes, woodpeckers, swallows, martins, tawny owls, barn owls, (wild) bee hives and rare orchids (common spotted/heath spotted). Furthermore one residence on Brookside road close to the proposed site contains a maternity roost of over 200 soprano pipistrelle bats which use the woodland and proposed site as a feeding ground. In section 9.5 of the Breadsall Neighbourhood Plan it states: 'it is proposed that a number of smaller sites should be designated as Local Green Spaces as they provide habitat for wildlife, including protected species, such as whiteclawed crayfish, water vole, badgers and bats. These sites are as follows: 1 Dam Brook and banks 2 Boosemoor Brook and banks 3 Croft Wood 4 Willowholt Plantation 5 Mill Plantation' ...and later in the section: '2 Prevention of development on sites of special importance. Given the absence of pressure for anything other than small-scale development in the parish there is no justification for development of any of the sites identified above as local wildlife sites and Local Green Spaces. These should therefore be protected from development unless the wildlife ceases to occupy the site in question. The SSSI already enjoys strong protection through national policy.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Simon Ferrad	Response-00853	This will destroy wildlife habitats
			simon morris	Response-00866	Any loss of greenbelt will have an adverse effect on all species of flora and fauna.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Stephen and Janet Allis	Response-01221	wildlife badly affected
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Steven furness	Response-01516	We know we have a variety of wildlife along the Greenway. Fields both side protect this. Removing the field buffer butts the wildlife in the Greenway at risk.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Stuart Brown	Response-00771	Planned area currently has vegetation which is home to many insects birds and mammals in the area, also very near an establish forest near breadsall
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Susan Dundon	Response-00396	It will affect our already struggling wildlife
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Thomas Bateman-Wong	Response-00985	More wildlife areas being taken. Leaving the Northern Greenway is a good move but it's getting to the point where it will be a single, lonely track with no wildlife as they have no space
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Tom King	Response-00734	Bats nest in the surrounding areas
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Tom Parker	Response-01398	The estate currently has beautiful green spaces with thousands of habitats for many wildlife which of course will be destroyed with the proposed builds.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Tony Hawkins	Response-01532	The proposed development will adversely affect the wildlife in the area forcing them into a much smaller corridor. Light pollution will negatively impact this much smaller corridor namely the Great Northern Greenway and also the farming animals next door. The land provides breeding grounds for all types of wildlife including foxes, rabbits, insects, birds including buzzards, owls and bats. this would be lost. There is also a natural pond at the bottom right corner of the land and this and the wildlife within will be adversely affected by a through road if not lost. The proposal ignores the Breadsall Parish Council Village Neighbourhood plan 2019-2029. Key points of are: ? 1 - Protect and enhance the rural character of the parish and prevent urbanisation. ? 2 - Enforce the requirements of the Green Belt to prevent inappropriate development and avoid coalescence with the Derby conurbation. ? 9 - Improve measures to control existing flood risks within the parish and resist any new development that may increase existing flood risks. ? 11 - Identify key wildlife and biological features within the parish and take appropriate steps to preserve them. ? 12 - Mitigate the effect of the large volume of through traffic in the village and aim to prevent any growth in through traffic.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Tracey Turner	Response-00334	Wildlife between Durose Country Park and Breadsall Village is rife - animals need habitats protected.
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Wobbina Bugg	Response-00846	Ofcourse it effects biodiversity!!

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.8	North of Breadsall Hill Top	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Zora Wilson	Response-01575	Objection to Proposed Development ? Conflict with Policy CP18 (Green Wedges) I note that this application has been amended to exclude the development adjacent to the A61. However I still wish to raise strong objections to the proposed development (both in its amended form and original form) on the grounds that it conflicts with Policy CP18 concerning Green Wedges. Although the site lies just outside the designated green belt surrounding Breadsall, it directly abuts existing woodland and open countryside, forming an important part of the green corridor along the Great Northern Greenway. The application site provides valuable habitat for wildlife and functions as an essential green buffer. Its loss would significantly reduce ecological connectivity and visual amenity, impacting local biodiversity and the quality of life for residents, walkers, and cyclists who currently use and enjoy this open space. The site is actively appreciated by the community as a visual break in built development and as a wildlife corridor connecting to other open areas. While the outline proposal includes the retention of woodland, there are serious concerns that development will increase pressure on these areas, potentially leading to degradation over time. I am concerned that the proposed development does not provide an adequate buffer to the woodland corridor and built development will sit too close and will detrimentally impact the existing woodland. There is no BNG Assessment listed in the application documents on the portal so it appears that it hasn't yet been done. How can there be any confidence that the proposal would be able to satisfy the statutory requirement to deliver 10% net gain. Any BNG delivery off site or through the purchase of biodiversity units elsewhere, dilutes the benefit of 10% net gain as the biodiversity is lost here in this locality and the significant environmental impact is here. Crucially, the proposed development sits adjacent to land at Breadsall recently released from the green belt, which Erewash Borough Council is considering for housing allocation. If both sites are developed, the cumulative impact will be substantial?leading to the loss of meaningful green space, erosion of the rural character of the Great Northern Greenway, and the elimination of the settlement gap between Breadsall and the wider Derby conurbation. For these reasons, I urge the Council to reject the proposal in order to uphold the principles of Policy CP18 and protect the integrity of this important green wedge.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Amy Cartwright	Response-01017	West Hallam has some lovely green spaces, losing one of these spaces and putting more cars on the roads will have an impact on our air quality in the village.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Andrea Cochrane	Response-01485	Adding extra vehicles onto already busy roads will impact the air quality especially around the school. Scargill School has a wonderful new sensory garden and play area for pupils to improve the health and wellbeing of everyone and especially those with SEND. Also, Beech Lane recreation ground is extensively used for football training and matches. Current thinking is to encourage more time outdoors to improve mental health and well-being. Sadly, this will not be achieved if this development is allowed to go ahead. In addition, research has shown that pollutants from vehicles adversely impact health and have led to an increase in childhood asthma.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Andrew Zielinski-Raynor	Response-00135	Adding further traffic (and congestion) to an already busy road is going to cause an increase in pollution right opposite a school. We know the risks that pollution poses to developing children.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Angela Reid	Response-00134	More pollution
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Anita Lawrence	Response-00726	For a proposed development of 90 houses potentially 180+ vehicles all coming and going, increasing not only the road safety risk but the air pollution in the area to which the young, elderly and those in poor health would be particularly susceptible to - is this really appropriate opposite a school, recreation ground and park? The additional use of personal vehicles would also negatively effect the intention to reduce emissions from fossil fuels.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Ann Toplis	Response-00271	More houses near the school would make the air quality worse for the children while at school.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Charles Brooks	Response-00535	Without doubt, hoses instead of open fields will naturally reduce the air quality as will the increased volume of vehicles. Its not just cars but delivery vehicles etc.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Charlotte Lun	Response-00150	90 additional houses could easily mean 180+ additional cars in the area. This will have a detrimental effect on air quality in the area. As well as destroying a green space in order to build on.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Chris Collins	Response-00037	With further traffic, households, waste etc comes further pollution. The air quality during construction of a number of houses would be incredibly polluting in the short to medium term on the health of residents, especially on the children in the school across the road. In the medium to longer term the new households would bring increased pollution with the added footprints.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Claire dean	Response-00069	Adding homes means adding pollution.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Daniel hickson	Response-00177	Children playing out at park and school which will suffer
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	David Morrell	Response-00477	Additional traffic will impact on the west Hallam conservation area
			Dean Wright	Response-00094	Increased vehicle numbers and homes will lower air quality, particularly worrying as it is next to a school
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Emily Reeve	Response-01495	The increase in traffic can only lower the air quality around a school and play area.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Emily Reynolds	Response-00149	Again, average 180 cars will be added to the village if the proposed development goes ahead. That will have a massive negative impact on the air quality around the village which I have always considered to be good.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Emma Lound	Response-00187	More vehicles will contribute to poorer air quality. As combustion engine vehicles accelerate from stationary (at a junction for example) they emit a higher level of pollutants. The number of vehicles using that road already reduce the air quality, increasing that number by up to 150 vehicles would only make the situation worse.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Gilly Turrini	Response-00151	This build will create more road traffic creating more air pollution
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Glenn Richardson	Response-00316	With cars often queuing for a considerable amount of time owing to only being enough room at peak times for single lane traffic it's obviously going to effect the air quality surrounding the school & adjacent park where people meet to play sports & recreation
			Guiliano Ricci	Response-01010	More traffic will impact on air pollution
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Helen Collins	Response-00034	Increased traffic and pollution is inevitable from any building site and the consequential increase in residents with cars.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Helen fox	Response-00064	The air quality could be significantly compromised, posing serious risks to the community. Increased construction and population density may lead to higher levels of pollution, which can adversely affect the health of residents and the overall environment. Such developments could disrupt the village's tranquil atmosphere, diminishing its appeal and potentially harming local ecosystems. Therefore, careful consideration must be given to the implications of expanding housing in this area.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Helen Johnson	Response-00170	Will always be affected by volume of traffic
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Helen Patenall	Response-00868	Air quality will be impacted by the increase in traffic in the area. More housing = more vehicles (possibly several vehicles at one property) = less clean air.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Helen Stanley	Response-01555	More cars means more pollution
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Hollie Briggs	Response-00040	We do not want any more poor air quality. We supposed to live in a ?nicer? area.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Iain Harrison	Response-01214	Building on greenbelt land in West Hallam directly contradicts national air quality and environmental improvement goals. The UK government's Environmental Improvement Plan 2023 emphasizes the importance of preserving green spaces to enhance air quality and public health. Greenbelt areas, like the proposed development site, play a crucial role in filtering pollutants, reducing carbon emissions, and providing cleaner air for communities. GOV.UK Moreover, the Clean Air Strategy 2019 outlines the necessity of reducing air pollution through sustainable land use and transportation planning. Developing housing on greenbelt land often leads to increased vehicle dependency due to inadequate public transport options, exacerbating air pollution levels. In West Hallam, the limited bus services, especially after the discontinuation of the Black Cat service, mean that new residents would likely rely heavily on personal vehicles. This shift would not only increase traffic congestion but also deteriorate local air quality, posing health risks to existing and future residents. Preserving greenbelt land aligns with national objectives to improve air quality and public health. Prioritizing brownfield sites for development, which are often better integrated with existing infrastructure and public transport, supports these goals more effectively.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	James Tilford	Response-00103	Increased air pollution
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Jane Taylor	Response-01023	More traffic will always increase air pollution
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Jenny Bexon	Response-00185	Its a village! Its small and its clean and we pay a premium in housing for this.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Jo-Anne Attenborough	Response-00129	The field is a haven for green trees and plants that photosynthesise, removing the carbon dioxide from our air and producing oxygen. Any destruction of these plants will result in poorer air quality and therefore a negative impact on the residents of West Hallam.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Johnson	Response-01037	Addition vehicles extra houses all will have a detrimental impact on the air quality which is already suffering in the Trent valley
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Jon Skelson	Response-01025	With extra houses comes extra pollution. This is a fact.
			Judith Hare	Response-01014	More traffic more air pollution! Simple as that.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Julie Harker	Response-01073	More cars obviously means more pollution
			Katie	Response-00047	More pollution from cars
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Katie Rice	Response-00036	More traffic, more pollution,
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Kerry	Response-01034	More cars around the school area creates more pollution for children to inhale.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Kerry Barratt	Response-00168	Adding more pollution to our village
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Kerry Middleton	Response-00266	This proposal would add congestion to the air quality thus ensuring asthma sufferers would be compromised.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Kevin Fox	Response-00682	The air quality around the school is already increasing. Further building dust and the inconvenience of further traffic will only make air pollution untenable for the residents.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Kian	Response-01493	Cutting down trees will mean more CO2 in the environment
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Kirsty Oliver	Response-00558	Maybe another 180 vehicles to pollute the area on a daily basis.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Lindsey Lyons	Response-00071	Air pollution is a critical action the government has committed to reducing. By building additional houses, the increased gas emission from building a singular house contributes largely to the global emission crisis. Each house building operation contributes to 27% of global emissions with an additional 15% contribution for the building materials and embodied carbon process. I heavily contest why this is being considered with global warming at an all time high. For the local village, the air quality is moderate and unsafe for sensitive groups, adding additional housing will contribute to the air quality being unsafe for a larger proportion of the area, this should be a strong reason for not approving the development in its own.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Louise Annison	Response-01049	Pretty obvious, extra housing and lack of green area which makes this village have a lovely rural location would be impacted by poorer air quality.
			Mandie frith	Response-00247	More cars ect more fumes more chest and breathing issues
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Mark Patenall	Response-00851	More cars, decreased air quality
			Mark Power	Response-00276	With added Cars, a lot of people have two cars per household these days, will indeed affect the Air quality of the area
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Michelle	Response-00148	The air quality will suffer due to the toxic fumes that comes with more cars and housing
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Mr and Mrs Mellors	Response-01797	With more vehicles travelling through West Hallam, especially during peak times, there would be a significant rise in air pollution and noise levels. Given the rural nature of the village, this would negatively impact residents' quality of life and contradict environmental goals aimed at reducing emissions in small communities. Children walking to school and elderly individuals with respiratory conditions would be particularly vulnerable to these changes.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Mrs Judith Pittson	Response-00753	More traffic and houses will effect the air quality.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Mrs Strelley	Response-00233	More traffic will add to congestion. Asthma cases are increasing and it is becoming alarming, the number of children requiring inhalers. It will increase poor air quality.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Nick Craddock	Response-00145	As per my comments for other west Hallam Proposal

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Nicola Elkington-Horridge	Response-00079	A lot of extra and completely unnesscary fumes from cars which will only add to ruining the village and the health of the people who pay a premium to live in it.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Nina Walters	Response-00244	Yes
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Pamela Fox	Response-01242	The air quality around the school is already getting increasingly worse my husband is an asthmatic and has to use his inhaler more often nowadays so additional traffic will only make this worse
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Patricia Eady	Response-00114	I feel the pollution would be high due to more cars coming to and from the school this is not acceptable outside a school especially for children with asthma
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Paul aldre	Response-00152	It's a village we don't need more pollution from traffic and housing
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Paula Piggott	Response-01041	Destroying the countryside, killing wildlife, all the things needed for the world to go round. Extra traffic, extra pollution. The air quality will be seriously impacted in a detrimental way! You need trees and you need wildlife for the world to exist! You can't keep destroying the countryside and it not affect the air we breathe.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Pauline wood	Response-01100	Air quality by the school will be badly affected both during building then extra traffic
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Peter Litley	Response-00161	Queuing traffic at busy times already plays havoc with air quality. 90 extra homes can only make things worse.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Rachel	Response-01015	90 more vehicles in a small village.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Robert Hall	Response-00630	Development would inevitably worsen air pollution by reason of increasing level of traffic in the Village.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Robert Reynolds	Response-00260	More houses would mean more traffic and, therefore, more air pollution.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	sam richards	Response-01467	building such a large site directly opposite a very busy primary school will be causing unnecessary fumes and construction dust which could be harmful to the children. this also applies to nearby residents. there will also be a huge amount of extra cars coming in and out of the village as homes are built, with most homes in the village having 2/3 cars each.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Sarah James	Response-01085	Traffic will increase pollution particularly in school vicinity.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Serena Bostock	Response-00125	Traffic concerns will elevate air quality issue and pollution in the area.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Simon Reeve	Response-01080	The government needs to make their minds up whether they're taxing us to death over emissions or making money out of us with a green con. The addition of more homes on green belt land brings more pollution and the removal of fields and trees less carbon capture and converting greenery. Use the dead town of Ilkeston where shops are closed and convert those in to homes, use some of the land around Stanton, these brown field sites go untouched
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Stacey Eady	Response-01529	The south site is across the road from the school more houses and cars within this area will have a negative on the local air quality, and the children that are at the school Site, as well as those that live locally
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Teresa Faulkner-Day	Response-00242	With the increase in traffic going through the village would have a negative impact on the air quality around the school, increasing the risk of long term health issues for our young people and children in the community
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Teresa Webster	Response-00086	Increased housing brings increased traffic into a semi rural location - we are trying to maintain the village Green areas
1.9	South of West Hallam	Air Quality	Tracey Barks	Response-00111	As a resident of Hallam Way, we already have the school drop off and pick up to contend with in terms of extra vehicles and their associated noise and pollution. An extra 90 houses and their associated vehicles will cause added nuisance and pollution
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Alison Fletcher	Response-00198	If affordable housing is to be planned then improved bus services will be a requirement
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Andrea Cochrane	Response-01485	The current bus service is very limited. There are two buses an hour during the daytime (approx 6am to 6pm) on weekdays. Evening services are almost non-existent. At weekends, there is a limited service during the daytime on Saturdays and hardly anything at all on a Sunday.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Anita Lawrence	Response-00726	Bus services are wholly inadequate for the existing population, there is no evening service at all.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Ann Ainsworth	Response-01096	Poor transport links from the village especially in the evening
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Anne Vanstone	Response-01216	We lack a reliable bus service, and the nearest train connections are not easily accessible.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Carol Hart	Response-01829	The bus service is non-existent, 6 buses in each direction in a day and nothing before 9 a.m. or after 6.30 p.m.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Charles Brooks	Response-00535	What bus service!! You refer to West Hallam being well served by buses. This is simply not true. I suggest you do your research and check bus timetables. For a village the size and population of West Hallam, it is poorly serviced by public transport.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Charlotte Lun	Response-00150	West Hallam has next to no bus service. This will lead to people that rely on buses not wanting to move to the area. It will however attract people that can drive thus creating more traffic and more air pollution in the area.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Chris Collins	Response-00037	The bus service is already appalling for the number of residents in west Hallam. With such significant developments planned there is no way a bus service will ever meet the needs. However, as only 40% of the houses are affordable? (the cynic in me says that these will also be out of reach of most young people anyway) then the rest will have cars and not worry about public transport?.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Christine	Response-01019	Already a very limited bus service to Ilkeston and Derby, meaning more cars on the tight roads especially St Wilfrids
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Christine Barnes	Response-00640	There is a poor bus service, particularly for people trying to get to and from work. An hourly service, when frequent late or no show buses, and no evening service is not conducive to people getting to and from work. Potentially there could be another 2 cars per household, as the bus service will not meet the need for most people in employment.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Christine Barnes	Response-01827	Ninety households will need at least one vehicle each to commute to work as the number 32 bus is hourly and service finishes early evening. The 53 bus is every two hours and finishes late afternoon. It also has to be said buses can run very late or at times, not at all, not conducive for a person trying to reach a workplace. I would hope that you will come to the village at the start and end of the school day to witness the problems I have outlined.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Claire dean	Response-00069	Very poor in the area
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Daniel Clark	Response-01094	They struggle to manoeuvre now with the high traffic and small roads and more houses in the area will make it worse



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	David Fretwell	Response-00133	Currently Hallam is not really served by a bus service, which without further increases the use of cars and increases the volume of traffic
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	David Mosley	Response-01062	The bus service is quite poor for West Hallam. Will the bus provider be offering an improved service for the area? This then adds to the road safety on Beech lane in busy periods.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Diane Reynolds	Response-00216	There are no buses in the evening which means if you wanted to go anywhere in the evening you can't
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Eileen Bailey	Response-00213	Terrible bus service
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Eileen Bailey	Response-01053	Bus service is terrible doctors are terrible can't get appointments now
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Emily Reeve	Response-01495	Our bus service is limited with no service in the evenings.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Emily Reynolds	Response-00149	The bus services are rubbish anyway in west hallam. People will be forced to rely on cars because it's difficult to get anywhere by bus therefore increasing congestion and the likelihood of accidents if the road is busier. More people would be likely to use the bus if it was more reliable and more frequent but if you added that many homes I think the buses would be rammed anyway and you'd struggle to get on them.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Emma Stanley-Smith	Response-01564	Very poor bus service which would mean people have to drive who live here. Making congestion worse.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Francesca Dean	Response-00221	Already limited and a nightmare. Adding more people will cause an increase to this.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Gary Hamson	Response-00052	A long standing bus stop opposite the school entrance is being relocated and taken away from the existing site opposite the school entrance
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Graeme Taylor	Response-01131	There are insufficient bus services for the area already meaning increased cars and car pollution
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Guiliano Ricci	Response-01010	The bus service is poor and would not support more housing
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Helen Collins	Response-00034	The bus services to the village are poor, consequently inhabitants do rely on their own transport. Hence any new inhabitants must do the same and will only add to levels of traffic and congestion.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Helen fox	Response-00064	Local bus services may face significant challenges. The increase in residential development could lead to heightened traffic congestion, making it difficult for buses to maintain their schedules and efficiency. Furthermore, the potential rise in population may not be matched by an equivalent demand for public transport, resulting in underutilized services that could ultimately be reduced or eliminated. This decline in bus services would be detrimental to the village, as it would limit mobility for residents, particularly those without access to private vehicles, thereby isolating them and diminishing the overall quality of life in the community.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Helen Johnson	Response-00170	Already struggle to get through the village
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Helen Patenall	Response-00868	The bus service in West Hallam is woefully inadequate. The buses run very infrequently during the day and the last bus available in the evening is 18:20. A perusal of the bus timetables will support this point
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Helen Stanley	Response-01555	Evening and weekend service is poor, not the well connected village mention I the application
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Homewood	Response-01074	Already limited services here
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Iain Harrison	Response-01214	Public transport provision in West Hallam is extremely limited. Since the loss of the Black Cat service several years ago, residents have been left with minimal bus coverage. The current service is infrequent and does not run in the evenings, making it virtually unusable for commuting, appointments, or social activities. This lack of reliable public transport means that any new housing will inevitably lead to a sharp increase in car ownership and road usage?putting even more strain on already congested roads, insufficient parking, and overburdened infrastructure. Sustainable development should reduce dependency on cars, not increase it. In a village with such poor transport links, building more homes without first addressing this issue is entirely counterproductive.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Iris Howes	Response-01169	Bus services in West Hallam are infrequent and unreliable. Most new residents would inevitably rely on private cars, adding to the congestion.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	James Johnson	Response-01125	The proposed development area is poorly served by public transport, meaning most residents will be dependent on cars. This not only increases emissions and road use but also highlights the unsustainable nature of this development. No substantial infrastructure improvements appear to be included in the application to address this.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	James Painter	Response-01119	The village is served by a very poor bus service with no late buses
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Jane Marshall	Response-01172	Already below par.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Jenny Bexon	Response-00185	Theres fuck all bus service as it is!! Its a village leave it alone.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Jenny Butler	Response-00202	The bus services here are poor and irregular anyway. How will they meet the need?
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Jo-Anne Attenborough	Response-00129	What bus service! Getting in and out of West Hallam is already ridiculously hard on public transport. Why build houses in an area that has no reliable public transport?
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Judith Hare	Response-01014	Buses are poor in the village. Only every 2 hours until early evening which means people have to drive or taxi to venture out of the village
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Karina Cooper	Response-00267	Would need a regular service with a later running time
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Kathryn Gilbert	Response-01574	Bus service is not adequate enough to persuade people to use public transport instead of cars. Increased housing with a development of this site will only increase traffic and cause heart and safety issues
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Katie	Response-00047	West Hallam already had a limited bus service
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Ken Mitchell	Response-00763	The bus service through West Hallam is intermittent and does not go directly to Nottingham. This is important since West Hallam is a commuter area for Derby and Nottingham. There is no evening service.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Ken Musson	Response-00900	The area has suffered in recent years with the withdrawal of public transport services and so nobody is going to use this to reach the school or surrounding area.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Kerry	Response-01034	Public transport not great for the area as it is. More people will use more cars

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Kerry Middleton	Response-00266	This would be stretching the bus services beyond their capabilities.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Kirsty Oliver	Response-00558	Will there still be a bus service when the road is all dug up?
			Laura Egglestone	Response-01027	Limited services provided by the no 32 bus believe there was talks of this being reviewed in July 2025
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Linda Webster	Response-00744	I would question some of the claims in the report. Travel links are definitely not OK - I am a slave to public transport and can tell you the daily service is very poor and there is no evening service at all.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Lindsey Lyons	Response-00071	Bus services are already limited in the area. Beech lane is used as a key point for secondary school children to get the local buses. That said, this is already dangerous with one bus stop and the road has limited visibility. Bus services are not frequent in the area with tight roads and dangerous curves proving a road hazard. Additionally housing would require a more frequent bus service but the roads are not fit for purpose.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Mandie frith	Response-00247	Poor already from and in west Hallam
			Mark	Response-00164	What Bus services? No way to get into Derby or Ilkeston if you work shifts or don't work in the centres
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Mark Patenall	Response-00851	The bus service is very poor during the day and non-existent from early evening onwards.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Mark Power	Response-00276	The bus service is not great around here
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Maureen Briggs	Response-00190	The buses have a struggle when schools coming out so more traffic would be terrible.!!
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Max Egglestone	Response-01278	The village is poorly served by public transport, with minimal bus connections and no rail options. New residents would be forced to rely on private vehicles, increasing road traffic and undermining sustainability goals.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Max Longdon	Response-00128	The village has already lost bus services through the village at times when the school is there due to congestion levels
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Mr and Mrs Mellors	Response-01797	Public transport in West Hallam is inadequate, particularly in the evenings. The village is served by limited bus services with no provision after early evening hours, making it difficult for residents - particularly the young, elderly, and those without private transport - to access work, education, healthcare, or leisure facilities. A housing development that increases population without improving connectivity will only lead to greater car dependency, exacerbating traffic and pollution problems further.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Mrs Glenda Orchard	Response-01490	Very poor bus service s
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Mrs Judith Pittson	Response-00753	Bus services are already poor with no evening service at all. More traffic on Beech Lane will impede this further.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Mrs Strelley	Response-00233	So are bus services going to increase due to a growing population in West Hallam? I doubt it very much. Is the infrastructure going to accommodate more families?
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Nick Craddock	Response-00145	As per my comments for other West Hallam Proposal
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Nicola Elkington-Horridge	Response-00079	The bus services are already next to none the extra traffic will make the bus route even more congested!
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Nicole Brookman	Response-01559	What bus service???? you can't get to Nottingham. For Derby there is one bus every couple of hours, there are very few bus stops and they are not reliable. There are no timetables so you don't know when they are. On a Friday the last bus is around 6pm and there aren't any later to get back.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Patrick Hynes	Response-01902	Public transport is limited. There are few buses and the services we do have are unreliable. This development would put hundreds more car journeys onto roads already under strain.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Paul Aldred	Response-00152	We can't have more big vehicles in the village it can't cope now
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Paula Piggott	Response-01041	The bus service is already limited in West Hallam. Increasing this service would put extra traffic on the roads causing a safety issue and compromising the safety of the children in the village as well as polluting the clean air.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Pauline Wood	Response-01100	Very poor bus service and they struggle on that road because of parked cars
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Peter Lilley	Response-00161	What bus services? We hardly have any, so more cars in the area!
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Pete Vanstone	Response-01164	Public transport links in the area are almost non-existent, with very few bus services and no nearby rail connections. As such, any new residents will be heavily dependent on car travel for commuting, shopping, school runs, and medical appointments. This will further intensify traffic pressure and carbon emissions.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Richard Brewell	Response-01028	Bus services through and around West Hallam are poor currently and a larger population will only make this problem worse. Any new residents will be faced with the same problems.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Robert Reynolds	Response-00260	Bus service is poor, there is no indication it will improve, therefore there are likely to be more cars using Beech Lane.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Sam Richards	Response-01467	There is already a huge lack of public transport around the village, but Beech Lane is one of the main roads used for buses and school buses every day. Unnecessary build up of traffic due to the new site could cause delays for these buses. There is no evening bus service in the village.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Sarah James	Response-01085	Bus service is not sufficient as it is only hourly. The people moving in will probably be commuters and possibly non-bus users particularly if not regular enough.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Sarah Taylor	Response-01819	West Hallam's bus service is very poor. A bus every two hours in either direction during the day - 6 buses a day. None in the evenings.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Scott Wright	Response-00089	We do not have a strong bus service to support an additional 125 properties, this will mean additional vehicles and increased pollution, increase footfall and wear and tear to infrastructure.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Sharon Hickson	Response-01430	The buses can't already get around the corner of St Wilfreds due to householders not having drives adding more to the congestion of the village, the proposed development will only create more problems to the village and Beech Lane and for the buses themselves
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Simon Reeve	Response-01080	The bus services in the area are good, commuting links to Ilkeston, on the Nottingham or direct to Derby are good
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Sophie	Response-01105	Abysmal bus services as it is so this is irrelevant
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Stacey Eady	Response-01529	The bus service for the village isn't great already, buses do not run later than 8pm, the road on Beech Lane does not meet the width of a bus route that should be 6.2m wide. Other sides could help house the new homes

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Teresa Faulkner-Day	Response-00242	The bus services have always been inadequate for the villagers. We have had promises of improvement for as long as I can remember.
			Teresa Webster	Response-00086	There is very limited bus services as it is
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Tilly Fletcher	Response-00317	Bus services are already lacking, they do not increase frequency for busier times and we could not sustain once an hour for 90 more houses.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Bus Services	Tina Jay	Response-01801	Also the public travel links for West Hallam are very limited, with no evening service at all, with cars being the main use of transport, and any new housing developments of this size bringing further difficulties.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Adam Spencer	Response-00054	The development will result in an increased risk of flooding within the village and surrounding area of the development
1.9	South of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Alex	Response-01026	This particular field is good at absorbing rainwater and holding it as groundwater which has been evident when walking through it when it has rained. If we build on top of it and tarmac it then we lose all the natural drainage and at greater risk of flooding to the village.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Alison Stills	Response-01057	West Hallam already has continued issues with water maintenance and leaks
1.9	South of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Andrea Cochrane	Response-01485	During periods of heavy rainfall, Beech Lane suffers from surface water flooding and this is eased through runoff onto the proposed development area. If this land is built on, this runoff capacity will be lost. In addition, paving over more land will only intensify surface water flooding further down the slope onto the Station Road/ Cat and Fiddle junction.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Andrew and Julie Douglas	Response-00146	Natural spring in the field building over this will cause flooding
1.9	South of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Andrew Zielinski-Raynor	Response-00135	The proposed site becomes very waterlogged in all but the Summer months due to clay soil.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Anna Richardson	Response-00162	The development on the old White Hart Pub site just round the corner has caused huge flooding problems along station road. This development would just exacerbate that,
	South of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	A Redshaw	Response-00287	The site is a wetland in winter
1.9	South of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Charles Brooks	Response-00535	I do understand that the proposed land is often extremely wet and is quite undulating. It is also above an old mine. This area needs to be properly surveyed.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Chris Collins	Response-00037	There's probably not a flooding issue with the site as it's elevated and slopes away from the rest of the village. Drainage however maybe a concern. Severn Trent have no end of issues in West Hallam. I would be concerned with the ability of the service providers to ramp up and not impact others negatively.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Claire dean	Response-00069	Extra homes address pressure to our systems.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Connor Gratton	Response-00232	The area already suffers from poor drainage and West Hallam is frequently cutoff following heavy rain. This will further aggravate the situation.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Emily Reynolds	Response-00149	I honestly can't see how essentially concreting over that area won't have an effect on flooding in the village. You'd be covering that whole area in impermeable services and will likely increase the risk and likelihood of flooding events occurring and those events having a considerable impact on the surrounding homes and businesses.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Emma Lound	Response-00187	The safeguarded area is a run off field. It is low lying and some of the plants growing in there are associated with boggy/wet land. Building or considering building on this would cause issues.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Glenn Richardson	Response-00316	the fields off beech lane & station road act as natural flood plains. Since the council allowed the development on the old white hart pub site ,drainage is a constant problem (I've got videos to reinforce this )
1.9	South of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Helen fox	Response-00064	Flooding can significantly impact a small village, particularly in areas where there are plans for new housing developments. Increased construction can lead to changes in land use and drainage patterns, exacerbating the risk of flooding. This not only threatens the safety of residents but can also damage infrastructure and disrupt local ecosystems. Furthermore, the potential for flooding may deter new residents and investors, ultimately hindering the village's growth and economic stability. The long-term consequences of such environmental challenges could be detrimental to the community's overall well-being and sustainability.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Helen Johnson	Response-00170	Site all ready floods on Beach lane
1.9	South of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Helen Patenall	Response-00868	The land is boggy when wet, if the proposed site is covered in housing where will all the rainwater run off to?
1.9	South of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Iain Harrison	Response-01214	looding and drainage are also serious concerns that must not be overlooked. Greenbelt land?particularly open fields like the one in question?plays a crucial role in natural drainage and flood prevention. These areas absorb rainwater, reduce surface runoff, and help manage the water table. Once this land is replaced with tarmac, roofs, and paved driveways, water has nowhere to go. This dramatically increases the risk of surface water flooding both on the development site and in the surrounding village. West Hallam already experiences flooding issues during periods of heavy rainfall, and the infrastructure for drainage is clearly not equipped to handle additional pressure. The Environment Agency has repeatedly warned that developments on previously undeveloped land without proper sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) can lead to increased flood risk not just locally, but downstream as well. With climate change leading to more intense and unpredictable weather events, building over natural drainage areas is both irresponsible and dangerous. Short-term housing gains should never come at the expense of long-term flood resilience and community safety.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	James William Allen	Response-01280	The road at the bottom of the hill (ie the one from the old station leading to Midlands Storage) regularly floods in inclement weather. Reducing the amount of arable land above the road which intercepts said water will only make this problem worse.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Jenny Bexon	Response-00185	We dont need 90 houses here. It is a protective factor for the surrounding areas to have run off and natural drainage and land absorption
			Jo-Anne Attenborough	Response-00129	This field is a flood plain. For most of the year it is very wet and muddy. Surely it is not safe to build on this site!

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.9	South of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Julie Harbon	Response-00022	The playing fields across the road from the planned site is very prone to flooding, particularly at the pavilion end, being wet and boggy most of all year. I wonder if the additional build will increase water in this already fragile area?
			Julie Wright	Response-00091	More houses could potentially cause drainage issues
1.9	South of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Karen Squire	Response-01040	In heavy downpours it does flood down past Station House so it will be interesting to see how that's managed. Maybe a holding pond like at Oakwood
			Katie	Response-00047	Often this field can be flooded.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Kerry	Response-01034	No thought to where the water ultimately has to flow
			Kerry Barratt	Response-00168	Had this been seriously addressed
1.9	South of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Kerry Middleton	Response-00266	The fields beyond flood and are therefore not suitable for building houses on.
			Kevin Fox	Response-00682	Too often we see building works affect flood plains and increase flooding?
1.9	South of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Laura Egglestone	Response-01027	The proposed site has a natural stream running in the safeguarded field.
			Lindsey Lyons	Response-00071	West Hallam already experiences flooding. As a local area, flooding has become a real concern over recent years with global warming. Additional housing will increase global warming, air pollution and take up vital land that absorbs water from excessive rainfall. There is already often roadworks to cope with draining issues on beech lane and additional housing will increase this issue tenfold, with the issues already struggling to be rectified.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Mandie frith	Response-00247	Already have issues around beech lane and station road with flooding more buildings less soak away
			Margaret Lewis	Response-01499	We will have more flooding due to loss of greenery
1.9	South of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Mark Patenall	Response-00851	The proposed site is very boggy in wet weather
			Mark Power	Response-00276	Fields get really boggy
1.9	South of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Maureen Briggs	Response-00190	Would there be arrangements for drainage etc because of any flooding that might appear.
			Mr and Mrs Wood	Response-01826	Climate change will undoubtedly make us more concerned about the removal of natural flood plains
1.9	South of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Mrs Strelley	Response-00233	Drainage is a big issue. Parts of the field don't drain well. It has been looked into before as a building plot and it has complications.
			Nick Craddock	Response-00145	As per my comments for other west Hallam Proposal
1.9	South of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Nina Walters	Response-00244	Yes
			Paul adred	Response-00152	Flooding is irrelevant we don't need more houses filling green belt
1.9	South of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Paula Piggott	Response-01041	Keep building over green land will not only unnecessarily kill lots of wildlife you will also destroy the area as there will be less natural soak aways. This will cause flooding and cause drainage problems.
			Rachel	Response-01015	The area is already prone to flood
1.9	South of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Rhonda Holt	Response-00237	Water infrastructure is at saturation point already. West Hallam has suffered flooding already. I suggest not building on a soakaway stretch of land.
			Robert Reynolds	Response-00260	No doubt there are zero plans to include additional sewer treatment facilities, and also make adequate provision to deal with heavy rainfall. Thus combination may well cause sewage to back-up through people's toilets in times of heavy rain.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	sam richards	Response-01467	there are certain areas in west hallam that get affected by floods - some close to the site. maybe these problems should be looked and and fixed by the council before more properties are built.
			Sarah Taylor	Response-00115	There are already water drainage issues around WH with the underground clay content and natural water springs. They push up into the streets that the Highway Agencies are already aware of. This is considerably noticeable at the junction of Beech Lane and Station Road. With councils doing very little to tackle climate change and taking away green spaces these issues will only get worse.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	sharon hickson	Response-01430	Building on open fields is always going to effect the natural way the ground absorbs water, tarmac, block paved drives all allow water to run off and flood areas, for the first time in years in 2024/2023 have I seen water collect at the bottom of St Wilfreds road and station road going out towards Stanley village, also in Stanley village we had floods and my grand parents, parents and I have lived in West Hallam and never have I seen it flood in those places
			Simon Reeve	Response-01080	It's a joke, the area already has issues along Nutbrook, the new housing on Quarry Hill floods as does the entire trail around Manor Flood, more so now than ever in my almost 50 years in the areas. Taking away fields and trees and replacing with tarmac and concrete with drains to "lose the water" to another location simply overloads another area....it can't continue
1.9	South of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Stacey Eady	Response-01529	N/a
			Teresa Faulkner-Day	Response-00242	As we have seen in the past, where we have had new housing developments, little care or research has been done, causing issues of flooding, despite this being raised by locals in the community who have good knowledge of the area. Houses have been built and drainage systems have not been considered or inadequate systems have been put in place
1.9	South of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Toni Tomlinson	Response-00204	This field is permanently waterlogged in Autumn/winter. Where will this water go? The cricket field?
			Tracey Barks	Response-00111	I do not have enough knowledge of this area but presumably there will be many disadvantages in terms of flooding and drainage
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Alison Fletcher	Response-00198	Open green spaces, countryside and village community are reasons why people choose to live in West Hallam.
			Alison Reynolds	Response-00243	Taking away from area of natural beauty
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Alison Stills	Response-01057	We need to maintain all green belt areas and use brown belt or rejuvenate empty properties
			Andrew and Julie Douglas	Response-00146	This is green belt land
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Anita Lawrence	Response-00726	The Labour Party Manifesto 2024 states that 'Labour is committed to preserving the greenbelt which has served England's towns and cities'. Labour was elected on the basis of this manifesto, please leave this area to nature for the benefit of all. It is my understanding that the owner of the land concerned has had planning permission refused previously for an agricultural building, how could this now be considered as suitable for the development of housing?

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Ann Ainsworth	Response-01096	Area well used and appreciated by walkers
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Anne Vanstone	Response-01216	Greenbelt land should be protected, there is no excuse to use it at this present time. The risk of further development creeping onto nearby fields is also very real with it being 'safeguarded' on the plans. Once the precedent is set, the surrounding greenbelt becomes vulnerable. We must ask why more appropriate, better-connected locations have not been prioritised.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Bruce Broughton	Response-01534	The proposed site has been rebuffed by Planning at Erewash many times over the years and one application that was submitted for an agricultural building was refused, so what is different now?
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Carl fox	Response-00067	Spoils the landscape over crowds the area
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Carol Hart	Response-01829	This owner of this land has, I believe, contacted the Planning Department over the years in an effort to develop the area, he has always to my knowledge been rebuffed. He did actually put in an application to erect a barn in 2022, this was refused, the refusal mentioned due to its design and siting within the Green Belt and adjacent to the conservation area, it would have an adverse impact upon the visual appearance and character of the conservation area and would harm the openness of the Green Belt, so what has changed, if a single building is going to have that impact what are 90 or more likely 150+ going to have. I have not even mentioned the Green Belt invasion and the major impact on the wildlife in the site which is upsetting many of the residents.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Cat Hope	Response-00127	West hallam is a village, now soon will be an estate like oakwood! Traffic is horrendous, more so parking. Empty houses already on where the former white hart is. This once attractive village, will soon by awful. Ilkeston as the nearest town can't handle more traffic. Our villages are losing our green belt areas! Years ago Erewash would never budge, eg dale road stanley. We need to protect our green space! Soon will be none. Huge overcrowding happening. Criminal activity needs protection also! Our police can't cope as it is now.
			Cathy Bostock	Response-00181	Need to preserve green space for future generations
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Charles Brooks	Response-00535	People live in a rural location to enjoy the countryside and the benefits of being surrounded by open space. I pay extra for the pleasure of living in West Hallam. If green belt was not important to me then I would choose to live in a town or city. Green belt is very precious to me and should be to Erewash. Once you start building on it then where does it end??
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Chloe Parkin	Response-00154	Spoils the beautiful countryside views in our village that lift the spirits of many. Seeing these views is a wonderful part of the village we live in and will building on this site will spoil our lovely village.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Chris Collins	Response-00037	Stop developing on green belt when there is brown belt land available.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Chris Reid	Response-00136	This should not be happening in such a small area
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Christine	Response-01019	The beauty of WH is the surrounding green fields, totally opposed to building on new land when there are disused sites that could be used
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Christine Barnes	Response-00640	This site has previously been refused planning for further agricultural use. I cannot understand how circumstances have changed for it now to be considered for housing.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Christopher Chambers	Response-00172	The local authority should not be considering applications on green belt land.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Claire dean	Response-00069	There is several areas of brown belt so why take our green.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Connor Gratton	Response-00232	Refer to comments on wildlife.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Daniel hickson	Response-00177	Will ruin the cricket club with houses backing onto the ground
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Daniel Stanbridge	Response-00099	We must strive to protect our green belt
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	David Morrell	Response-00477	This development would impact on the aesthetic of the west Hallam conservation area
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Dean Wright	Response-00094	This area should be protected, loss of greenery belt will not only result in the loss of habitat and lower air quality, villages and towns will simply blur into one.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Diane Reynolds	Response-00216	It is important to protect the green belt so we still have green spaces. Why protect it for green belt if it is then able to be built on. How can a building in 2021 be objected due to it being green belt but now some money can be made it is being considered. This gives you no faith in the council when considering to vote that goal post can be moved to make money instead of considering wildlife and the area
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Dominic Tye	Response-01016	We are losing yet more of our precious green belt land which is so important for everyone. We should be able to continue to enjoy the land as it is with the spectacular countryside which surrounds our village.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Emily Reeve	Response-01495	The green belt land should not be built on. There are other areas that would be a more suitable site
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Emily Reynolds	Response-00149	The green belt should be left alone. The houses once built and while in development will have a negative impact on the surrounding environment.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Emma Lound	Response-00187	This is an area of green belt. A previous application for a farmer to build an agricultural bulding on this exact land was refused in 2021 due to it bordering conservation area and possible affecting the aesthetic of the green belt...but 90 houses is OK??? Also there has been a brown field site identified less than a mile away at the storage depot, why not extend that site where the road and infrastructure can be amended and built from scratch rather than shoehorn things into a spot that does not fit.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Francesca Dean	Response-00221	Use houses already available or brown sites. We must protect our greenbelt!
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Gary Hamson	Response-00052	Is there any other sites in the village that is in green belt but away from the school and within the scoring given on the criteria layed down?
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Gilly Turrini	Response-00151	Green belt should be protected for the sake of our planet. West Hallam used to be a village and is now a semi rural suburb of Ilkeston
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Glenn Richardson	Response-00316	Consider that 10 years ago this wonderful council turned down our building application to extend our house ( which we won on appeal from the Secretary of State) on the grounds of it spoiling the view of greenbelt land from the junction of station road & beech lane ?.the same view you want to spoil with the proposed development?This land is a vital part of the local eco structure

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Graeme Taylor	Response-01131	It is clear that this development will sprawl further into the attractive and bio diverse green belt
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Helen Collins	Response-00034	I opposed houses being built on green belt anywhere. There many brown field sites that should be utilised for housing developments.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Helen fox	Response-00064	Constructing on greenbelt land would adversely affect our small village just to expand housing. Such development threatens the village's character and environment, disrupting the natural landscape that provides essential ecological benefits. Additionally, increased housing could lead to overcrowding, straining local resources and infrastructure, while diminishing the community's sense of identity and cohesion. The loss of green spaces would not only impact residents' quality of life but also undermine the village's appeal, potentially leading to long-term economic consequences.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Helen Johnson	Response-00170	Over density
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Helen Patenall	Response-00868	By definition green belt is "an area of open land, on which building is restricted". I have always been led to believe that the proposed site is green belt land. It seems more than suspicious that all the area around the proposed site remains green belt on the map. It would seem to me that the green belt rules protecting the proposed site have been 'altered' to suit political aims, this is underhand and bordering on the deceitful/corrupt. Proposals to develop the land in the past have been refused, why is it ok to build now?
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Helen Stanley	Response-01555	Development would create a block between greenbelt land and the village. Current acts as a buffer between the village and adjacent greenbelt.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Helen Vickseds	Response-00062	Protecting green belt land is important and brown field sites / areas in towns with empty buildings should be considered as the first option before impacting our previous green belt.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Holly Mohamed	Response-00076	Loss of Greenbelt Land: The proposed development is on greenbelt land, which is meant to be preserved for its environmental and recreational value. Building on this land would lead to the loss of natural habitats and green spaces that are vital for the community's well-being. Greenbelt land serves as a buffer between urban and rural areas, and its loss could have long-term environmental impacts. Urban Sprawl: Developing greenbelt land can contribute to urban sprawl, reducing the separation between towns and leading to a loss of rural character. Once greenbelt land is developed, it is lost forever, which can have long-term negative impacts on the environment and community. The development could set a precedent for future encroachments on greenbelt land, further eroding its value.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Iain Harrison	Response-01214	The greenbelt exists for a reason. It was established to prevent urban sprawl, safeguard the countryside, and preserve the character of rural communities like West Hallam. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) clearly states that greenbelt land should only be built on in exceptional circumstances?and overburdening a village with housing, without first exhausting all brownfield alternatives, does not meet that threshold. The Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) has repeatedly found that there is enough brownfield land in England to build over 1 million new homes, without touching a single acre of greenbelt. In fact, building on greenbelt often leads to low-density, car-dependent developments that increase emissions, traffic, and pollution, while erasing the green spaces that benefit both people and wildlife. Greenbelt land is not "spare" or "unused"?it is performing vital functions: absorbing carbon, filtering air and water, supporting mental health through access to nature, and providing food and shelter for wildlife. Once built over, it cannot be restored. To sacrifice this for short-term gain, especially when better options exist, is poor planning and an affront to the long-term well-being of the community and the environment.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Ian Brown	Response-00163	open land for walking and bird watching
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Iris Howes	Response-01169	This proposal would consume a large area of designated Green Belt land. Once built on, this land is lost for good ? along with its role in separating communities, preserving natural beauty, and supporting biodiversity. West Hallam has grown over the year and now need to protect our green spaces and fight for the ?village? it should be.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	James Johnson	Response-00183	There are better areas like the old oak well brick yard or rear of the Newdigate public house that would cause less disruption to the countryside.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	James Morris	Response-01060	Keep green belt, green belt land
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	James Painter	Response-01119	The site has been designated Green Belt and in a small island like ours the green spaces and wildlife areas must be protected and preserved, with our local industrial past surely we must use the Brown Field sites first , once the countryside has gone it has gone forever. This site been turned down on several occasions for various plans one being an application for an orchard and agricultural building which would have been much more in keeping with the idea of Green Belt I fail to see why agricultural use was turned down but houses on Green Belt are alright.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	James Tilford	Response-00103	Loss of green belt
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Jane Marshall	Response-01172	Develop brown sites, not green belt.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Jane Taylor	Response-01023	This is an important area for wildlife and biodiversity
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Jane thomas	Response-01056	It's the wrong place to build find a grey site
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Jane Zielinski-Raynor	Response-01095	This is Green belt land and should remain so
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Jenny Bexon	Response-00185	This is part of the greenbelt. There's already too many developments nearer Ilkeston that are destroying land right by nature reserves.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Jo-Anne Attenborough	Response-00129	This is an important site for dog walkers and walkers who want to enjoy a green and pleasant space. It contributes to residents' well-being and happiness. Building on this site will have a strong negative psychological affect on the residents of West Hallam.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Johnson	Response-01037	Should not be building on green belt land. West Hallam does not want to become an urban sprawl. Green spaces needed for the biodiversity
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Julie Harbon	Response-00022	Leave this area alone! What is the point of having Green Belt if it is ignored and used for profit?
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Julie Harker	Response-01073	We were told when we decided to buy in West Hallam that no more houses would be built. It is important for people's health that we keep our green belt.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Julie Stewardson	Response-00282	Probably been renamed as grey belt but it is vital green belt to us!
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Karen Squire	Response-01040	Controversial but I think we can spare a bit of green belt
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Karina Cooper	Response-00267	This would ruin a beautiful area enjoyed by many residents
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Kay	Response-01030	Definitely taking to much out the green belt will make it way to build up for such a beautiful village
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Kerry	Response-01034	Our green space. Don?t steal it from us
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Kerry Barratt	Response-00168	Wildlife destroyed
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Kerry Middleton	Response-00266	Greenbelt land should not be used for building houses on. It should be used for the public to enjoy recreation and pleasant green surroundings.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Kevin Fox	Response-00682	What?s the point in having green belt protection if Liebour just come in and rip it up!!
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Kian	Response-01493	this was green belt. Why does it have to change. Keep england the way it should be with fields and nice views instead of poor brickwork and shoddy roofs
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Kirsty Oliver	Response-00558	This should just be kept as important green belt. A lot of people invest in their homes for this reason.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Laura Egglestone	Response-01027	Greenbelt should be protected. Also, dong understand why this site has been chosen over others in the area. It has been refused several times with the most recent being got just one dwelling. Each time it has been declined?. What?s different now? Nothing has changed and for this reason it makes a mockery of the whole system if it goes ahead
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Lindsey Lyons	Response-00071	It?s disappointing to see the council is now considering the site, having previously been rejected twice to protect the green belt land. I strongly object to this space being used for housing as green belt is crucial to providing control over expansion of towns / villages. How does this now get initially approved when previously rejected? It is astounding to think the council are being flippant with their decisions.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Mandie frith	Response-00247	Protection needed on all areas we need areas to stop all the flooding ect
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Margaret Lewis	Response-01499	We need to keep more of our green belts to help the planet
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Mark	Response-00164	Green belt doesn,t seem to matter anymore. Why is that? Surely you have wasted opportunities everywhere for building on grey sites x industrial etc. Who needs more warehouses and industrial units? Build on these sites rather than our precious Green belt
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Mark Newton	Response-00179	You don't care about this, but please leave some free land left for the children to look over from their school.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Mark Patenall	Response-00851	I'm led to believe that the proposed site is green belt. You can not change the rules just to support your political mantra. Those are the actions of a dictatorship and will be met with the strongest of resistance and disruption. If you break the rules, don't expect protesters to follow them either.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Mark Power	Response-00276	Destroying green belt is tragic and affects people?s mental health. Greenbelt is designed to protect land to be built on, there are places in Ilkeston that already have sites (industrial) that could be built on so it doesn?t effect green belt.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Max Egglestone	Response-01278	Greenbelt land should be protected to prevent overdevelopment. More suitable and sustainable locations have been proposed in the past. Why are those being overlooked?
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Mr and Mrs Wood	Response-01826	The Covid outbreak in 2019 was a stark reminder how important open spaces are to our mental health. The one thing I love about West Hallam is that feeling of well-being and connection with nature that you get when taking a stroll or walking the dog just a stone?s throw from my house. The numerous fields that surround our village are natural spaces not those contrived by architects. All NIMBYs, I am sure make these points, maybe with justification as we all know that saying ?are these developments just the thin end of the wedge?. Rumours are already circulating, and locals need reassurance.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Mr Brown	Response-00191	Would ruin the Green belt and feel of the village
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Mr J Martinazzoli	Response-00044	The loss of green belt to build houses will increase traffic in an already busy area. This will constitute a very high safety risk to pedestrians and school children from the west hallam school.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Mrs Bird	Response-00045	Quite frankly, building on green belt land is preposterous. There are many brown field sites within the Ilkeston area. Building this proposed development right in the centre of a rural village would set a dangerous precedence with the surrounding area. Further decreasing the gap between Stanley and west hallam.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Mrs Caroline Hooton	Response-00231	This has always been greenbelt so how did/can this be changed. We must protect these areas for the benefit of our environment.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Mrs Judith Pittson	Response-00753	Brown field sites should be built on not the green belt
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Mrs Strelley	Response-00233	It is Green Belt. Areas of the field are boggy. Not suitable for foundations.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Nick Craddock	Response-00145	As per my comments for other west Hallam Proposal
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Nicola Elkington-Horridge	Response-00079	Not sure why you label land greenbelt and apply rules to not building on it and then try and build on it.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Nina Walters	Response-00244	Yes, losing more green belt.
1.9	Non-specific	Green Belt	Patricia Hill	Response-01930	I wish to strongly oppose the above Core Strategy Amendments as the plans will cause Urban Sprawl. The villages will lose their identity and become towns with massive loss to green belt. When these plans are passed, I hope there will be Infrastructure to cover the proposed residence requirements as Spondon are left with inadequate facilities.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Patrick Barber	Response-00280	The site is using greenbelt land so reducing the greenbelt within Erewash.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Patrick Hynes	Response-01902	The proposed site sits entirely within the Green Belt. The land serves as a visual and environmental buffer, supporting not only wildlife but the rural identity of our village. Developing this land undermines the protections the Green Belt is supposed to provide.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Paul aldre	Response-00152	Keep the green belt you can?t just re select as grey or whatever it?s green belt. There?s plenty of broenfieldcsites availsble

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Paula Piggott	Response-01041	You can't keep destroying the countryside destroying habitats, killing wildlife and it all not have a knock on effect. You are destroying the air we breathe. We need flowers, we need bees these things the world can't exist without. The wildlife will seriously be impacted. You will destroy the habitats of many animals needed for the world to survive. This is a small village. With lots of precious animals, insects, flowers, trees etc you will kill these insects and animals when you destroy their habitats thus destroying the air we breathe. There is a school and many bungalows with pensioners. It is a accident waiting to happen. Also dog walkers, horse riders and lots of wildlife. Seriously someone will get hurt or worse killed! It is a small village without the capacity for more houses. The roads are not built for so many extra residents. You will totally destroy the area and you will totally destroy the clean air killing lots of wildlife and their habitats in the process.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Paul Panayiotou	Response-00186	Loss of green belt
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Pete Vanstone	Response-01164	Greenbelt land, is essential in preventing urban sprawl and preserving our countryside. Alternative sites with fewer constraints and more robust infrastructure have previously been suggested. It is deeply concerning that those have been overlooked in favour of this unsuitable location.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Rachel	Response-01015	Destroying beautiful green land.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Rebecca Ricci	Response-00102	Save our green land
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Rebecca Simpson	Response-00113	please stop stealing our natural environment! Once built on, this land is gone forever. Build on brownfield sites!
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Rhonda Holt	Response-00237	Keep the green belt as it is. There is no need to build any further in the periphery of West Hallam.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Richard Walters	Response-00546	Core Strategy Review Amendment - Public Consultation In response to your call for comments on the Core Strategy Review Document I hereby submit my views for your further consideration . My views will be largely confined to the Site Selection Paper, in particular as it relates to West Hallam and more specifically proposals relating to the Land South of West Hallam (CSR-0044) although my comments could equally apply to the other projected site in the village Land North of West Hallam (CSR0048). Point 1 - I note that in relation to site CSR-0044 the Paper states ?the site falls on land that fails to make an important contribution to the Green Belt? (ref p10, first full paragraph 1). I consider this statement, at best, a very subjective construct based on, what appears to be, unsubstantiated opinion. I presume that the justification for this is the assessment against the criteria of Safeguarding the Countryside from encroachment Checking the Unrestricted Sprawl of Large Built-Up Areas, and Preventing Neighbouring Towns Merging I further note that four sites at the Junction of St Wilfrids Road and High Lane Central ( CSR0004 & CSR0004 a, b and c) were rejected as meeting the above Green Belt criteria. I am unable to discern or find any evidence in the review as to why these sites meet the criteria and those at CSR0044 and CSR0048 do not. This distinction seems to arise purely from the unsubstantiated and subjective views of the paper?s author rather than any detailed and objective in depth analysis of the respective sites contribution to the Green Belt. In fact a case may be made that the Beech Lane site (CSR0044) indeed makes a greater contribution in meeting the criteria vis Safeguarding the Countryside from encroachment :- the immediate presence of large scale urban encroachment is far more apparent on the Beech Lane site, sitting as it does on the edge of West Hallam central/core housing developments. Whereas the rejected sites (CSR004 etc) only lie adjacent to the lesser populated ribbon developments of the village. Over my time living in the village I have monitored the habitat contribution of the Beech Lane site. I have for example, to date recorded 53 bird, 15 mammal and 4 amphibian species on this site. As such it makes a valuable contribution to the countryside that would be jeopardised rather than safeguarded if housing development were to proceed. Taken as a whole the Beech Lane site has, at least as diverse a range of countryside attributes (hedges, adjoining woodland, wetland habitat, ditches, grassland perfect for ?predator? hunters such as owls and hawks) as any of the ?rejected? sites. Checking the Unrestricted Sprawl of Large Built Up Areas:- with a current population of c.6000 in 2600 households (2001 census) West Hallam already has a population that surpasses that of several East Midland towns. This raises the existential question as to what is the fundamental nature of West Hallam as a community. Again the pressure from built up area sprawl is already more keenly felt at site CSR 0044 than at the ?rejected? village sites so it is difficult to understand why the Green Belt criteria apply to ?rejected sites? and not the Beech Lane site. Preventing Neighbourhood Towns Merging:- Suffice it to say that I can perceive no more justification in saying this criteria applies to the rejected sites than in doing so for the Beech Lane site (CSR0044). If there is a distinction to be made it needs to be justified/quantified. Point 2 Tr
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Richard Walters	Response-00546	affic and Services The main core of the village, the Village and the Estate, is already poorly served by access and egress roads. This already creates excessive traffic congestion particularly at peak periods. This can be further exacerbated by:- the frequency of road works necessitated by the aging services infrastructure of the village e.g. utilities and the subsidence legacy of the mining past The presence of the village school and main playing fields adjoining one of those main access/egress points. Further housing development without improved/additional road infrastructure, as currently envisioned, is only going to worsen an already problematic situation. In Summary I note both the rejected and proposed housing proposals. However I cannot see that any case has been satisfactorily made justifying why some sites have been deemed to meet the Green Belt criteria and others do not do so. The only rather spurious justification appears to be that of expedience and opportunity! That the Land South of West Hallam (CSR0044) has an absentee owner who is only too willing to facilitate its development and, in doing so, meet the Authorities targets. In particular I would expect far greater transparency and justification as to why the report states that some sites meet the Green Belt criteria while others do not. THE SITE SELECTION PAPER FAILS TO MAKE ANY SUBSTANTIVE CASE WHY SOME SITES MEET THE GREEN BELT CRITERIA BUT OTHERS DO NOT.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Robert Flatley	Response-00978	This development would take place on existing greenbelt land
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Robert Hall	Response-00630	Development on the Green Belt should not occur in the absence of special circumstances.Such circumstances have not been established.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Robert Mee	Response-01581	My main reason for objecting to these developments is that I do not believe that the criteria set out in the NPPF has been met justifying any encroachment into the Green Belt at this time. The Core Strategy and this Amendment are developed in order to meet the housing targets allocated to the council by central government. I do not believe that the number of houses required by government constitutes, in itself, the 'exceptional circumstances' which are required under the Framework. This is particularly so in view of there being no published objective basis for the numbers allocated to each authority. The term 'exceptional circumstances' does include 'instances where an authority cannot meet its identified need for homes'. The waiting list for social housing in the general area might suggest that this is the case, but I do not accept that these plans will go far to address this issue. The vast majority of the planned housing allocations are not even for affordable housing, let alone social housing. Additionally, I do not remember seeing evidence that Erewash has specifically quantified local (i.e. Erewash) housing needs. I also do not believe that much, if any, of the Green Belt selected for development would fit the definition of 'Grey Belt'. As a concept, I can support the idea of Grey Belt as originally reported, i.e. pieces of land within the Green Belt which have previously been developed. Indeed, I can think of a few locally, though they are all fairly small. I find the arguments that I have heard over distances between the edge of Derby and the edge of other towns, and how these distances will still be maintained, extremely spurious. The Green Belt in its entirety exists to prevent Nottingham and Derby from merging. While building on any of these sites does not immediately make the two cities any closer to each other, it does reduce the green space between the two cities, which is precisely what the Green Belt was established to prevent. The Green Belt is a regional initiative, covering two counties and several local authorities. With Erewash having such a high proportion of its land earmarked as Green Belt it is incumbent on the region as a whole to find a solution to the housing shortage, rather than to expect our authority to have to sacrifice its green spaces.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Robert Mee	Response-01511	My main reason for objecting to these developments is that I do not believe that the criteria set out in the NPPF has been met justifying any encroachment into the Green Belt at this time. The Core Strategy and this Amendment are developed in order to meet the housing targets allocated to the council by central government. I do not believe that the number of houses required by government constitutes, in itself, the 'exceptional circumstances' which are required under the Framework. This is particularly so in view of there being no published objective basis for the numbers allocated to each authority. The term 'exceptional circumstances' does include 'instances where an authority cannot meet its identified need for homes'. The waiting list for social housing in the general area might suggest that this is the case, but I do not accept that these plans will go far to address this issue. The vast majority of the planned housing allocations are not even for affordable housing, let alone social housing. Additionally, I do not remember seeing evidence that Erewash has specifically quantified local (i.e. Erewash) housing needs. I also do not believe that much, if any, of the Green Belt selected for development would fit the definition of 'Grey Belt'. As a concept, I can support the idea of Grey Belt as originally reported, i.e. pieces of land within the Green Belt which have previously been developed. Indeed, I can think of a few locally, though they are all fairly small. I find the arguments that I have heard over distances between the edge of Derby and the edge of other towns, and how these distances will still be maintained, extremely spurious. The Green Belt in its entirety exists to prevent Nottingham and Derby from merging. While building on any of these sites does not immediately make the two cities any closer to each other, it does reduce the green space between the two cities, which is precisely what the Green Belt was established to prevent. The Green Belt is a regional initiative, covering two counties and several local authorities. With Erewash having such a high proportion of its land earmarked as Green Belt it is incumbent on the region as a whole to find a solution to the housing shortage, rather than to expect our authority to have to sacrifice its green spaces.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Robert Reynolds	Response-00260	The council/government should look for brown belt land to build on, rather than eating into the greenbelt with its associated ecological impacts.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	sam richards	Response-01467	this is green belt land, which has been denied planning permission many times by the lands current owner, for obvious reasons. it is beyond me how the council suddenly feel it is ok to build here taking away more green from the village which it is already lacking in.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Sarah Taylor	Response-01819	Green belt needs to be preserved.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Scott wright	Response-00089	Green belt should be protected. Residents have purchased housing in West Hallam to benefit from being a village and embracing nature. More crammed in, thrown up housing does not adhere to the protection of our green belt and village status.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	sharon hickson	Response-01430	you should never build on green belt land it is protected for a reason, I think our green spaces however small or large help with peoples mental health and nurture wildlife to help maintain environments. always protect our open spaces
		Green Belt	Shelly Meer	Response-00116	Worried about the plans for further expansion onto our lovely countryside.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Simon Reeve	Response-01080	The fields between West Hallam Village and Kirk Hallam, just like those between High Lane, West Hallam and Shipley/Heanor Road, Ilkeston support a diverse population of wildlife with open fields, woodlands, marsh land, lakes and streams/rivers. Removing any part of this environment for housing should be banned on this basis alone, there be no home for nature and "not cutting the grass verges" (to save money) won't make a difference.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Stacey Eady	Response-01529	Beech Lane As you will be aware this specific piece of land has been identified for development on several occasions within the last five years and was previously included in the work that was conducted for the core strategy before it was amended. At this point, it was removed from the plan. You will no doubt be aware that this has been the subject of objections on more than one occasion, not for just one reason but for several very valid ones which I would like to reiterate. So I, and many others, are asking why this site is being considered once again, when the situation concerning the land, infrastructure and position has not changed? I have been advised that this most recent inclusion of the Beech Lane site is not due to the recent changes in the Green Belt policy that was implemented in late 2024, as you have confirmed to me that you are not using this policy. I'm lead to believe that you are using the previous version of the policy that was in place at the beginning of the revised core strategy, and this was much earlier(2022). This merely creates more confusion about the desire to include the land in question. As the alternative site (CSR0004) on St Wilfrids Road in West Hallam had been rejected during this policy period, as a result of satisfying the Green Belt criteria, you will surely understand, having visited both sites, that this St Wilfrids site offers far less in terms of the Green Belt criteria than that of Beech Lane. This latter site has several mature trees that promenade the front of Beech Lane, not to mention the thousand of birds/wildlife and plants it houses and it's vital contribution to the mainainance of the conservation area that is within very close proximity. With the Safeguarded Land that is being discussed still been used for agricultural purposes, I feel that there is some misjudgment as to how these different sites scored and maybe this was influenced by the sudden need to deliver outcomes quickly rather than actually scoring this appropriately. As such, I wish to challenge the findings as the report doesn't clearly outline the process.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Teresa Faulkner-Day	Response-00242	The green belt area is a protected area for a reason, it can't just be concreted over for a few more houses. It needs to remain protected and other more suitable areas need to be considered.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Teresa Webster	Response-00086	Most residents have chosen to move out of the towns and cities to enjoy a more rural way of life. As the green belt gets ?eaten up? we will slowly lose the village atmosphere and the wildlife that we are surrounded by
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Tracey Barks	Response-00111	Save the green spaces , we need them. West Hallam is not a town and should never be turned into one. Our children and future generations need these spaces
1.9	South of West Hallam	Green Belt	Victoria Walker	Response-00228	Building on a green belt should be a last resort, especially when there are plenty of brown/grey belt that can be built on where new transport links can be created.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Adam Spencer	Response-00054	Healthcare facilities in the village are already overstretched and are often having to send people to alternative GPs, the additional 90 homes with no extra healthcare provision is going to have a negative impact on both the current and potential new residents
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Alesha Johnson	Response-00783	We live in the village and can see that the health care provider is already overwhelmed. We struggle to get the help we need from the healthcare services available.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Alice Johnson	Response-00093	impossible to get an appt at the doctors as it is. never mind adding potentially 300-400 people into the surgeries
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Alison Reynolds	Response-00243	Already cannot support current housing
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Alison Stills	Response-01057	Reducing the ability to access timely appointments for healthcare
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Amy Cartwright	Response-01017	The local drs surgeries are already at capacity with regular appointments taking at least 2 weeks to get in, another nearly 200 people trying to access this already stretched service is wrong
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Andrea Cochrane	Response-01485	The current healthcare services in the village are too limited to meet the needs of a proposed large influx of new patients. If the proposed development goes ahead, there will be further delays for anyone seeking medical treatment who is unable to travel outside West Hallam. Or alternatively, it will mean new residents having to travel for treatment, and so adding to the congestion on the roads.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Andrew and Julie Douglas	Response-00146	The doctors in the village are more than busy. No appointments are available and there will be even less with at least another 180 patients This will be a dangerous situation
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Andrew Zielinski-Raynor	Response-00135	From personal experience I know that it is already frustratingly hard to get a Doctors appointment in the Village. An increase in population will simply result in an increased burden on an already overstretched service. Potentially putting people?s lives at risk.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Angela Reid	Response-00134	No appointments
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Anita Lawrence	Response-00726	Services such as childcare and doctors are already unable to meet residents' needs, the addition of more housing within the village will put further strain on these services. It can take 4+ weeks to obtain an appointment with a GP and recently took 5 weeks for even a telephone consultation with the practice pharmacist . Increased housing will only exacerbate this problem.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Anna	Response-00112	We don?t have enough of anything anymore! Why aren?t doctors / schools and leisure facilities being built instead of all this ridiculous housing? Where are the people supposed to go?
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Ann Ainsworth	Response-01096	Already inadequate to meet the needs of existing population
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Anna Richardson	Response-00162	Healthcare facilities in west hallam are at maximum capacity and there are no NHS dentist places available at all locally
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Anne Vanstone	Response-01216	Healthcare is another worry ? waiting times for GP appointments now regularly exceed five weeks. Patients are frequently offered appointments out of area. The current medical infrastructure simply isn?t coping.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	A Redshaw	Response-00287	It is already impossible to register with a local doctor
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Benjamin Price	Response-00257	It is currently a 3-4 week wait to get an appointment at the GP in West Hallam. By increasing the population of the village you?re putting a higher strain on those NHS services and reducing the service which they provide the the residents
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Ben Rodney	Response-00122	Already cannot get appointments let alone adding another 90 homes
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Charles Brooks	Response-00535	I'm sure Councillors are very aware of the declining lack of healthcare facilities in West Hallam. Its extremely difficult to get an appointment with a GP (no full time GP practicing in West Hallam) and you even have to go to Ilkeston for a simple blood test. The current practice cannot cope with the existing demand. Where are the occupants of the proposed new development meant to go to receive their medical care.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Charlotte Lun	Response-00150	The doctor?s surgery in West Hallam is at full capacity. Surrounding surgeries are at full capacity. Where will families moving into 90 additional homes go for GP treatment? It will put additional pressure on an already struggling area.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Chris Collins	Response-00037	Thankfully I use a doctor outside of the village who is fabulous. I hear nothing good about the capacity challenges faced with people attending the village doctor surgeries. To add further people to this without adding capacity / capability would be negligent.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Christine	Response-01019	Increased pressure on the Doctors surgery, when it already is too busy for a blood test and appointments are 3 weeks in advance
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Christine Barnes	Response-00640	Healthcare is already overstretched and cannot meet the current demand .
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Claire dean	Response-00069	There is a demand for the local services, most of us have to already travel out to access health care
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	David Fretwell	Response-00133	It?s currently taking around 3 weeks to get my son into a the doctors for a return appointment. Increasing the population of West Hallam is only going to to make this worse
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Dean Wright	Response-00094	Healthcare provisions are already stretched without more homes in the area
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Diane Reynolds	Response-00216	Doctors are already at capacity and having to wait months for an appointment with more houses this will only make the situation worse and potentially dangerous for people who need to see a doctor
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Eileen Bailey	Response-00213	Can?t get an appointment now
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Emmet Barnes	Response-01053	Doctors are missing in West Hallam
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Emily Reeve	Response-01495	It is difficult to get a doctor?s appointment as it is in the village.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Emily Reynolds	Response-00149	Same as schools really. It's difficult enough to get a doctors appointment as it is and the pharmacy always seems to be very busy. You cannot add 90 new homes to the village and expect everything to be okay and that it won't have a huge impact on the people already living here and the surrounding areas like ilkeston, and to the health care facilities.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Emma Lound	Response-00187	The local surgery is already busy. The plan does not address the need for more doctors places or additional funding to cope with the increase in residents...which could be up to 300 more people to cater for.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Francesca Dean	Response-00221	Again, no health care services to those who already live in west hallam. We already have to go to ilkeston for ours! It's a risk to everyone who already loves here
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Gary Hamson	Response-00052	Has anyone checked if the local GP Practice have availability?
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Gillian Bosworth	Response-00921	Healthcare facilities are already very stretched in this area.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Glenn Richardson	Response-00316	It?s already impossible to register for an nhs dentist in this area & almost as hard to get a doctors appointment..We?ve lived in the village for over 20 years & only our kids can get a dentist locally.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Heidi Spencer	Response-00189	The current doctors in the village doesn?t have capacity to serve the community never mind adding another 90 houses and families into the mix
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Helen Collins	Response-00034	I understand that the 2 local practices in the village are already overstretched with appointments hard to obtain. There is not capacity to support the additional numbers of inhabitants proposed.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Helen fox	Response-00064	The proposed construction of additional housing could negatively impact the healthcare system. An increase in population may strain existing medical resources, leading to longer wait times and reduced access to care for residents. Furthermore, the influx of new residents could overwhelm local healthcare facilities, diminishing the quality of services available. This situation could ultimately be detrimental to the overall well-being of the village, as adequate healthcare is essential for maintaining a healthy community.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Helen Johnson	Response-00170	Would put extra strain on the practice
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Helen Patenall	Response-00868	Again, another inadequate service in the village. The surgeries in the Dales often refer patients to Littlewick medical centre which is some 3 miles away, all too frequently the only service provided by the Dales medical centre is a consultation by telephone, this clearly is not satisfactory.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Helen Vickseds	Response-00062	Both doctors are already busy within West Hallam and people struggle to get access. Therefore additional housing will only seek to increase the impact
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Holly Mohamed	Response-00076	Strain on Healthcare Services: The local healthcare facilities, such as West Hallam Medical Centre, are already under pressure. An influx of new residents could exacerbate this, leading to longer wait times and reduced quality of care. The medical centre currently serves a large number of patients, and additional residents could overwhelm the existing healthcare infrastructure. Limited Capacity: With only a few medical centres in the area, the additional population may overwhelm the existing healthcare infrastructure. This could result in longer waiting times for appointments and reduced access to essential healthcare services.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Iain Harrison	Response-01214	I have lived in West Hallam for 20 years. When we first moved here, accessing healthcare was straightforward?I could see a GP without difficulty and register with an NHS dentist locally. Now, it?s virtually impossible to get a doctor?s appointment, with both surgeries constantly full and waiting times unacceptably long. NHS dental care is entirely unavailable in the area. The healthcare infrastructure is already stretched beyond capacity. Adding more housing?and by extension, more residents?will place even greater strain on already overburdened services. To continue building on greenbelt land in a village already at breaking point is irresponsible and deeply concerning. This proposal reflects a complete disregard for the well-being of current residents and the long-term sustainability of the community.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Iris Howes	Response-01169	GP services are already stretched, with delays of up to five weeks for appointments. Residents are being directed to practices outside the village.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Jacqueline Shakh	Response-00095	Can't get in at the doctors now

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	James Johnson	Response-01125	Local schools and GP surgeries are already under considerable pressure, with limited capacity to absorb a large influx of new residents. No clear or deliverable plan has been provided to show how these essential services will be expanded to meet additional demand. Without this, the development would reduce the quality and accessibility of local education and healthcare for existing residents.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	James Morris	Response-01060	Takes along time to be seen by a doctor we don't have the infrastructure
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Jane Marshall	Response-01172	Already difficult to get an appointment with a healthcare practitioner.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Jane Taylor	Response-01023	The drs surgeries in the village are already at capacity and it would be detrimental to existing villagers to have this stretched even further
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Jane Zielinski-Raynor	Response-01095	Can't get doctors appointments now - with 90 more families it would be even worse
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Jenny Stanbridge	Response-00088	Not enough appointment as it is at local doctors
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Jo-Anne Attenborough	Response-00129	Have you tried to get a doctors appointment in West Hallam lately? Given , Doctor Burns is now operating his private practice, getting appointments will be even more challenging. We do not need more housing so more people are competing for the appointments that are available.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Jon Skelson	Response-01025	West Hallam medical centre seems busy all the time. Can it support more patients while still delivering the correct quality of service ?
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Josh August	Response-00084	It is already difficult to get to see your doctor, without there being more in the village
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Judith Hare	Response-01014	As it stands you cannot get into the doctors in the village within s as couple of weeks. No staff and not enough doctors now never mind after more houses are built
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Julie Harbon	Response-00022	It is very difficult to get an appointment at The Dales Medical Centre now. Usually we have to go to Littlewick in Ilkeston. It is clear that there is insufficient resources for current patients without any additions.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Julie Harker	Response-01073	The same with the doctors. You have to wait long enough for an appointment as it is !!!!!
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Julie Stewardson	Response-00282	Can't get an appointment as it is with only two part time doctors at The Dales Medical Centre. No capacity for extra patients at all without expansion of the services.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Julie Wright	Response-00091	The Health Service in the village is always difficult to access more patients would make it even worse.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Karen Squire	Response-01040	There are two surgeries and a chemist . I don't know how busy they are . I assume busy as you can never get in .
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Karina Cooper	Response-00267	This is shocking. How do you propose to meet the needs of 90 more households when it already takes 3 weeks for a gp appointment locally.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Katie	Response-00047	Adding extra houses will have a huge impact on healthcare. Residents already find it difficult to access.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Katie Rice	Response-00036	We already can't get appointments at our doctors, it would be a nightmare with even more families using our doctors surgeries
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Ken Mitchell	Response-00763	The doctors surgeries in West Hallam are already overwhelmed. There is currently ana average of 4 weeks wait for a routine GP appointment.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Ken Musson	Response-00900	The village does not have the infrastructure to support more housing in terms of doctors
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Kerry	Response-01034	Struggle to get a GP appointment ad it is. More people put pressure on the current system
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Kerry Barratt	Response-00168	Already awful to obtain a GP appointment
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Kerry Middleton	Response-00266	An already overstretched health care provider, would be unable to cope with a growing population.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Kevin Fox	Response-00682	West Hallam would benefit from a single health care practice, I've no idea why we have 2 separate practices! They need to amalgamate and offer one for all in a bigger health care practice and not separate widening appointments from the one?
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Kirsty Oliver	Response-00558	Already a nightmare to get appointments without the influx of new residents.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Laura Egglestone	Response-01027	Waiting times for appointments are currently around 5 weeks. If you try for an on the day appointment then we get redirected to Ilkeston as they cannot good with current demand.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Linda Webster	Response-00744	I do not think the doctors' surgeries would cope with an influx of new patients, you cannot get an appointment as it is.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Lindsey Lyons	Response-00071	The local Doctors already struggle to get residents that use the service an appointment within 24 hours, usually having to wait a minimum of 7 days. Additional housing increases the need for more Dr's appointments being available, this has not been mentioned in the proposal. How do you propose this will be managed? It needs to have a plan and not just ?winged? in the best hope that the occupants of the new houses will not use the local Dr's.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Louise Annison	Response-01049	Healthcare's already strained,
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Louise Hunt	Response-01032	GP surgery in village not big enough to accomodate.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Mandie frith	Response-00247	Over stretched have to go to Ilkeston one due to capacity n West Hallam already. More houses more capacity
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Mark	Response-00164	Doctors surgeries are a nightmare to get any sort of attention never mind a face to face appointment. More people more problems surely! There are no Dnetists locally for NHS patients!
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Mark Baker	Response-00110	What impact will additional houses have on an already overwhelmed clinic?
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Mark Patenall	Response-00851	The two surgeries we currently have in the village cannot cope with the numbers of residents we have now. The service is quite frankly terrible and will only get worse with an increase in the village population
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Mark Power	Response-00276	It takes around one month to get an appointment if your lucky in the doctors in West Hallam
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Matt Haddon	Response-00696	This site would also put a huge additional significant load on the Doctors surgeries, which are already heavily subscribed making it very difficult to get appointments, and would therefore be putting peoples health at risk.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Matthew Lyons	Response-00061	It's already hard the get a doctors appointment in, how will the local doctors cope with more patients?
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Maureen Briggs	Response-00190	It will make a big difference to the health of everyone if the Dr s have to take on more patients without making extra provisions for them.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Max Egglestone	Response-01278	Healthcare provision is also at a breaking point. Waiting times for GP appointments regularly exceed five weeks, and residents are often referred to clinics in Ilkeston rather than their local practice. The system is already stretched too thin to take on more patients.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Max Longdon	Response-00128	Have you tried to get a doctors appointment in west Hallam . Last time I tried I was told it would be quicker to attend Ripley hospital drop in centre. Overcrowded already
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Michelle	Response-00148	It's hard enough trying to get an app at the doctors without having more people in the area needing help.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	M Mcfarlane	Response-00147	There is 1 doctor for the whole of west Hallam which is totally unacceptable for those in need. The waiting time to see a doctor would be well over 2 months if this were to happen
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Mr and Mrs Mellors	Response-01797	West Hallam does not have the infrastructure to support a large influx of new residents, existing GP services are already stretched. Adding more families without expanding essential services would place an unfair and unsustainable burden on current facilities, negatively affecting both existing and new residents.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Mrs Bird	Response-00045	The surgeries at the Dales and west hallam medical centre are already full to capacity. Added housing would further put pressure on this.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Mrs Glenda Orchard	Response-01490	Dr fascilities already too busy to get appointments
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Mrs Strelley	Response-00233	The doctor's surgery is bursting already. It can't cope with all it's patient intake at the best of times. Where are you going to build another surgery. How are the local hospitals going to cope?
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Natalie Payne	Response-01523	The doctors surgeries in the village are already over subscribed and getting a gp appointment is already difficult
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Nick Craddock	Response-00145	As per my comments for other west Hallam Proposal
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Nicola Elkington-Horridge	Response-00079	Their is a short supply of health care services already in westhallam this will only add to the strain on the NHS to this area. West Hallis already struggling with too many appointments with many villagers having to go further away for treatment, making village life more like town life!
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Nicole Brookman	Response-01559	i struggle to get into my doctors, you cant get appointments, you have to ring at 8 and when you get through the appointments have already gone. i am at west hallam medical centre. my inlaws, who are elderly are at the other one in the village and they can never get in so they have to go to one in ilkeston. my mother in law doesnt drive so relies on us taking her in. The pharmacy often has a que, but ou do have to rely on it as you cant see a doctor in the village. there is no dentist in west hallam. i couldnt get on ein the area for years so had to travel to long Eaton, which is half an hour away
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Nina Walters	Response-00244	Yes
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Pamela Fox	Response-01242	The Healthcare services are already stretched to the point that it is very rare to get an appointment in the village surgery on several occasions I have been sent to Littlewick centre in Ilkeston and also to Ilkeston Hospital if I didn't have my own transport I would find it difficult to attend these appointments
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Patrick Barber	Response-00280	There is a lack of primary health care provision within the local area with long waiting lists for a GP appointment.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Patrick Hynes	Response-01902	GP waiting times in our area often exceed five weeks, and many residents are now being directed to clinics in Ilkeston. This is not acceptable now, and certainly not sustainable if the population grows.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Paul aldred	Response-00152	The village health care is possibly one of the worst around
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Paula Piggott	Response-01041	Health care facilities are already strained there isn't the capacity for extra patients.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Pauline wood	Response-01100	Precious few doctors now to go round without adding more bodies
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Peter Lilley	Response-00161	It is already impossible to get an appointment at our two local surgeries. Adding another 300 residents to the mix is madness without providing extra facilities
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Pete Vanstone	Response-01164	Local GP practices are overstretched, with waiting times for non-urgent appointments exceeding five weeks. Many residents are being redirected to Ilkeston for care, despite being registered locally ? highlighting just how overwhelmed the service already is. Adding another large group of households to this catchment would only make access to care even more difficult.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Rachel	Response-01015	The doctors surgery in the village only had 2 GPs getting an appointment is somewhat impossible already.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Rhonda Holt	Response-00237	Littlewick, Dales and West Hallam Medical Centre are at capacity.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Richard Brewell	Response-01028	Healthcare in the area for West Hallam residents is currently appalling, with insufficient practitioners and with long wait time for appointments, including gp and simple tasks such as blood tests. Having more residents will take a poor service and stretch it to breaking point. This is exacerbated as many current residents in the area are already mature or aging and who will need this healthcare.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Robert Dodd	Response-00201	Infrastructure is not set up for additional housing occupants. Doctors are already a nightmare to get access to
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Robert Flatley	Response-00978	This development would place and increased strain on the two medical facilities located within the Village where appointments are already hard to come by. Furthermore, these facilities are not able to extend or expand at their current premises due to constraints of the buildings already there.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Robert Hall	Response-00630	Existing health services are already fully stretched. NHS dentistry is not available for new adult patients in the area.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Robert Reynolds	Response-00260	The doctors in the village already have a massive amount of patients. No mention has been made of opening new medical practices etc to support an increase in population.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Ruby Reid	Response-00119	Added pressures on the local GP's and pharmacy services
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	sam richards	Response-01467	i dont know where to start on this one - healthcare facilities are almost non existent in the village. i can never get myself or my family into our registered doctors in the village when needed and get sent to ilkeston surgery instead which is very inconvenient. if plans go ahead for 90 houses this will bring a lot more residents to the area who will not be able to use a local surgery. there is also a lack of dentists with space, and none taking on nhs adults.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Sarah James	Response-01085	Already pressured.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Sarah Taylor	Response-00115	There are two Dr's surgeries one being Monday to Friday WH Medical Centre and the other open a couple of days a week. Medical appointments are already outsourced to Littlewick Medical Centre in Ilkeston which is not helpful if unwell if you don't have own transport and thinking of using a bus they do not operate regularly around here. If you have to have blood taken that is outsourced too, closest place for that is Ilkeston. As a WH resident we are already having to travel out for these services that once were in house more people will cause more strain to an already stretched service.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Sarah Taylor	Response-01819	The doctors surgeries already have very long waiting times for their patients so they wouldn't be able to cope with more.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	sharon hickson	Response-01430	we can not get doctors appointments in the village now , adding more people to the doctors list will create less appointments for the locals already in west Hallam
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Simon Reeve	Response-01080	The ability to get a doctor's appointment is a bit of a joke, the doctors surgeries are all over prescribed, chemists are too busy trying to pick up the slack and dentists are near impossible to get in to, we travel 40 minutes away to a dentist. There simply cannot be more pressure through new housing on a breaking system
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Sophie	Response-01105	Do you think the already struggling GP services are going to be able to facilitate 90 extra family's?
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Stacey Eady	Response-01529	Some reflections on the Health and Well-Being aspects of the proposal: - Will it reduce health inequalities? No, but this is no different for all of the sites in West Hallam. - Will it improve access to health services? No - Health Service provision in the village is currently inadequate and residents are being directed to local safety-net services such as Littlewick Medical Centre in Ilkeston and the nearest walk-in centres. Older residents find access to these alternatives quite difficult, especially when not feeling well. - Will it increase the opportunities for recreational physical activity? No, this is the same for all of the sites - Will it bring new open spaces or improve the quality of existing open spaces? No ? this is the same for all sites. However, the Beech Lane site will tarnish the visual aspect of our historical village centre and negatively impact the nearby Conservation Area. - Will it improve access to local food-growing opportunities? No - this is the same for all sites. However, I note that the 'Safeguarded Land' on Beech Lane seems to be the only land that is currently used for an agriculture purpose, and this land is worked annually to provide feed for local animals.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Teresa Faulkner-Day	Response-00242	The doctors surgeries, dentists and chemist's already struggle massively to meet the needs of the community. Forcing us to go out of the village to receive basic health care
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Teresa Hall	Response-00270	It is difficult to get appointments at the local GPs surgery with the population of the village as it is
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Teresa Webster	Response-00086	Health care facilities in the village are already stretched and we find often that we are unable to get appointments and have to go to other surgeries. This will become more of a problem if the population increases
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Tina Jay	Response-01801	The Doctor's surgery/health care at The Dales Shopping Centre is not capable of coping with such a high influx of new patients. Current patients already now need to travel out of the village to Little Wick Medical Centre in Ilkeston and Ilkeston hospital for their appointments as West Hallam Medical Centre is not able to cope with the amount of appointments needed. Patients are also needing to wait far longer now for appointments, with the already increasing number of people in the area, and particularly for more serious conditions requiring the need to see a Doctor, which can involve waiting over a month to be seen.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Tracey Barks	Response-00111	West Hallam already struggles with health care provision. Getting a Doctors appointment is nigh on impossible. An extra 90 households will add to this burden resulting in inadequate health provision for all
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Val Stevens	Response-01070	It is extremely difficult to get an appointment at our surgery and travelling to Ilkeston is often our only option, more families would exacerbate this problem.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Vicky Buckley	Response-00182	already overcrowded
1.9	South of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Victoria Walker	Response-00228	I live in the village. I cannot get an appointment at the dales medical centre when I need one. Assuming 90 houses and 3 people in these houses on average, where are 270 people going to register for GP services? I cannot get a local NHS dentist. Again, where will these people register?
1.9	South of West Hallam	Landscape	Adam Spencer	Response-00054	The proposed new development will alter the landscape of the village and will impede on the picturesque countryside vies which attracted so many people to the village in the first place
1.9	South of West Hallam	Landscape	Alex	Response-01026	What makes living in West Hallam so special is the green space that surrounds us and the beautiful rolling landscapes that you can view from our village. We don't agree that these houses should be built here and it's people who don't live here that get to make the decision to build these houses but you aren't the ones who have to live with them on your door step and have them built on your dog walking routes.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Landscape	Andrew Zielinski-Raynor	Response-00135	The proposed site is essentially along a ridge overlooking rolling countryside. In building here the countryside aspect from miles around will be gone forever .
1.9	South of West Hallam	Landscape	Angela Reid	Response-00134	Views and walking taken away
1.9	South of West Hallam	Landscape	Ann Toplis	Response-00271	Building more houses here would spoil the countryside round this area.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Landscape	Benjamin Price	Response-00257	I walk my dog through that green field every day, as do a number of other dog walkers. It is local and convenient and a refreshing way for me to clean my mind
1.9	South of West Hallam	Landscape	Bruce Broughton	Response-01534	The development of this area would not respect or preserve identified landscape character nor have any positive impact on visual amenity.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Landscape	Carl fox	Response-00067	Will ruin the village feel
1.9	South of West Hallam	Landscape	Carly Denham	Response-00292	Ruin the look of the village
1.9	South of West Hallam	Landscape	Charles Brooks	Response-00535	West Hallam is a rural location and its identity must be preserved. We are a very close knit community who enjoy living in the countryside and enjoy the wonderful walks and green areas on our doorstep. Is it so necessary to disturb this.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
	South of West Hallam	landscape	Chloe Parkin	Response-00154	Building here will ruin the landscape of the lovely village.
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Chris Collins	Response-00037	As a village it would be preferable to not have more housing. To try and not come across as a NIMBY however, the current location means that the countryside starts across the road from the school, at the top of Hallam Way, at the end of The Village - changing this would be a significant impact to the landscape of the village and hundreds of people
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Christopher Chambers	Response-00172	The proposed development will decimate the existing landscape.
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Connor Gratton	Response-00232	The area is a commonly-used and very pleasant walking area. Destroying this will have a negative impact on the village.
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Daniel Hickson	Response-00177	Will be ruined
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	David Fretwell	Response-00133	Part of the attraction of living in the village is it is surrounded by beautiful landscapes and walks. Adding houses both reduces the attraction, impacts the local wildlife and can have a negative impact on villagers mental state
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	David Morrell	Response-00477	This would irreversibly impact the open countryside views from west Hallam and take away from The conversation area
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	David Richards	Response-01465	The openness of this site is an important characteristic of the village and provides relief form the otherwise densely populated pattern of development. The loss of this will be harmful in this regard. The impact on the adjacent conservation area will be significant and this should be avoided. A densely populated housing development adjacent to a historic farmstead is inappropriate.
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Dean Wright	Response-00094	The view across the dales will be irrevocably lost, with extensive habitat lost
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Emily Reeve	Response-01495	The current landscape is used by lots of people. From dog walkers to children heading to the fields and woods to play.
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Emily Reynolds	Response-00149	The houses would be a scar on the landscape.
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Francesca Dean	Response-00221	What landscape? There won't be any with houses there!
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Gary Hamson	Response-00052	This site with the safeguard land will severely affect residents living on Beech Lane
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Glenn Richardson	Response-00316	Such a detrimental impact on the landscape & the diverse wildlife habitat .For many residents it's their only view of gods great countryside
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Guiliano Ricci	Response-01010	Building an estate on this land will impact on my views
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Helen Collins	Response-00034	It's a pleasure to be able to live so close to open land, people have invested in the location of their home for this reason. To have this taken away and spoiled is not acceptable. One small area, becomes another and another until large areas of land are lost. New houses are often 3 stories to capitalise on quantity of houses in a small area, which also effect the landscape.
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Helen fox	Response-00064	Increased construction can lead to changes in land use and drainage patterns, exacerbating the risk of flooding. This not only threatens the safety of residents but can also damage infrastructure and disrupt local ecosystems. Furthermore, the potential for flooding may deter new residents and investors, ultimately hindering the village's growth and economic stability. The long-term consequences of such environmental challenges could be detrimental to the community's overall well-being and sustainability.
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Helen Johnson	Response-00170	All tha will be seen is houses
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Helen Patenall	Response-00868	The proposed development is alleged to " keep line of site views", this statement is nonsense, the view of rolling hills and a much treasured historic landmark (Cat and Fiddle Windmill) will be blighted and obscured from view for residents of our village
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Jacqueline Shakh	Response-00095	Spoiling beautiful views for existing residents.
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	James Morris	Response-01060	Ruining the landscape for people that have lived there years
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Jenny Butler	Response-00202	West Hallam has always had open spaces and countryside views. This is going to be an ugly unwanted addition
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Jo-Anne Attenborough	Response-00129	This is an important site for dog walkers and walkers who want to enjoy a green and pleasant space. It contributes to residents well being and happiness. Building on this site will have a strong negative psychological affect on the residents of West Hallam.
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Johnson	Response-01037	The development will have an impact on the landscape we need green spaces
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Josh August	Response-00084	There is nothing better than looking out of your window and seeing the beautiful Derbyshire countryside. Building these houses will completely ruin all of that
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Julie August	Response-01064	Ruins the landscape of the area
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Julie Harbon	Response-00022	I?m glad the proposal protects the south facing aspect of some of the original houses. As I live at The Village end of Beech Lane, it certainly will affect my view! We have lived here for 25 years and chose this house partly for the open aspect across the road, which we will lose.
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Julie Harker	Response-01073	Again we chose to live here because of the green landscape. It is what makes West Hallam a beautiful place to live
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Julie Wright	Response-00091	We need to keep green areas
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Karen Squire	Response-01040	It?s a sloping hill down towards a massive storage depot . It?s not like you?re looking over the Brazilian rain forest
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Katie Rice	Response-00036	This will be ruining the view and peace of all the houses that back on to these fields, bought because of the view and will make there houses less desirable to live in or sell
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Kay	Response-01030	I think it will take away from the beauty of the village and will make it look more like a state
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Kerry	Response-01034	Lovely ad it is. Beech lane residents love the view. We all love the field to use. Stealing it from us all
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Kirsty Oliver	Response-00558	It would change the open aspect turning up from Hallam way which enhanced the village looking up to the windmill.
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Lindsey Lyons	Response-00071	The area proposed creates a beautiful landscape for the local area. The village does not have many open spaces and it is extremely disappointing to see that ghis landscape may now reside housing with limited view or the beautiful sunset / sunrises you can experience over the area.
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Mark	Response-00164	Build here and everything is gone forever!
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Mark Newton	Response-00179	As prior, I know the council doesn't care in the slightest about this becuase they want to impress the labour government. But please leave some free land left for the children to look over from their school, please don't forever harm a conservation area, please don't scar the village.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Mark Patenall	Response-00851	The development supposedly will keep line of site views from Beech Lane to the open countryside. Let's be honest - it won't really will it.
			Maureen Briggs	Response-00190	As it is we have a lovely view over the fields and building houses there would put a stop to that.
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Max Longdon	Response-00128	Part of being a village is being surrounded by countryside. New housing is an eyesore. Poor quality and shabby workmanship leaves a blot on the landscape
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Michelle	Response-00148	Why damage beautiful landscape? I live here because of the landscape ?. Green fields and the wildlife
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Michelle Cox	Response-00138	We need what field area / Grass area why spoil a beautiful Village with more crap built houses that look ugly all modern houses are not nice for a Village keep the Village a Village
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Mrs Judith Pittson	Response-00753	Housing on this site will effect the landscape adversely particularly the views
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Mrs Strelley	Response-00233	The beautiful landscape would be lost forever. Less bird song and less skyline for local residents.
			Nick Craddock	Response-00145	As per my comments for other west Hallam Proposal
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Nicola Elkington-Horridge	Response-00079	The ruining of the landscape is everything, the views and green spaces are vitality important to residents mental and physical health. All the green areas in west hallam are sociable spaces full of freedom for walkers, places to meet and chat, dog walking a d immersing ourselves in beautiful nature. If you take this away you take away a huge part of village life, and we start to become a town but without the facilities and definitely without the desire
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Nicole Brookman	Response-01559	We would loose our views, and the villiage feel of the villiage. it is currently green and you feel like you are in the countryside but we would loose that. We have a lovely big tree at the entrance to the field and we would loose that. At the moments we are in a small community that feels safe, inviting more people we may loose that. We chosse to move here becuse it felt small, friendly and safe. There is no pub in the villiage and not enough facilites for more houses.
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Paul aldred	Response-00152	The village is fine as it is
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Paula Piggott	Response-01041	You can't keep destroying the countryside destroying habitats, killing wildlife and it all not have a knock on effect. You are destroying the air we breathe. We need flowers, we need bees these things the world can't exist without. The wildlife will seriously be impacted. You will destroy the habitats of many animals needed for the world to survive. This is a small village. With lots of precious animals, insects, flowers, trees etc you will kill these insects and animals when you destroy their habitats thus destroying the air we breathe. There is a school and many bungalows with pensioners. It is a accident waiting to happen. Also dog walkers, horse riders and lots of wildlife. Seriously someone will get hurt or worse killed! It is a small village without the capacity for more houses. The roads are not built for so many extra residents. You will totally destroy the area and you will totally destroy the clean air killing lots of wildlife and their habitats in the process.
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Rachel	Response-01015	Destroying the landscape
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Rebecca Ricci	Response-00102	Building on this land will have an impact on the landscape. I look out of my bedroom window and see this area off green. I do not want to look at a housing estate. Save our green areas
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Robert Flatley	Response-00978	This development is proposed for open fields which lay on the edge of a conservation area. It would further impact on the rural and historical character of the area in a negative way.
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Robert Hall	Response-00630	Development on this site would compromise the integrity of the Village Conservation Area. There is no suitable development layout on the eastern boundary which would avoid this happening.
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Robert Mee	Response-01581	Beech Lane runs across the top of a ridge overlooking the valley ? the development of a new estate here will alter the landscape of the village in general, and for existing residents of Beach Lane in particular.
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Robert Mee	Response-01511	Beech Lane runs across the top of a ridge overlooking the valley ? the development of a new estate here will alter the landscape of the village in general, and for existing residents of Beach Lane in particular.
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Robert Reynolds	Response-00260	The development would spoil the local landscape, and needlessly remove a greenfield site. The landscape should be preserved, it is vital in aiding stress management. We need as much beautiful landscape to enjoy as possible.
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Ruby Reid	Response-00119	Negatively impact the landscape by removing more open land in what makes our village a nice place to live
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Sarah Taylor	Response-00115	Answered this on previous questions
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	sharon hickson	Response-01430	the proposed development would not fit into the area it is a small field that would look overbearing with houses built on it
1.9	South of West Hallam	landscape	Simon Reeve	Response-01080	We have a beautiful landscape, any changes to the natural environment will shatter the beauty of the area, you can't keep adding more and more homes and solar farms on the countryside. Especially when there's so much dead town centre which will never recover and should be changed from retail to housing for example the lower half of Bath Street Similarly every shop, home and all the new factories in Stanton should have solar panels on the roofs and as canopies to the car parks adding addition benefits of sheltering vehicles before any consideration to rip up the countryside.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.9	South of West Hallam	Landscape	Stacey Eady	Response-01529	My concerns are also that whilst the Beech Lane piece of land is a 'developers dream' and the land owner is eager to sell, these decisions should not be influenced merely by this aspect. The land is situated adjacent to the centre of our historic village, which dates back to as early as the Domesday Book, and which is currently part of the vital Conservation Area. As you will know, this area was initially designated and implemented to protect and preserve the local area. The proposed new development will be very close to this crucial area and will, in everyone's opinion, add very little visual benefit. Indeed it will, in all probability, have a negative impact on the Conservation Area, while being in no way in keeping with the current historical aesthetics of a traditional village centre that was built many years ago. To allow access to this historical village centre to become clogged with the excess traffic that will be generated by the current proposal is, in the opinion of most residents, intolerable. Upon reviewing the paperwork that was shared by the Planning Department, (including the scoring of each site), I'm finding it difficult to understand how some of the scores were arrived at, in terms of the Beech Lane site opposed to the other local West Hallam sites (North of West Hallam site, CSR0048, St Wilfrids Road site, CSR0004C and Land West of Station Road, CSR0016). I'm tempted to ask whether this could be the direct result of there being no actual site visits undertaken to 'obtain' this information, a point which Carol Hart, our local councillor, brought to your attention at the official planning meeting. I have listed for you below some areas that I feel should be checked/challenged as, once again, I fail to see how these sites have been scored so differently. 014 ? Landscape and Building Environment: Beech Lane scored -2, which appears to be a major negative, although St. Wilfrids scoring -3, suggesting a worse scenario. Again, I cannot see how this is possible. - Does it respect or preserve identified landscape character? The proposed Beech Lane site is just outside the centre of the village, right next to the Conservation Area. This raises the question of why the St Wilfrids site can be given a worse score than Beech Lane. The proposals for the Beech Lane site will also include the felling of several beautiful trees that currently add beauty to the area and a request for a Tree Preservation order has already been made for the significant large oak tree that is opposite to Hallam Way. This iconic tree adds significant beauty to the centre of the village. - Does it have a positive impact on visual amenity? The centre of the village is quaint and of a traditional appearance, this being one of the reasons it lies within a Conservation Area. These proposed new dwellings will hardly enhance this 'visual amenity' and in addition, will cause extra congestion in the immediate village area, thus reducing the 'visual amenity'. - Will it maintain or enhance the local distinctiveness of townscape and built environment? ? the proposed Beech Lane site will have more of a negative impact than the St.Wilfrids site, as it will be creating traffic congestion at both ends of the only through-route that serves a village that has already far outgrown its own infrastructure. - Will it conserve or enhance the interrelationship between landscape and the built environment? ? this would be a 'negative' for most of the sites, however CSR0048 and CSR00
1.9	South of West Hallam	Landscape	Stacey Eady	Response-01529	16 would be impacted less. 015- Heritage ? again, the St Wilfrids' site scored the same as the Beech Lane site with a -3 score, which is I find very puzzling. I would be grateful for some explanation as to how scores in this particular aspect have been agreed upon. - Will it conserve and enhance the historic environment, designated and non-designated heritage assets and their settings? Whilst none of the other sites, especially St. Wilfrids, are directly touching the village centre or near the Conservation Area, the Beech Lane site will cause more disturbance for access to the school and the village (shops/doctors/pharmacy). At this stage, we should also consider the ancient Scargill Foundation which has helped fund the village school and the education of local children for many centuries. Queues of clogged-up traffic outside the school gates whilst those same children are coming and going to and from their education is hardly showing any respect for such a fine, historic local institution. - Will it respect, maintain and strengthen the local character and distinctiveness? Whilst this will be a negative for all of the sites, once again the Beech Lane site butts up to the historical part of our village, unlike the other sites that are situated on the outskirts of the estate, where natural expansion has already happened. - Will it provide better opportunities for people to access and understand local heritage and participate in cultural activities? I don't believe any of the other sites are affected by this, other than Beech Lane, as constituents who reside in the immediate village (ie. within the Conservation Area) contribute to payments - via their Community Tax - towards the local church. Among several annual traditional village activities enjoyed by the West Hallam residents, the age-old Well-Dressing celebrations are a feature of the yearly cycle. Roads are closed-off on the 'big day' and the Hallam Way junction - already struggling to cope at such times - is the very spot where access to the proposed Beech Lane site will be created. - Will it protect or improve access and enjoyment of the historic environment? The site where there is the largest negative impact is again Beech Lane, due to its closeness to the already-discussed congested village centre. - Will it conserve and enhance the archaeological environment? Once again, this will have a significantly high impact on the Beech Lane site due to its proximity to the Conservation Area and the historical aspects of the village centre.
			Teresa Webster	Response-00086	This is a beautiful field which is home to a wide range of wildlife
1.9	South of West Hallam	Landscape	Tilly Fletcher	Response-00317	The landscape from the north view on Beech Lane will be completely destroyed - the benefits of this beautiful location will no longer be enjoyed.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Landscape	Tracey Barks	Response-00111	If this proposal goes ahead the village landscape will change forever. It will just be another housing estate with no heart
1.9	South of West Hallam	Landscape	Victoria Walker	Response-00228	The landscape is beautiful in this area, views of the church and village will be blocked
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Adam Spencer	Response-00054	The number of houses on the proposed development is too many, many of the houses are likely to go unsold or be unaffordable, we already have new houses in the village which have not been sold since they were built
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Alesha Johnson	Response-00783	90 new homes is too much for the infrastructure of the village. If each home then also has two cars this will overwhelm the roads and access to the school.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Alison Reynolds	Response-00243	Facilities already struggle to support current housing
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Alison Stills	Response-01057	90 houses could mean up to 2-3 times that of vehicles on the local roads straining the already neglected facilities.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Andrea Cochrane	Response-01485	Looking at the area for the proposed development and the number of houses intended to be built on the site, I think the density will be too great for the size of plot. This will mean limited space for gardens and open areas around the houses to allow for residents' enjoyment of their property and also to allow for surface water run off. There is likely to be limited parking space per plot so adding to congestion on the site and on adjoining roads. thereby adding to the traffic issues mentioned before.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Andrew and Julie Douglas	Response-00146	90 houses is beyond a joke especially with the expectation of even more. The village cannot cope with this
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Andrew Zielinski-Raynor	Response-00135	As a Father and Grandfather I fully understand and agree with the need to build more houses. However the proposed site is far from ideal for the reasons already provided. Would a compromise be to limit building to a single row of roadside houses along the edge of Beech Lane?
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Anita Lawrence	Response-00726	The proposed development would be for 90 houses - with the potential for more houses to be built encroaching on safeguarded land - the above problems would be further exacerbated and have a seriously negative impact on the Conservation Area.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Anne Vanstone	Response-01216	It's puzzling that this land, once considered inappropriate even for a single house, is now being pushed forward for a major development. That shift raises serious concerns about consistency and planning integrity.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Bruce Broughton	Response-01534	The proposal to build around ninety homes on this site with a further area to the west being safeguarded for future development suggests even greater impact on this area is almost inevitable in the longer term.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Carolyn Wojtas	Response-01052	The village has a lot of housing developments/estate already so I believe the area cannot cope with more housing re schools, roads, health centre etc.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Cathy Bostock	Response-00181	Too many houses, new houses locally standing empty for past 2 years!
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Charles Brooks	Response-00535	I understand the proposal is for 90 new homes with provision for more in the future. I am 100% against such a large number with the threat of even more. Councillors need to come and look at West Hallam. How can they vote in favour without inspecting the area and spending time in the location.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Charlotte Lun	Response-00150	90 houses on that plot of land is a lot to fit in. There will be barely any space between the houses.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Chris Collins	Response-00037	The site shouldn't be developed at all, no houses. It is a dangerous location.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Craig Johnston	Response-00234	Estate is already big enough for the infrastructure
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Dave Stone	Response-00140	How is the local infrastructure going to be improved to match extra demand of added houses and population. If it isn't then it should not be permitted.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	David Harasym	Response-01055	The site is not large enough for the number of proposed houses
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Diane Reynolds	Response-00216	The area will not be able to cope with the amount of houses the road structure is not suitable.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Emily Reeve	Response-01495	The number of houses concerns me. I seems like it is going to be a case of squeezing in as many as possible to give maximum gain.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Emily Reynolds	Response-00149	I don't think any houses should be built but if you build any the number should be massively reduced to limit the impact on the current residents of West hallam. The infrastructure simply won't cope with that number of houses. Our areas of greenspaces for us and our wildlife are in massive decline and they should not be taken away. For our own benefit in terms of mental wellbeing but also for species which are already in decline.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Francesca Dean	Response-00221	Far too many
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Glenn Richardson	Response-00316	Do we really need more housing when the new builds on the white hart site are still empty ?yet again another planning office disgraceful decision
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Heidi Spencer	Response-00189	Too many houses to be squeezed into an area. All likely to be overlooking each other with tiny gardens
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Helen Collins	Response-00034	Too many houses proposed. In addition more large expensive houses are not needed. Affordable housing for young people is needed, they are currently priced out of the area.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Helen fox	Response-00064	The construction of additional houses could have negative consequences for the community. An influx of new homes may strain local resources, disrupt the village's character, and lead to overcrowding. Furthermore, increased traffic and demand for services could overwhelm existing infrastructure, diminishing the quality of life for current residents. Preserving the village's unique identity and ensuring sustainable development should be prioritized over rapid expansion.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Helen Johnson	Response-00170	Over density of area..
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Helen Patenall	Response-00868	As previously commented upon, more houses are not required, infrastructure is already at breaking point
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Helen Stanley	Response-01555	The density of housing ould not be in keeping with the village. Worry that the development would be set out to encourage future expansion
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Homewood	Response-01074	No need for such a large development here
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Ian Brown	Response-00163	too many houses should be more bungalows
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Iris Howes	Response-01169	Past applications ? even those proposing a single property ? have been rejected on this same site. Nothing has changed that would justify approval for a large-scale development now.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	James William Allen	Response-01280	Too many - simply. West Hallam is characterised by an eclectic mix of housing intermingled with footpaths (jitties), play areas and green spaces. This makes a pleasant and biodiverse environment for all, where walking to the shops (for example) is easy and healthy experience enjoyed by many. Allowing a developer to simply cram in as many houses as possible without inclusion of green spaces, play areas and footpaths will not only harm the chatacter of the village, but the physical and mental health of the residents.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Jane Taylor	Response-01023	None appropriate
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Jane thomas	Response-01056	This amount of housing will have a negative impact on the area
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Jo-Anne Attenborough	Response-00129	No houses should be built on this field.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Julie Harbon	Response-00022	Cramming in 90+ houses will mean small plots with little garden, definitely not in keeping with the area. There are several new builds unsold at the moment. I wonder how well these would sell, particularly in the ?affordable housing ? market which they most definitely would not be.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Julie Harker	Response-01073	We don't need any more housing in West Hallam
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Julie Stewardson	Response-00282	90 to begin with and no doubt more to come will greatly increase the population for a small village and it's amenities
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Julie Wright	Response-00091	The estate is big enough
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Katie	Response-00047	There is no need for affordable housing in west Hallam. The area is already a sought after area. With people wanting to move here. I believe affordable housing will have impact on house prices within the village. Prime example there's been multiple new build houses unable to sell on the old white heart site.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Keith Atkinson	Response-01050	West Hallam is big enough already and facilities struggle to support the current population.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Kerry	Response-01034	Ridiculous! See a field & try to cram in as many houses as possible without thinking about the consequences
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Kerry Barratt	Response-00168	No thought of affected local people
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Kerry Middleton	Response-00266	Extra housing would be detrimental to an already full village.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Kevin Fox	Response-00682	If the housing increase has to be approved just make the estate a good extension of the present village, nice houses that attract nice people?
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Kirsty Oliver	Response-00558	20 max we already have a very big estate.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Laura Egglestone	Response-01027	90 houses with the request for the neighbouring field to be safeguarded for future development is ridiculous having a massive effect on the village as we know it and adding to the highway concerns that we already have.
			Linda Webster	Response-00744	I would not like to see a development taking away the village's identity.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Lindsey Lyons	Response-00071	Given the size of the lane, the proposal for 90 houses feels excessive. Looking at the field, these houses will not be the type expected by the council. The large build, will devalue local housing (having already consulted an independent surveyor). How do you propose the new housing will not devalue housing but add to the wealth of the area? A lot of people move to the area as it is well kept and has a moderate level of wealth. Affordable housing I can see has increased from the initial proposal of 20% to 40% how has this proposal been carefully considered? In addition, the local area already struggles to accommodate the residents, with the only two pubs already closed (one was to build houses in that now appear to be unsafe) and the other no one can afford to take it on. The area has also lost a cafe, estate agents and pizza place in the last few years. Additional housing will need careful consideration on the local amenities being offered.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Louise Annison	Response-01049	Far too many new proposed houses, West Hallam has already been developed to capacity so why try and ruin a great village and put undue strain on local services. West Hallam is special because of its green surrounding areas, it will just turn the village into an over populated, under serviced, congested, concrete housing holding area, losing the village charm. Most people who live in the village do so for the surrounding fields and wildlife.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Mark Patenall	Response-00851	We have enough housing in West Hallam already. Any more and the services and infrastructure will not be able to cope
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Mark Power	Response-00276	We don't need anymore houses
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Matthew Lyons	Response-00061	90 houses is far too many. They will be cheap houses which will devalue the area.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Max Egglestone	Response-01278	It's worth highlighting that this land has previously been deemed unsuitable, even for single dwellings. That decision should carry weight in assessing this much larger proposal. Moreover, allowing this build sets a precedent for creeping expansion onto nearby fields, further intensifying the negative impact.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Michelle Cox	Response-00138	To many houses already in the area it will spoil the actual Village area
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Mr and Mrs Wood	Response-01826	plus further pressure on local public services, as well as air quality and local wildlife and diversity.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Mrs Judith Pittson	Response-00753	Too many
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Mrs Strelley	Response-00233	How many houses are going to be squeezed into a field? Will the entrance be adequate for the traffic numbers? The driveway into the field is not wide and the entrance needs to be visible to speeding traffic using Beech Lane.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Nick Craddock	Response-00145	As per my comments for other west Hallam Proposal
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Nicola Elkington-Horridge	Response-00079	We have more than enough houses in our over populated village already. New houses are not required
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Nina Walters	Response-00244	Yes, the knock on effect of more houses in the village.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Pamela Fox	Response-01242	If the proposal goes ahead then reduce the amount of planned dwellings and keep more of the green spaces with plenty of planting of trees and hedges to blend in with the surrounding beautiful countryside
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Patrick Hynes	Response-01902	This same land has previously been turned down for development - including for a single dwelling. It is hard to understand how a plan for over 90 homes could now be deemed acceptable.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Paul aldre	Response-00152	Regardless the village is full
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Paula Piggott	Response-01041	You can't keep destroying the countryside destroying habitats, killing wildlife and it all not have a knock on effect. You are destroying the air we breathe. We need flowers, we need bees these things the world can't exist without. The wildlife will seriously be impacted. You will destroy the habitats of many animals needed for the world to survive. This is a small village. With lots of precious animals, insects, flowers, trees etc you will kill these insects and animals when you destroy their habitats thus destroying the air we breathe. There is a school and many bungalows with pensioners. It is a accident waiting to happen. Also dog walkers, horse riders and lots of wildlife. Seriously someone will get hurt or worse killed! It is a small village without the capacity for more houses. The roads are not built for so many extra residents. You will totally destroy the area and you will totally destroy the clean air killing lots of wildlife and their habitats in the process.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Pete Vanstone	Response-01164	It is notable that previous applications for even a single dwelling on this land have been refused. Approving a development of more than 90 homes now appears completely contradictory and raises serious concerns about the integrity and consistency of the planning process. This development creates a precedent that could open the door to further housing on adjacent fields. The cumulative effect would have a devastating impact on traffic, infrastructure, and the overall character of the village.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Phil Campbell	Response-00109	Ensure plenty of homes for single people.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Rebecca Ricci	Response-00102	West Hallam is already over populated - more housing is not required in our small village
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Robert Reynolds	Response-00260	There are plenty of houses for sale and rent in West Hallam. There is no requirement to build more.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	sam richards	Response-01467	far too many houses being planned in that area in my opinion. west hallam is already a very large village and we dont need to extend it anymore. as we all know, once 90 houses are put there it will soon lead to more.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Sarah Taylor	Response-00115	The number houses proposed for the site sounds like they are going to be cramped and more townhouse like not keeping in line with houses that outline the village and whether they look out to the countryside they are taking away the countryside that we pay a premium in council Tax for for living around here. Because once it's gone it will never come back.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Serena Bostock	Response-00125	90 houses doesn't just mean 90 houses. That could be a family of 4 which is an additional 360 people possibly and the services etc...are already stretched.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	sharon hickson	Response-01430	we dont need any more houses in the village on either site as west Hallam doesn't have the facilities to cope with any more
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Simon Reeve	Response-01080	Too many
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Stacey Eady	Response-01529	Please reconsider the current proposal for this approved site CSR0044 and reconsider the other sites within West Hallam. We are all aware of the huge challenges the Local Council is facing to provide housing within the borough and we want to support this. We understand the need to offer up some land within West Hallam area but we want this to be in the right spaces - ones that do not have huge negative impacts on the village. With an extra 90 houses (+ 32 dwellings within the 'safeguarded land' they wish to develop), this will total 122 houses, which seems ludicrous with this specific site having only one access in and out of the new development, meaning an extra (potentially) 244 cars coming on and off Beech Lane. This is, in my opinion, a disaster waiting to happen. Some of the other sites within the area could better facilitate the increase in traffic but they could also offer the key for the whole village. For example, the possible development of the site West of Station Road (CSR0016) is just on the lead into the village and has a large lay-by area that could be used as a filter lane to allow traffic on and off the site onto the existing road which has the major-road dimensions required. The North of West Hallam site (CSR0048) is on High Lane, a major road that is a straight one. A possible change here could be the reduction of speed used on this road, from 40mph to 30mph, to assist traffic on and off the site, which would be a positive impact to pedestrians within the whole village. The St. Wilfrids site (CSR0004) would benefit from the installation of a mini roundabout at its junction with High Lane. Further along towards Stanley Common, this new roundabout would ease the congestion currently suffered at the High Lane-Station Road junction, (Mill House Garage junction) where a blind bend already causes problems.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Teresa Webster	Response-00086	There are a large number of houses for sale or sat empty within the village - why would we want to increase the number of properties when there is already ample ?
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Tilly Fletcher	Response-00317	The land in which to build 90 houses on is simply not suitable. To add 90 behind a row of just 15 is completely disproportionate and the roads/landscape are not fit for that level of people/traffic.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Tina Jay	Response-01801	Both these proposed housing developments would also have a very detrimental impact on the village's identity, and on the Conservation area. This is a village area, which has already expanded greatly over the years with the building of a large housing estate and any further developments of these proposed sizes and in these areas would greatly damage the existing green belt and green open space of this rural village.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Tina Rice	Response-00096	Surly just single row as full in never 90 houses
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Tracey Barks	Response-00111	90 is too many on this small area. None would be the better option. We need to save our green spaces. There are many brown field sites to usr
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Val Stevens	Response-01070	Far too many for the village to cope with and obviously there is a future plan to use the extra land.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Vicky Buckley	Response-00182	already overcrowded
1.9	South of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Yvonne	Response-00207	What an awful eye sore
1.9	South of West Hallam	Other	Benjamin Price	Response-00257	I think reducing the size of the landscape around West Hallam and increasing the population would have a detrimental impact on a number of people's mental health as it is used by people to clean their minds and ensure they're getting out and about to improve their mental health.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Other	Cat Hope	Response-00127	West hallam is a village, now soon will be an estate like oakwood! Traffic is horrendous, more so parking. Empty houses already on where the former white hart is. This once attractive village, will soon by awful. Ilkeston as the nearest town can't handle more traffic. Our villages are losing our green belt areas! Years ago Erewash would never budge, eg dale road stanley. We need to protect our green space! Soon will be none. Huge overcrowding happening. Criminal activity needs protection also! Our police can't cope as it is now.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Other	Charles Brooks	Response-00535	Overall, I wish to object to this development on the grounds of its close proximity to the local primary school. I do consider it a health and safety issue caused by increased traffic movement on Beech Lane which is effectively a country road and not a full width highway. I am sure Highways would have concerns about an entrance onto the proposed development on Beech Lane which would have to be opposite the school.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.9	South of West Hallam	Other	Chris Collins	Response-00037	Water supply issues are an issue in the village with Severn Trent regularly suffering leaks, pressure issues etc. adding another significant number of houses onto their old creaking network doesn't seem like a good idea.
			Chris Hull	Response-00272	All looks fine to me
1.9	South of West Hallam	Other	Connor Gratton	Response-00232	West Hallam is a greenbelt area which is surrounded by fields. In addition to the immediate negative impact of the development, the is a significant risk that this will set a harmful precedent for future damaging developments.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Other	Dale bush	Response-01542	Roads are already hazardous around beech Lane and the playing field and school, damaging to deerland increased risk of flooding in the area. The doctors is already to busy the village does not have the infrastructure for this site to go ahead.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Other	Dave Stone	Response-00140	How is the sale and development going to benefit West Hallam. If there are no benefits (as judged by residents) then alternative brown field sites should be used for development.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Other	Dean Wright	Response-00094	How is this development even being considered? West Hallam has no suitable areas for development.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Other	Diane Reynolds	Response-00216	This will effect my mental health. My garden and view are my sanctuary and for these to be taken away is so sad. It will also have an effect on our house value, not having clear views will mean lower value
1.9	South of West Hallam	Other	Emma Lound	Response-00187	Other sites have already been identified. Brown field sites have been identified. This site has been turned down several times due to the logistical issues, the safety issues and the green belt/conservation area. Amongst other concerns.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Other	Glenn Richardson	Response-00316	So with the only pub in the village closed ,the pav bar is now the hub of the community.We back on too the cricket club & occasionally we hear music / noise late at night ,but it?s great to see the community using it as an asset ..Bonfire night sees the whole village get together ..I?m sure the people living on the proposed development won?t be happy about that ..thus creating great concern that we might loose another community hub ..In the day time the field is used by numerous people exercising themselves/dogs/children etc in a safe & friendly environment
			Graeme Taylor	Response-01131	Local shopping areas are already at capacity for parking this will create significant congestion
1.9	South of West Hallam	Other	Heidi Spencer	Response-00189	Concerns over the noise and disruption to the school whilst the build is taking place. What impact will this have on the children trying to learn and concentrate
1.9	South of West Hallam	Other	Helen Collins	Response-00034	Areas such as ours need young people and affordable housing but not at the expense of the loss of key greenbelt areas. The infrastructure of the village does not currently lend itself to such a development.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Other	Helen Johnson	Response-00170	Village already struggling with parking issues,traffic along beach lane and st Wilfred?s junction off high line and st Wilfred?s has had many collisions
1.9	South of West Hallam	Other	Helen Patenall	Response-00868	The site has been previously refused for development, so why has this changed all of a sudden?
1.9	South of West Hallam	Other	Iain Harrison	Response-01214	This proposed development represents a serious and irreversible threat to the fabric of our local community. West Hallam is a village?small, close-knit, and already stretched to its limits in terms of healthcare, education, transport, and infrastructure. The people who live here do so because of its peaceful environment, rural setting, and community spirit. Pushing through further housing developments on precious greenbelt land will not only overwhelm our already fragile services?it will erode the very character that makes this village a special place to live. The destruction of the surrounding countryside is not a minor side effect?it is the loss of vital green space, biodiversity, and the mental and physical wellbeing that comes with access to nature. Once it is gone, it is gone forever. There are better, more sustainable alternatives?brownfield sites, empty homes, and underused urban areas?which should be prioritized before sacrificing the greenbelt. I urge you to reject this proposal in the interests of environmental integrity, community wellbeing, and responsible planning for future generations.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Other	Ian Brown	Response-00163	west hallam is big enough if you need to build housing build on already built on land
1.9	South of West Hallam	Other	Jack	Response-00278	I could add stuff in every box but it won't make a difference. This clearly isn't a suitable site due to the roads and infrastructure in the local area which are already over stretched
1.9	South of West Hallam	Other	James Tilford	Response-00103	Added pressure on existing facilities
1.9	South of West Hallam	Other	Jo-Anne Attenborough	Response-00129	Whilst housing may be needed this is not the place to put it. Why are there several empty new build houses on the old White Hart development that stand empty? Surely this shows houses in West Hallam are not needed as no one has moved into these!
1.9	South of West Hallam	Other	Julie Stewardson	Response-00282	Despite its size West Hallam maintains a lovely village feel. We would not want to lose that. Especially as the village pub has already closed
1.9	South of West Hallam	Other	Katie Rice	Response-00036	There are other sites that would be more suitable to build on around the west Hallam area that would affect less houses and wouldn't contribute as much to congestion in and out of the estate
			Kerry	Response-01034	Don't steal our green space. It's our village.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Other	Kerry Barratt	Response-00168	It's our village. An awful place to build. No thought to local residents.
			Kerry Middleton	Response-00266	The infrastructure of the village would be totally compromised by this proposal.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Other	Laura	Response-01530	No comments
1.9	South of West Hallam	Other	Linda Webster	Response-00744	I would not recommend the Dales for shopping, the car park is nearly always full.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.9	South of West Hallam	Other	Lindsey Lyons	Response-00071	I strongly oppose the housing development for the following reasons; 1. SAFETY - of children using the school, pavilion for sports and park for their mental wellbeing. 2. POLLUTION - housing creates additional pollution from building and the ongoing air quality of the area 3. PARKING - this is already dangerous in beech lane, I urge you to go and witness this during school times and sporting events, you will then see the dangers. As well as local other roads, users already park over drives, additional housing will add to this issue 4. HOUSE PRICING - there is no doubt this will devalue local housing as stated by an independent surveyor 5. AMENITIES - local amenities already struggle to accommodate the residents in the village, there?s no proposal to increase amenities for the 90 houses with an average household of potentially 3+ residents. It is absurd to think the local area can cope with this extra demand 6. LANDSCAPE AND WILDLIFE - the local wildlife and landscape will be destroyed. This is disappointing for what was previously rejected to now be considered 7, HEALTH RISKS - as mentioned in pint 2, pollution will be increased leading to further potential health issues for residents and increased risks for sensitive groups I strongly encourage you as a local council to address each points with facts and evidence to support, else the housing should be rejected.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Other	Lynsey anderson	Response-01068	No room for any more car People can't park correctly at school times School is already full I am writing to object to both proposed building sites in Wwst Hallam. Firstly the site behind High lane West, putting houses here is dangerous. Access either directly from High Lane or from Park Hall Lane would cause traffic chaos. Park Hall Lane leads to a blind bend and is mostly single track. This is an accident waiting to happen. The filed also floods into the gardens and out onto the road. Houses surely can not be built on a field that floods. I can not comprehend what the field would cost to compulsory purchase as the owner does not want to sell. My house backs onto the field that has been proposed behind High lane West and I did not buy here to be in the middle of building site or housing estate, I bought this house to live near the countryside. I was in attendance at the council meeting in Long Eaton and I found it laughable the reasons that were being given for both sites, apparently £230,000 + houses were going to solve a homeless crisis we have In Erewash. Most of the houses being £400,000 or above just does not make any sense that it would solve anything to do with the homeless issue. This argument was clearly just being used to tug at the heart strings. The only reason the council is so desperate to build houses is you are under threat of having your planning department removed and London making the decisions. This is no reason too destroy green belt, nature and take over our village. With regards to the site off Beech lane there are multiple highway issues here, wherever you would put the access roads again it is an accident waiting to happen and it would cause traffic chaos during rush hr. Both sites have been turned down previously. So what has changed now. The danger to the children at Scargill is also not acceptable, school drop off is already dangerous adding 100+ cars to the scenario is just incomprehensible. The houses would add this many cars as the transport links are minimal and unreliable. Again this would destroy green belt and the environmental issues are numerous. How would the shops cope of Beech lane, the car park already overflows and with no plans for another school, doctors, dentist then where are these new residents supposed to go. Everything adds up to the fact that no one in West Hallam wants this and we do not appreciate the council trying to rush this through and not coming forward correctly sooner with the proposal. If you were at the meeting in Long Eaton I am sure you could tell from the noise and boo?s coming from all attendee?s that no one wants any of these sites built on. I would hope that mine and all the other objections would be listened to and the council would make the right decision however I am pretty sure that the decision has already been made and no matter what any of us say or think it will not be heard. Please listen and realise you are potentially destroying a community, green belt and causing environmental issues at a time we should be doing the opposite.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Other	Mandie frith	Response-00247	Why are we destroying our country side with more houses. There are enough empty run down houses ect that can be used to a good effect. We need to protect the land more and help provide a place for wildlife
1.9	South of West Hallam	Other	Mark	Response-00164	Recover and use all the houses that are currently unoccupied. Get Derbyshire council to sell some of their outdated and very large buildings! Do not build on Green Belt and fields what about the future for us all?
1.9	South of West Hallam	Other	Mark Patenall	Response-00851	The site has previously been turned down for development so what has changed now?
1.9	South of West Hallam	Other	Mark Perrin	Response-00223	The plans should include unrestricted access to the cricket club for pedestrians
1.9	South of West Hallam	Other	Matthew Lyons	Response-00061	Local amenities are not great. 2 pubs and cafe gone over the past 4 years. The community spirt is lost and becoming soulless. More housing coming with nothing much to do in walking distance for residents.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Other	Maureen Briggs	Response-00190	Considering we pay council tax and parish council tax I think our opinions matter.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Other	Max Longdon	Response-00128	I think the council should look at the development at white heart. A village pub pulled down houses built that have sat empty ever since. There are plenty of other sites to build on away from villages. The shops in the village are barely big enough now to cope with the mount is cars/ people. The junctions to get out the village can barely cope. The junctions onto high lane are far to dangerous to cope with anymore cars
1.9	South of West Hallam	Other	M Mcfarlane	Response-00147	This land is used as a lovely area for walking in across with dogs or to the cricket club? please stop robbing us of our lovely green areas
1.9	South of West Hallam	Other	Mrs Bird	Response-00045	These proposed houses would decrease the value of properties in the area. They would be entirely our of context for the local areas which is an old village combined with older housing.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Other	Mrs Strelley	Response-00233	The whole rural climate would be compromised with more dwellings being built. It would change the logistics and feel of the whole community.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.9	South of West Hallam	Other	Nicola Elkington-Horridge	Response-00079	I've lived in the village for 50 yrs now and it has got worse and worse as more and more houses have been built. Enough is enough. The council should spend time on updating the parks for the hundreds of children that live here, the road markings, potholes and street signs, a recycling area and allotments, these are the things that will benefit the villages. If the council needs to make money then it should develop things that the village needs and that definitely isn't more houses. This goes for all areas of development in the village.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Other	Paul aldred	Response-00152	Villages like chellaston has proved this doesn't work. I grew up in chellaston when it was a village. People now won't walk alone home from the pub at night because of threat of attack. When will councils learn. And if councillors built on their back yard before everyone else's then no one could complain
1.9	South of West Hallam	Other	Paula Piggott	Response-01041	You can't keep destroying the countryside destroying habitats, killing wildlife and it all not have a knock on effect. You are destroying the air we breathe. We need flowers, we need bees these things the world can't exist without. The wildlife will seriously be impacted. You will destroy the habitats of many animals needed for the world to survive. This is a small village. With lots of precious animals, insects, flowers, trees etc you will kill these insects and animals when you destroy their habitats thus destroying the air we breathe. There is a school and many bungalows with pensioners. It is an accident waiting to happen. Also dog walkers, horse riders and lots of wildlife. Seriously someone will get hurt or worse killed! It is a small village without the capacity for more houses. The roads are not built for so many extra residents. You will totally destroy the area and you will totally destroy the clean air killing lots of wildlife and their habitats in the process. Keep building over land will cause flooding and lead to drainage problems as natural soakaway will be destroyed.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Other	Richard Fearn	Response-00180	Beach lane would not be a suitable access point. Cat and fiddle lane would be slightly further but much more suitable to handle the extra traffic.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Other	Robert Reynolds	Response-00260	There is only one shop serving the village, with only limited customer parking, that gets extremely congested, expanding onto the site south of West Hallam will only exacerbate this issue.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Other	sam richards	Response-01467	being so close to the proposed site i am clearly against the plans for my own reasons too. we have lived at our house for 3 years and paid a premium to have such lovely views across from us. it is such a shame that this could be replaced with a building site and houses. west hallam is already a large village but lacks facilities and doesn't even have a pub! I feel that bringing such a large amount of new residents will overcrowd the village and it will soon lose its village feel which is what residents live here for. the dates shopping centre car park is very often overfilled causing congestion. white rose cricket club is a very popular location which most people access via this land. it is also a very popular walk for dog owners with many walkers seen there every day. it would be a shame to lose this access to cock orchard.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Other	Sarah James	Response-01085	Surely there are alternative buildings that can be recycled rather than building new unaffordable housing for young local people. West Hallam is a sort of village, premium house prices. This site won't meet the needs of the current housing crisis.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Other	Sarah Taylor	Response-01819	West Hallam is a Conservation area that needs to be maintained.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Other	Simon Reeve	Response-01080	Just stop it, look at the many brownfield sites in Ilkeston, Derby, Stapleford, Long Eaton, Nottingham and regeneration of those sites will deliver the homes without irresponsible damage of natural environment

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.9	South of West Hallam	Other	Stacey Eady	Response-01529	<p>I have written my full objection and emailed this in however I didn't know if I was still required to complete this for I have tried to divide my letter and responses to fit in each of the sections you have listed. However I want to attach the full response below so that this can be read and understood. Core Strategy Review- Public Consultation Please see below, my comments and objections to the proposed development of the SOUTH of WEST HALLAM BEECH LANE site (CSR0044) and why I believe this should not be allowed to progress. I also wish to put forward suggestions for other sites to be re-considered (CSR0016/CSR0048 and CSR0004C) that are also within the local West Hallam area and that scored similarly on your Core strategy report. I believe these to be safer/better situated and will service the needs of the local area as well as the core strategy and future planning targets. They could also help to rectify some of the local road infrastructure issues considerably, and also preserve our beautiful, quaint, village centre. Beech Lane As you will be aware this specific piece of land has been identified for development on several occasions within the last five years and was previously included in the work that was conducted for the core strategy before it was amended. At this point, it was removed from the plan. You will no doubt be aware that this has been the subject of objections on more than one occasion, not for just one reason but for several very valid ones which I would like to reiterate. So I, and many others, are asking why this site is being considered once again, when the situation concerning the land, infrastructure and position has not changed? I have been advised that this most recent inclusion of the Beech Lane site is not due to the recent changes in the Green Belt policy that was implemented in late 2024, as you have confirmed to me that you are not using this policy. I'm lead to believe that you are using the previous version of the policy that was in place at the beginning of the revised core strategy, and this was much earlier(2022). This merely creates more confusion about the desire to include the land in question. As the alternative site (CSR0004) on St Wilfrids Road in West Hallam had been rejected during this policy period, as a result of satisfying the Green Belt criteria, you will surely understand, having visited both sites, that this St Wilfrids site offers far less in terms of the Green Belt criteria than that of Beech Lane. This latter site has several mature trees that promenade the front of Beech Lane, not to mention the thousand of birds/wildlife and plants it houses and it's vital contribution to the mainainance of the conservation area that is within very close proximity. With the Safeguarded Land that is being discussed still been used for agricultural purposes, I feel that there is some misjudgment as to how these different sites scored and maybe this was influenced by the sudden need to deliver outcomes quickly rather than actually scoring this appropriately. As such, I wish to challenge the findings as the report doesn't clearly outline the process. My concerns are also that whilst the Beech Lane piece of land is a 'developers dream' and the land owner is eager to sell, these decisions should not be influenced merely by this aspect. The land is situated adjacent to the centre of our historic village, which dates back to as early as the Domesday Book, and which is currently part of the vital Conservat</p>
1.9	South of West Hallam	Other	Stacey Eady	Response-01529	<p>ion Area. As you will know, this area was initially designated and implemented to protect and preserve the local area. The proposed new development will be very close to this crucial area and will, in everyone's opinion, add very little visual benefit. Indeed it will, in all probability, have a negative impact on the Conservation Area, while being in no way in keeping with the current historical aesthetics of a traditional village centre that was built many years ago. To allow access to this historical village centre to become clogged with the excess traffic that will be generated by the current proposal is, in the opinion of most residents, intolerable. Upon reviewing the paperwork that was shared by the Planning Department, (including the scoring of each site), I'm finding it difficult to understand how some of the scores were arrived at, in terms of the Beech Lane site opposed to the other local West Hallam sites (North of West Hallam site, CSR0048, St Wilfrids Road site, CSR0004C and Land West of Station Road, CSR0016). I'm tempted to ask whether this could be the direct result of there being no actual site visits undertaken to 'obtain' this information, a point which Carol Hart, our local councillor, brought to your attention at the official planning meeting. I have listed for you below some areas that I feel should be checked/challenged as, once again, I fail to see how these sites have been scored so differently. 05 ? Health and Wellbeing: the Beech Lane site scored 2, which, in my opinion, was a major positive. The site scored significantly higher than the other two West Hallam sites while matching that of St.Wilfrids. However from a personal viewpoint, I cannot see any difference in any of the sites. Some reflections on the Health and Well-Being aspects of the proposal: - Will it reduce health inequalities? No, but this is no different for all of the sites in West Hallam. - Will it improve access to health services? No - Health Service provision in the village is currently inadequate and residents are being directed to local safety-net services such as Littlewick Medical Centre in Ilkeston and the nearest walk-in centres. Older residents find access to these alternatives quite difficult, especially when not feeling well. - Will it increase the opportunities for recreational physical activity? No, this is the same for all of the sites - Will it bring new open spaces or improve the quality of existing open spaces? No ? this is the same for all sites. However, the Beech Lane site will tarnish the visual aspect of our historical village centre and negatively impact the nearby Conservation Area. - Will it improve access to local food-growing opportunities? No - this is the same for all sites. However, I note that the 'Safeguarded Land' on Beech Lane seems to be the only land that is currently used for an agriculture purpose, and this land is worked annually to provide feed for local animals. 014 ? Landscape and Building Environment: Beech Lane scored -2, which appears to be a major negative, although St. Wilfrids scoring -3, suggesting a worse scenario. Again, I cannot see how this is possible. - Does it respect or preserve identified landscape character? The proposed Beech Lane site is just outside the centre of the village, right next to the Conservation Area. This raises the question of why the St Wilfrids site can be given a worse score than Beech Lane. The proposals for the Beech Lane site will also include the felling of sever</p>



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.9	South of West Hallam	Other	Stacey Lady	Response-01529	<p>al beautiful trees that currently add beauty to the area and a request for a Tree Preservation order has already been made for the significant large oak tree that is opposite to Hallam Way. This iconic tree adds significant beauty to the centre of the village. - Does it have a positive impact on visual amenity? The centre of the village is quaint and of a traditional appearance, this being one of the reasons it lies within a Conservation Area. These proposed new dwellings will hardly enhance this 'visual amenity' and in addition, will cause extra congestion in the immediate village area, thus reducing the 'visual amenity'. - Will it maintain or enhance the local distinctiveness of townscape and built environment? ? the proposed Beech Lane site will have more of a negative impact than the St.Wilfrids site, as it will be creating traffic congestion at both ends of the only through-route that serves a village that has already far outgrown its own infrastructure. - Will it conserve or enhance the interrelationship between landscape and the built environment? ? this would be a 'negative' for most of the sites, however CSR0048 and CSR0016 would be impacted less. 015- Heritage ? again, the St Wilfrids' site scored the same as the Beech Lane site with a -3 score, which is I find very puzzling. I would be grateful for some explanation as to how scores in this particular aspect have been agreed upon. - Will it conserve and enhance the historic environment, designated and none-designated heritage assets and their settings? Whilst none of the other sites, especially St. Wilfrids, are directly touching the village centre or near the Conservation Area, the Beech Lane site will cause more disturbance for access to the school and the village (shops/doctors/pharmacy). At this stage, we should also consider the ancient Scargill Foundation which has helped fund the village school and the education of local children for many centuries. Queues of clogged-up traffic outside the school gates whilst those same children are coming and going to and from their education is hardly showing any respect for such a fine, historic local institution. - Will it respect, maintain and strengthen the local character and distinctiveness? Whilst this will be a negative for all of the sites, once again the Beech Lane site butts up to the historical part of our village, unlike the other sites that are situated on the outskirts of the estate, where natural expansion has already happened. - Will it provide better opportunities for people to access and understand local heritage and participate in cultural activities? I don't believe any of the other sites are effected by this, other than Beech Lane, as constituents who reside in the immediate village (ie. within the Conservation Area) contribute to payments - via their Community Tax - towards the local church. Among several annual traditional village activities enjoyed by the West Hallam residents, the age-old Well-Dressing celebrations are a feature of the yearly cycle. Roads are closed-off on the 'big day' and the Hallam Way junction - already struggling to cope at such times - is the very spot where access to the proposed Beech Lane site will be created. - Will it protect or improve access and enjoyment of the historic environment? The site where there is the largest negative impact is again Beech Lane, due to its closeness to the already-discussed congested village centre. - Will it conserve and enhance the archaeological envirom</p>
1.9	South of West Hallam	Other	Stacey Lady	Response-01529	<p>ent? Once again, this will have a significantly high impact on the Beech Lane site due to its proximity to the Conservation Area and the historical aspects of the village centre. Finally, the remaining issues surrounding traffic on Beech Lane. If you have ever visited Beech Lane, you will know that the road is currently already very busy during peak times, such as school drop off and pick up. Cars regularly park on both sides of the road, which causes major disruptions to ongoing traffic driving through the village. It is one of only two routes in and out of a village that has already expanded way beyond its initial infrastructure and is the major road that haulage uses to get deliveries through the village to the main centre, The Dales. Beech Lane also has a large recreational ground and children's playground adjacent to the school, which is used regularly during evenings and weekends to facilitate both football matches and cricket games meaning it's busy all day, most days. The road dimensions on Beech Lane are much narrower than those of a normal major road. It is not wide enough to be marked with central white lines (I'm guessing that's why it was originally termed a 'lane') which means it's even tighter when cars park on one or both sides and, at times, this has caused delays with emergency services/buses, simply being unable to get through. I also note that as a bus route, the road should be at least 6.2 m wide, and this is not the case. Living on Beech Lane, I regularly see people driving up onto the pavement to get up the road, which simply is unacceptable, considering the closeness to the school. The road has a 20mph speed limit during school times. However this is very rarely observed, and in my time on Beech Lane, I have never seen speeds being monitored. With the school blocking off a huge portion of the Lane for its own Keep Clear Zone, which is required to be kept clear at all times to comply with rule 243 of the Highway Code, I'm unsure how any safe or practical solution could be arrived at to allow access to the proposed new site from Beech Lane. The road to the school is currently also required to be left clear (hence the single white line on the opposite side), so quite where the access to and from the proposed site is going to be situated is a mystery. My concern is that this site has been identified on several previous occasions, as suitable land to build on, but the process has always been stopped, mainly due to the concerns regarding traffic. These issues have not changed and indeed have significantly worsened due to the natural increase in population, so I'm unsure why or how this proposal has been approved this time around. With an extra 90 houses (+ 32 dwellings within the 'safeguarded land' they wish to develop), this will total 122 houses, which seems ludicrous with this specific site having only one access in and out of the new development, meaning an extra (potentially) 244 cars coming on and off Beech Lane. This is, in my opinion, a disaster waiting to happen. I have also been made aware that the Erewash Planning team have not yet consulted with DCC highways up until this point, which worries me further! Obviously, you must undoubtedly understand that feelings are 'running high' within the West Hallam community and the need for transparency at every stage of the procedure is essential. If not, rumour-mongering and suspicion is bound to occur and there is a fear that the use of consultancy companies may, at w</p>

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.9	South of West Hallam	Other	Stacey Eady	Response-01529	orst, cover up any indiscretions and, at best, cloud the issue. Are there any assurances in place to maintain the necessary complete transparency? Can I ask if DCC Highways will have the 'final say' in the Traffic Safety and suitability of this site or will this be left in the hands of a consultancy firm/Erewash Council planners? Some of the other sites within the area could better facilitate the increase in traffic but they could also offer the key for the whole village. For example, the possible development of the site West of Station Road (CSR0016) is just on the lead into the village and has a large lay-by area that could be used as a filter lane to allow traffic on and off the site onto the existing road which has the major-road dimensions required. The North of West Hallam site (CSR0048) is on High Lane, a major road that is a straight one. A possible change here could be the reduction of speed used on this road, from 40mph to 30mph, to assist traffic on and off the site, which would be a positive impact to pedestrians within the whole village. The St. Wilfrids site (CSR0004) would benefit from the installation of a mini roundabout at its junction with High Lane. Further along towards Stanley Common, this new roundabout would ease the congestion currently suffered at the High Lane-Station Road junction, (Mill House Garage junction) where a blind bend already causes problems. To conclude Please reconsider the current proposal for this approved site CSR0044 and reconsider the other sites within West Hallam. We are all aware of the huge challenges the Local Council is facing to provide housing within the borough and we want to support this. We understand the need to offer up some land within West Hallam area but we want this to be in the right spaces - ones that do not have huge negative impacts on the village. Stacey Eady 38 Beech Lane, West Hallam, De7 6GU. 07909332877.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Adam Spencer	Response-00054	Adding additional traffic from 90 houses and its vistors is going to add more cars on an already conjested road directly outside of the school and childrens play area
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Alesha Johnson	Response-00783	I fear for children and the elderly in our village. The roads are not adequate for a new housing estate opposite the school.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Alex	Response-01026	This stretch of Beech Lane is already super busy, especially with Scargill being here and being a main route to the shops and getting out of the village.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Alice Johnson	Response-00093	traffic is already awful on this road during school pick up and drop off hours also at weekends when football tournaments are on
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Alison Fletcher	Response-00198	Risks particularly around school start and finish times with increased vehicular and pedestrian activity., access to the proposed site and road crossing from the school into the development.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Alison Reynolds	Response-00243	Cars parked currently on Beech Lane and end of Pavilion Court already an issue without adding burden of additional housing and junction.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Alison Stills	Response-01057	This area already causes safety issues for local residents with the current usage especially with the school traffic.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Amy	Response-01031	Beech lane already heavily congested at school times and football matches at weekends.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Amy Cartwright	Response-01017	Due to the narrowness of the current road there is already congestion at weekends and on weekdays. This additional traffic will cause safety issues for all road users
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Andrea Cochrane	Response-01485	Siting another junction so close to the school will not improve safety for parents/carers and pupils accessing Scargill School. Or for other road users needing to leave the estate. Visibility at school drop off and pick up times is already difficult due to parked cars and adding further vehicles plus another road junction will make the situation more hazardous. I have already seen many near misses over recent years .
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Andrea Reed	Response-00123	There are multiple cars parked on beech lane as it is at school pick up and drop off and when they play football it is extremely dangerous already
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Andrew and Julie Douglas	Response-00146	The site is opposite the school entrance of which is already very congested. This will be very dangerous as this is only a Lane
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Andrew Zielinski-Raynor	Response-00135	It is opposite a large school with very young children. Before and after school already seems fraught with danger adding more traffic into the mix will make an already dangerous situation much worse for both pedestrians and motorists. I have personally witnessed a number of car accidents on this stretch of road.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Andy Flindall	Response-01013	Traffic is already busy near the school adding more traffic that this site will do is an accident waiting to happen and smacks of greed over common sense
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Angela Reid	Response-00134	No school crossing on Beech Lane

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Anita Lawrence	Response-00726	Beech Lane is narrow and unsuitable for both access of groundworks and building vehicles and for the additional residential traffic that would ensue should housing be built on this site. Congestion causes some very frustrated delivery delivers to go over pavements and put pedestrians at risk. There are three ways to exit the village: a. Beech Lane meets Station Road on a blind bend, it is a very awkward junction with poor road surface. a/1. via Station Road towards Stanley Village (opposite new build houses that front the road of which some are unsold! Station Road leads to a T-junction over a humped backed bridge which has some visibility problems, turning left would take you towards the Cat and Fiddle Lane which is in very poor repair in places, turning right would take you through Stanley Village which is narrow, winding, is often reduced to single track due to parking and which struggles with drivers speeding. This is already a hazard to those crossing the road to access shop, post office, school, church, other. b. Via Station Road towards High Lane West/A609, this road gets very busy, vehicles are usually parked here creating a slalom course which some drivers negotiate in an extremely inconsiderate manner. Where Station Road meets High Lane West at a cross roads with Park Hall Lane is another blind bend from the direction of Stanley Common, even off-peak it is a difficult junction. b/1 The A609 is frequently used by emergency vehicles going at speed, increased traffic at this junction puts the emergency vehicles, other road users and pedestrians at risk and increases the likelihood of emergency vehicles being delayed in attending an incident. c. To exit the village by going through the West Hallam via The Village and St Wilfrid's Road: c/1 The Village is very narrow with parking on one or both sides reducing the road to single track slalom. c/2 at the junction with St Wilfrid's Road there is an extremely tight bend with poor visibility. c/3 at the top of St Wilfrid's road is a cross-roads with A609 and Mapperley Lane. There is very poor visibility from the Ilkeston direction due to the road dipping
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Ann Ainsworth	Response-01096	Proximity rto school on an already congested road
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Anna Richardson	Response-00162	The situation outside the primary school directly opposite this site is already very dangerous at school drop off and pick up time. Due to the volume of traffic there have been multiple accidents with cars damaged and two children run over in the last few years. We need to reduce the volume of traffic in this area.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Anne Vanstone	Response-01216	Beech Lane is already dangerous during school drop-off and pick-up times as well as when any other events such as football etc are using the playing fields or Powtrell Pavilion. With additional cars from a large development, the risk to pedestrians ? especially school children ? will only increase. There is no mention of substantial upgrades to the road network to offset these risks. Without that, this plan feels reckless.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Ann Toplis	Response-00271	Again building here would make the roads unsafe due to more traffic around the school area
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Benjamin Price	Response-00257	There is a school just around the corner and a significant number of school children walk around that are with no suitable crossing facilities. Increasing houses would increase vehicles on the road causes a higher danger to young ones
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Ben Rodney	Response-00122	Right opposite a primary school with more congestion,
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Bruce Broughton	Response-01534	The site is directly opposite Scargill Primary School, where there are over 300 pupils, and as stated above Beech Lane is already regularly congested as a result of parking on the road. The provision of a new section of pavement along the southern side of Beech Lane where it adjoins the proposed development site will do nothing to address congestion and road safety concerns on Beech Lane as a whole, where it is not unusual to see vehicles mounting the pavement to avoid congestion.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Carl fox	Response-00067	Additional traffic on what is a very quiet village
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Carol Hart	Response-01829	The proposed site is directly opposite the Scargill Primary School, which has over 300 pupils, the access to the development would be straight on to Beech Lane, as the name suggests it is not a major road and not even the width of a normal road, the access would also be very close to the major junction for leaving the estate, namely Hallam Way. The very major concerns are health and safety, Beech Lane is gridlocked several times a day, I am not sure whether the very short video can be included but it just proves a point, yes it is usually at school times but as there is a thriving junior football club that uses the Beech Lane recreation ground this also happens over the weekends. We are talking of 90 houses in the plan but with a safeguarded section adjacent, you might only be judging on the 90 but it is obvious once access was obtained then a further application would follow. It could mean up to 150 or more houses, even with one car per household that would be catastrophic but as we all know most houses now seem to have more than one car.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Carolyn Wojtas	Response-01052	It is difficult to drive down Beech Lane with parked cars constantly anyway. Lots of traffic for school drop off and pick up and cars for activities on the recreation ground. Dangerous near school and where children play.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Cat Hope	Response-00127	West hallam is a village, now soon will be an estate like oakwood! Traffic is horrendous, more so parking. Empty houses already on where the former white hart is. This once attractive village, will soon by awful. Ilkeston as the nearest town can't handle more traffic. Our villages are losing our green belt areas! Years ago Erewash would never budge, eg dale road stanley. We need to protect our green space! Soon will be none. Huge overcrowding happening. Criminal activity needs protection also! Our police can't cope as it is now.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Charles Brooks	Response-00535	This is already a serious issue on Beech Lane and especially at school opening and closing times. Its very difficult for through traffic to navigate the road safely. I have witnessed instances of vehicles mounting the pavements to get past. In the past I have been a school governor and Chair for about 10 years. The safety of the children near Beech Lane has always been an issue and has not improved over the years. In fact, the safety is even more acute since there is no longer a road crossing person or any measures to slow traffic. I always lived in dread of an accident involving a child and I still do. The village is already bulging with vehicles. Every household has more than one car. There are often near misses on the roads in West Hallam particularly people coming out from behind parked cars. Every exit out of West Hallam is difficult to navigate. There are no traffic lights, no mini roundabouts and no traffic calming apart from speed indicator devices on the High Lane Extra vehicles will only exacerbate the problems. I belong to Community Speed Watch and am very aware of the volume of traffic coming into and out of the village.,
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Charlotte Lun	Response-00150	The planned site is directly opposite a large primary school. The safety of the school children needs to be addressed if additional housing is to go ahead. The area is already an accident waiting to happen.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Chloe Parkin	Response-00154	Not a good idea building more houses especially directly opposite a school. Will increase risks of accidents involving minors from the school.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Chris Collins	Response-00037	Similar to my comments regarding traffic congestion, further traffic in the immediate area of Scargill School is a huge safety concern. During school pick-up and drop off there are huge numbers of cars arriving into the village / around the school for children. To introduce many more households trying to exit a new mini-estate opposite the main school entrance at ?rush hour? would bring chaos to Beech Lane and further roads around the village and introduce risk and safety concerns.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Chris Reid	Response-00136	Already too many cars in area and as this is close to the school
			Christine	Response-01019	Due to the amount of traffic at school opening and closing times road safety will be a massive problem
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Christine Barnes	Response-00640	The lane is narrow and there are many cars parked on the road/ pavement. Ninety plus houses will inevitably mean more children will have to cross the lane without a clear view of oncoming traffic. This will be an accident waiting to happen. I trust sufficient people have viewed the current difficulties and have sufficient foresight to do an appropriate risk assessment.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Christine Barnes	Response-01827	This site is directly opposite Scargill Primary School. Beech Lane is a narrow lane which is already heavily used by traffic entering and leaving the village. In addition parked vehicles present further hazards, particularly at the start and finish of the school day and during football matches at the weekends. These factors present a real problem for children crossing the lane, unseen, between parked vehicles, to access school and their home.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Christopher Chambers	Response-00172	90 dwellings is likely to bring 130+ vehicles. Beech Lane is not suitable for the current levels of traffic in peak times, and the proposal for more than 100 extra vehicles into the same area, without substantial and damaging consequences is unacceptable. The recreation ground is very popular and its use brings additional vehicles to the area that saturates existing capacity and encourages residents of the adjacent West Hallam estate to use alternative routes to High Lane West, adding all of these extra vehicles is only likely to harm the road safety in the village. The proposed development is scheduled to have an entry/exit road on Beech Lane and this can only be within 250m of the entrance to Scargill school, which is potentially catastrophic for the safety of children using the school.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Claire dean	Response-00069	The parking on beech lane poses a huge risk, to increase occupancy in the area and expect them to use beech lane as their main route in and out of the proposed estate would be utter chaos. Not to mention the primary school opposite.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Craig Johnston	Response-00234	Beech lane is already congested and unsafe
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Daniel Clark	Response-01094	Busy with cars parked everywhere now. Adding potential traffic to a area that has high parking and traffic issues now. Is ridiculous and this will have more people coming in to the village to use the shops and schools.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Daniel hickson	Response-00177	Children getting dropped off and collected at school
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	David Fretwell	Response-00133	Additional traffic at beech lane junction and station road is far from ideal. What is already an unsafe junction will not be helped by further traffic
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	David Harasym	Response-01055	The location next to the school is a traffic concern
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	David Mosley	Response-01062	Again, the road is already quite unsafe with parents parking for school drop off and pick up and also at the weekends with people parking all along Beech Lane for football on the field as they have nowhere else to park.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	David Richards	Response-01465	Children use this part of Beech Lane extensively due to the location of the school and using the park, cricket club and surrounding woodland. Introducing more traffic is not suitable.
			Dean Wright	Response-00094	Increased road traffic at an already busy junction
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Diane Reynolds	Response-00216	The traffic is already bad getting out of the village. We live on beech lane and on school times and when football is on it is particularly bad. With cars mounting the pavement at speed to get past each other. I genuinely fear for the safety of my family when walking or reversing of our drive. With at least most people having 1 car per household the roads will not be able to cope with more houses. There has already been a near miss with kids up the road with a car nearly hitting them coming out of their house on the pavement
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Ebony Eaves	Response-01497	.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Eileen Bailey	Response-01053	Parking is terrible

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Emily Reeve	Response-01495	Often during the times that vehicles are parked along the road and traffic comes from both directions which, it causes people to mount the curbs and drive along the footpath for a way. I have experienced this on many occasions when walking my children to school. People also speed down the road to be past the parked vehicles quickly making crossing very hard. An increase in housing in the area will only add to this issue. If the access to the site is put opposite the school this can only cause more danger to the children and adults of the school.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Emily Reynolds	Response-00149	Again, linking to traffic congestion. More congestion = higher chance of accidents. The proposed area of development is right outside a primary school. You will absolutely end up with kids at the very least injured if the proposed homes are built. Most households have 2 cars now so you would be adding at the least 180 cars to that one small area which links to increased congestion as well.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Emma Lound	Response-00187	The road is narrow and heavily congested already. More vehicles will increase the risk of KSI collisions. 300 children attend the primary school, the road junction is one of only two routes into the large residential estate and it's a main road to the shopping centre. This development will put residents and children in danger. Should there be any KSI collisions on this route there will be a record for the coroner and the relevant authorities of the concerns raised.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Emma Stanley-Smith	Response-01564	Serious concerns around traffic congestion and children's safety. Junction and surrounding roads already extremely busy during key times. This development could endanger a child's life.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Francesca Dean	Response-00221	No safe crossings or traffic control
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Gary Hamson	Response-00052	I fear children's safety is at risk and the likelihood of serious injury or worse is a distinct possibility of happening
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Gillian Bosworth	Response-00921	This proposed development is opposite the school off an already very busy road.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Gilly Turrini	Response-00151	Large school right opposite the proposed build site with lots of traffic already will put children, parents and staff at higher risk of RTC
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Glenn Richardson	Response-00316	It's not rocket science to realise that building opposite a large school & a major road junction into the village isn't going to help with the already ludicrous traffic problems on an already saturated beech lane. Perhaps the council should come & take a look at for them self. Increasing the volume of traffic using the road is again increasing the dangers to the local community
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Graeme Taylor	Response-01131	Beech lane is not wide enough to accommodate this development this will create road safety issues for the school and village center
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Guiliano Ricci	Response-01010	The Hallam way junction is not safe and building a housing estate will impact on this
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Heidi Spencer	Response-00189	Beach Lane is already a massive safety concern during school drop off, pick up and football training/fixtures. Cars park everywhere making it challenging to get through. Adding these houses into so close to the school will make things a lot worse and dangerous
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Helen Blackwell	Response-00456	Cars mount the pavement on beach lane, additional traffic to an already congested road opposite a school will make beach lane more dangerous.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Helen Collins	Response-00034	Beech Lane is already busy road through the village. The location of the proposed site so close to the school will create additional traffic and congestion which will be dangerous. Exiting my home (Hallam Way, nr Beech Lane) that is close the school is already very challenging at peak times, due to the road layout, the number of cars parked (often inappropriately) and the increased pedestrian traffic. The increase in traffic onto Beech Lane in particular at peak times will be an increased danger to the many families exiting cars and walking to and from school. There are no designated crossing points or school crossing patrols to support the safety of the young children attending school.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Helen fox	Response-00064	In a small village where plans are underway to construct additional housing, concerns regarding road safety have emerged. The increase in residential development could lead to heightened traffic, posing risks to pedestrians and cyclists. This potential surge in vehicles may compromise the tranquility and safety of the village, ultimately detracting from its charm and livability. Therefore, careful consideration of road safety is essential to preserve the village's character and protect its residents.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Helen Johnson	Response-00170	Not enough parking. The village has to manage schools commuters and Tesco deliveries. Many homes on beech lane do not have drives so this also adds to the congestion
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Helen Patenall	Response-00868	please see previous comment
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Helen Stanley	Response-01555	The narrow road are beech Lane can not cope with more traffic Creating a junction opposite the school is an accident waiting to happen. At school drop off and pick up times and every weekend with football matches beech lane is full of red cars resulting in difficult passing situation s. The new housing could add another 240 cars which the village just can't cope with
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Helen Taylor-Tipton	Response-00246	Lights needed at Mapperley crossroads
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Helen Vickedes	Response-00062	The proposed site would have entrances / exits onto a very tight bend increasing the risk of accidents as well as entering the village across from the school already a very busy junction on Beech Lane / Hallam Way at school times
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Hollie Briggs	Response-00040	Really silly location for new houses due to the 300+ children that walk to and from school, the increased traffic will become very dangerous for the children.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Holly Mohamed	Response-00076	Safety Concerns: More vehicles on the road can increase the risk of accidents, particularly in residential areas where children and pedestrians are present. The safety of residents, especially school children, could be compromised. There have already been concerns about speeding vehicles in the area, and additional traffic could exacerbate this issue. Inadequate Road Design: The current road design may not support the increased traffic volume, potentially leading to hazardous conditions. Narrow roads and lack of proper pedestrian crossings could pose significant risks to both drivers and pedestrians.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Iain Harrison	Response-01214	Road safety is another serious concern. The top of Hallam Way and Beech Lane?adjacent to the proposed housing development?has long been a dangerous crossing point. For years, a lollipop lady was stationed there to help children cross safely on their way to and from school, until that essential service was cut due to government funding reductions. Despite this, the road remains hazardous, particularly during peak times. Increasing the volume of traffic, along with the number of pedestrians and parked vehicles, will only heighten the risk of accidents. Once again, the idea of intensifying pressure on an already unsafe area is nothing short of reckless.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Iris Howes	Response-01169	cars often have to mount the kerb to pass, putting pedestrians ? especially children ? at risk. I've lived here a long time and witnessed many accidents over the years. Its also sad to see children struggling to cross a road in what should be a safe area.
			Jacqueline Shakh	Response-00095	Too near the school
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Jade Harland-Toomer	Response-00217	Dangerous junction opposite school
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	James Gadsby	Response-01058	The junction is already extremely busy and dangerous at school pick up times with out adding even more cars onto a busy stretch of road.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	James Johnson	Response-01125	West Hallam?s roads, particularly those leading into and out of the village, are not designed for high volumes of traffic. Additional housing will significantly increase vehicle numbers, leading to congestion, longer journey times, and heightened risks to pedestrians and cyclists, particularly around schools and village centres.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	James Painter	Response-01119	As stated previously the proposed development will be situated opposite an entrance to the infants and junior school, with an already fairly congested road this development will add to an already hazardous situation even worse. With only two ways out of the village both of which are congested at peak times with neither junction having traffic control in place with more traffic using these junctions this could well create safety problems
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	James Tilford	Response-00103	Increased traffic at a busy junction on the door step of a school
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	James William Allen	Response-01280	Beech Lane is already a notorious traffic bottleneck, where school children and those using the sports fields already run the gauntlet, crossing the busy road between parked cars. Adding further traffic pressure and children will only make matters worse. Again, access to the site from the West would mitigate this.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Jane Marshall	Response-01172	Beech Lane is already notoriously impossible to drive down at certain times of the day. To add more traffic is dangerous and an accident waiting to happen as a drop off for the local primary school.
			Jane Taylor	Response-01023	Outside the school, is obviously going to be a risk to pupils!
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Jane thomas	Response-01056	The roads and junctions are already busy, and congested
			Jane Zielinski-Raynor	Response-01095	Really busy and dangerous to cross at school times
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Jennifer Noble	Response-01012	Dangerous as it is at the moment let alone if there's new houses built
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Jenny Butler	Response-00202	Many children cross, walk and cycle along Beech Lane. What measures will there be to protect them??
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Jessica Rogers	Response-01524	More traffic in the area will lead to road safety being a significant risk to children at school drop off times
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Jo-Anne Attenborough	Response-00129	Since we have no lollipop person around Scargill, crossing roads around school time is very dangerous. Accidents have happened and children have been injured. Adding more roads will exacerbate the issue and make traffic congestion worse.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Joe Rice	Response-00063	Beech Lane is ALREADY a safety concern during busy times, school and football times. Lots of children need to use beech lane for the school and the park area and cars are already mounting the curbs to get past each other. As someone that lives on Beech Lane it seems to be a matter of time till there is a more serious accident.
			Johnson	Response-01037	Proposed development opposite school. Fears for safety of children on already very busy area
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Jonathan moon	Response-00273	As someone who users west hallam school this road is not suitable for another large housing development the road is very tight at school times also the local park is used for west hallam community football various in the week for training and at wkds it is very busy and very tight. Most houses now need 2 cars that's at least another 180 vehicles im very concerned that this increases the chances of a accident involving children on beech lane outside the school
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Jonathan Purkis	Response-00159	There is already an issue with cars parking on Beach Lane. This causes safety issues for motorists and pedestrians alike. More local traffic will only exacerbate this.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Jonie centro	Response-00730	too many houses near school and school children
			Jon Skelson	Response-00157	Beech lane is already at max capacity
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Jon Skelson	Response-01025	It's already only a matter of time before someone is seriously injured around here. Building more houses, hence more traffic will only compound this problem.
			Judith Hare	Response-01014	Too many cars. The roads and pavements in the village were not built for heavy traffic.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Julie August	Response-01064	Creating more roads where there are children coming out of school is a road safety issue
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Julie Harbon	Response-00022	I am very concerned at what the increase in traffic will do to an already extremely busy junction, right opposite the school. Parking is limited now, without additional housing. There are always lots of children around in school time, but also using the playing fields adjacent, particularly soccer practice.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Julie Harker	Response-01073	More houses means more cars right opposite the school so bound to be more of a hazard for children. Especially as it is a junior school
			Julie Stewardson	Response-00282	A crossing would need to be provided sure to the extra traffic
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Julie Wright	Response-00091	The roads are very busy it is difficult trying to get across the road
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Karen Squire	Response-01040	Cars move slowly along this stretch of road anyway
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Karina Cooper	Response-00267	Too close to the school , would invite you to come and drive during collection and drop off times.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Kate Halls	Response-01035	The traffic is incredibly congested at times along Beech Lane. A housing development of this number will only increase this, along with difficulties for the school position (Scargill), and the safety of children who go there. The village will lose it's ?village? feel.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Katherine Earley	Response-01075	Opposite a school and a well used playing field it would mean the creation of 90 dwellings would mean more cars using and parking and already over populated area.
			Kathryn Fearn	Response-00100	The proposed site is next to the school

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Kathryn Gilbert	Response-01574	Already have near misses with accidents on Beech Lane. Access to school opposite entrance to proposed development is too dangerous
			Katie	Response-00047	Beech lane is already dangerous at school and peak times. Adding more houses will increase this
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Katie Rice	Response-00036	Parking is unsafe and with even more traffic trying to get through, there is a chance emergency services would not get through when needed
			Kay	Response-01030	Will make it to busy
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Keith Atkinson	Response-01050	Beech Lane is totally unsuitable for another access road. Traffic entering and leaving a new development would endanger children and parents attending the school.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Ken Mitchell	Response-00763	The congestion and hazards from parked cars on Beech lane , together with a new junction, is an unacceptable road safety hazard so near to a large primary school.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Ken Musson	Response-00900	the most important reason why this land should not be used for housing is to protect the health and safety of the school children and staff at Scargill Primary School which is opposite the said site to be used for more housing. The road in front of the school is often impassable with buses avoiding the area at school opening and closing times, cars end up having to mount the pavement to pass through or to park. Therefore, how can more traffic in the area improve this situation. This whole area is an accident waiting to happen in terms of traffic and emergency vehicle access is already compromised without further housing and therefore more cars and traffic.
			Kerry	Response-01034	School and nursery entrance . Unsafe to have more cars on the roads in this area
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Kerry Barratt	Response-00168	Too much traffic already
			Kerry Middleton	Response-00266	There is already a risk of accidents within this area which would be increased with this proposal.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Kevin Fox	Response-00682	Further road safety measures and traffic calming will need to be added as beech lane speeds are increasing. Alternative road entrances into the village will need to be added if road safety is to be assured.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Kirsty Oliver	Response-00558	How can it be safe on such a narrow road that is half taken up with parked vehicles. It would be horrendous during building especially for safety.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Laura Egglestone	Response-01027	Cars regularly mounting the curbs to pass when cars are parked on one side of the road. People often speeding down past the cars to get to the end and not get stuck. Makes crossing the road very difficult
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Lesley Foulkes	Response-00130	To leave West Hallam from this proposed site means heading out via St Wilfrids Road, already an overbusy junction or Beech Lane towards Station Road. This junction is, at best, awkward at busy times already and adding further traffic would be chaotic.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Linda Webster	Response-00744	My main concern is one of Health and Safety as the site is directly opposite Scargill Primary School - a very dangerous position. Beech Lane is not a full width road and is congested several times a day; surely the road needs to be widened before considering any housing development? There have been problems at the junctions of Beech Lane/Station Road, the T junction at Cat& Fiddle Lane as well as Millhouse/Mapperley crossroads and more traffic from a development would just make this more dangerous.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Lindsey Lyons	Response-00071	Road safety is paramount to the wellbeing of the area and children that already use the local school. There have been multiple incidents in recent years of children being knocked over as cars are already double parked making visibility poor and safe for crossing the road. Adding additional housing will only increase this risk with more vehicles using the roads (Beech lane and Hallam Way) as access points driving further increased risk for incidents involving children and the potential for road traffic accidents (these have increased as well in recent years, I have personally witnessed several in the last two years). As mentioned in my previous comment, traffic is already heavily congested adding additional vehicles makes the area unsafe for not only school children but also road users as parking is limited, visibility poor and leaves the village open to further RTA's, which I am sure no council wants to increase.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Louise Annison	Response-01049	The road is already a dangerous congestion point.
			Louise Hunt	Response-01032	Opposite a school presents such a risk to kids, parents and teachers.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Mandie frith	Response-00247	Terrible congestion already in this area
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Mark	Response-00164	More Traffic onto the congested road around a school very sensible not!
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Mark Baker	Response-00110	Beech lane is meant to be 30mph but very few people obey this. More traffic increases the risk of injury.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Mark Mason	Response-01194	As previous comment
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Mark Newton	Response-00179	Needless to say, it is insane to add a junction for further housing here due to the large numbers of children that are present during term times in morning and afternoon, as well as every weekend due to the football matches and playing fields. I have seen so many near misses on this road. Developing on Beech Lane opposite a busy primary school and playing field, on an already dangerous road, thus increasing traffic volumes from a new direction, will almost certainly cause the death of a child. Whether school age, young infants playing on the fields, young children accessing the weekend matches, every day of the week this is a high activity area for children. There is nothing on this road to stop speeding traffic as it is. All you need is a speed gun, or to observe for 30 mins at school opening time each day, or simply to watch cars do dangerous moves every match day to swerve around the long line of parked cars, denotes it is simply insanity to add high risk to this area.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Mark Patenall	Response-00851	The junctions at Station road, Cat and Fiddle lane and Millhouse corner are already very busy. The proposed development includes a new access road near the school which will pose further risks for the children
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Mark Perrin	Response-00223	A zebra crossing should be provided across beech lane including traffic calming measures (not speed bumps!)

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Mark Power	Response-00276	People speeding near schools, and busy junction at Scargill. The junctions around the area are extremely busy, again causing traffic issues . Scargill onto Beech lane is constant as is station road into Beech lane, the top of station road into high lane west, station road down to Cat and fiddle lane and the junction near there is a Stop junction and is a safety concern anyway. Cars mount kerbs and speed at school/football times and is rising safety issue as cars speed even on the kerbs
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Matt Haddon	Response-00696	The village is already very congested at times with the car park at the Dales often full causing vehicles to park on both sides of the road in the village resulting in very poor visibility for those exiting the Dales and also on the dangerous blind bend on to St Wilfreds Road. Highway issues would be increased if this site goes ahead due to Beech Lane not being a full width road and already has issues with vehicles parked down the full length at school pick up and drop off times, as well as weekends when the recreation ground on Beech Lane is utilised by the local children?s football teams. With vehicles often mounting the kerb as mentioned before this creates a huge safety concern for pedestrians and parents/children crossing the road, as well as wheel chair users and parents with pushchairs. Hallam Way is also badly affected by parking at school times resulting in very poor visibility for cars, buses and pedestrians crossing the road.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Matthew Lyons	Response-00061	Parking already a big problem at school time. Accidents happening and lots of near misses. Parents already park across home owners home. How will this be managed. Are we expected to just accept it
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Maureen Briggs	Response-00190	The road is already very busy at school times with parking and picking children up.It can be very dangerous at times and would be a terrible idea to build more houses and therefore more traffic.!!
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Max Egglestone	Response-01278	The influx of new cars will heighten these existing issues, making daily commutes more hazardous for drivers and pedestrians alike. We have footage of this and I'm more than happy to provide it along with a police incident number which involved our three daughters - Luckily no one was hurt this time but do know of accidents that have been caused by erratic driving during busy times. Nearby junctions-especially those with Station Road and areas near the Cat & Fiddle and Millhouse Garage-already suffer from poor visibility and congestion during peak times. With no concrete plans to improve these access points, any further development would only exacerbate the danger.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Max Longdon	Response-00128	Dangerous levels of traffic at busy periods is only going to get worse
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Michael Earley	Response-01039	It's irresponsible to expand more housing on a densely populated area?.. that is flooded with traffic at numerous times of day
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Michelle	Response-00148	More traffic will no doubt cause road safety issues.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Michelle Cox	Response-00138	T o much traffic going through The Village already
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Mr and Mrs Mellors	Response-01797	The roads throughout West Hallam ? including Beech Lane, Station Road, and surrounding lanes ?are narrow and were not designed to accommodate the increased volume of traffic that would arise from a large-scale housing development. This poses a serious health and safety risk to elderly residents and children who regularly walk through the village to reach the local shop, school, or recreation grounds. Increased traffic would heighten the risk of accidents, particularly in areas with no continuous footpaths or safe crossing points. The influx of construction vehicles during development and additional cars post-completion would make the village environment far more hazardous for all pedestrians.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Mr and Mrs Wood	Response-01826	I am sure others will make points about concerns regarding road safety around the two proposed sites, one directly opposite a primary school and the other near a busy crossroads.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Mrs Bird	Response-00045	More traffic along beech lane would be detrimental to safety, especially given its outside a school. Traffic coming from either direction to the proposed development would increase the poor safety of the area and road layout. In addition the traffic going towards the village centre, using the already tight bends and junctions, would further increase risk.
			Mrs Glenda Orchard	Response-01490	Traffic and parking is a nightmare at school time
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Mrs Judith Pittson	Response-00753	Beech lane cannot cope with more traffic and the dangers that will bring.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Mrs Strelley	Response-00233	The school on Beech lane and the recreation green already add to traffic congestion. The traffic speeds along this road. Children cross all the time. It is positively dangerous.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Natalie Payne	Response-01523	Traffic and parking around this area is already at a level where accidents can easily happen
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Neil Fletcher	Response-01063	Area is already very busy at school times. Adding housing here would significantly increase the likelihood of road traffic accidents.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Nichola Dodd	Response-00196	Beech lane is already congested regularly due to the school, use of the playing fields etc. It would be dangerous and an accident waiting to happen to have an access to 90 houses there.
			Nick Craddock	Response-00145	As per my comments for other west Hallam Proposal
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Nicola Elkington-Horridge	Response-00079	Too many cars going past school already! We don't need anymore.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Nicole Brookman	Response-01559	the roads are already too busy so my children can not cycle around the villiage and they are 11 and 13 as there is too much car movement
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Nina Walters	Response-00244	Beech Lane is already congested and dangerous when parked cars are there at school times and when football matches take place on the recreation ground / events in the village. The proposed area is opposite the primary school which already has road safely concerns at school drop off and pick up times .
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Pamela Fox	Response-01242	Further road safety measures and traffic calming will need to be added as Beech Lane speeds are increasing. Alternative road entrance into the village will need to be added if road safety is to be assured
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Patricia Eady	Response-00114	I visit the area frequently, my granddaughter attends Scargill school at drop off and pick up time the congestion up beech lane is horrendous and the cars park bumper to bumper, also on the pavement I feel there is an accident waiting to happen, it's bad enough now without more houses off beech lane



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Patricia Ryan	Response-00132	Beech Lane is dangerous enough with parking at the school with more 90 more hours and the coming out onto Beech Lane it will be a nightmare. An accident waiting to happen.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Patrick Barber	Response-00280	The proposed entrance to the site is close to the school and a number of other road junctions so causing problems at busy periods and produce addition risks to children.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Paul aldre	Response-00152	It's a death trap now
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Paula Piggott	Response-01041	Road safety will seriously be impacted. There is already too much traffic. This is a small village. There is a school and many bungalows with pensioners. It is a accident waiting to happen. Also dog walkers, horse riders and lots of wildlife. Seriously someone will get hurt or worse killed!
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Pauline wood	Response-01100	As previous comment
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Peter Lilley	Response-00161	Extra traffic on an already busy road near a Primary School is an accident waiting to happen.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Pete Vanstone	Response-01164	Parked cars leave barely enough space for a single vehicle to pass, forcing motorists onto pavements and endangering pedestrians, especially children walking to and from school. This danger is compounded by poor sightlines and the lack of traffic-calming measures. The T-junctions where Beech Lane meets Station Road, near the Cat & Fiddle pub and Millhouse Garage, already present difficult and unsafe conditions during busy periods. The additional vehicle load from 90+ homes would severely compromise road safety and lead to daily congestion and delays. No road upgrades have been proposed to address this.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Phil Campbell	Response-00109	Ideally, a traffic light should be installed to ensure safe crossing to the school.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Philip Davies	Response-01116	Already many vehicles appear to be speeding along Beech Lane, taking little or no notice of the school speed restrictions. Added numbers of children and adults crossing will be a safety hazard.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Rebecca howe	Response-00126	School drop off and pick up already awful
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Rebecca Ricci	Response-00102	Beech Lane and Hallam way is already too busy especially at the start and end of the day coinciding with the school day. Adding houses on this site and a junction for the houses will have a significant impact on road safety.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Richard Fearn	Response-00180	With a blind bend and a school nearby extra traffic would be dangerous.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Richard Norman	Response-00043	The access on beach lane will increase the already high chance of an accident around school times and sports events on the recreation ground
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Robert Dodd	Response-00201	Beech Lane already gets heavily congested at times due to the school and the use of the playing fields. There is not adequate infrastructure for the additional access for 90 homes.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Robert Flatley	Response-00978	In a similar vein to concerns regarding congestion the proximity to the school and the frequent presence of parked vehicles along one side of the road makes an increased risk of accidents both for vehicles and pedestrians. Furthermore there is no school crossing patrol present here either meaning that increased vehicular traffic could pose a risk to school children and other pedestrians crossing the road.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Robert Hall	Response-00630	Development on this site be detrimental to road safety by reason of proximity to Scargill Primary School.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Robert Mee	Response-01581	I have considerable concerns over road safety with this proposal. Beech Lane is already the most congested street in the village. In the afternoon, in the lead-up to school finishing, it is not unusual to see traffic having to drive along the pavement in order to get past obstructions at the same time as there is a large number of young pedestrians in the vicinity. Adding more housing, and a further junction, will only add to what is already an intolerable situation. I see nothing in the notes for this site that suggests that there will be any mitigating measures introduced.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Robert Mee	Response-01511	I have considerable concerns over road safety with this proposal. Beech Lane is already the most congested street in the village. In the afternoon, in the lead-up to school finishing, it is not unusual to see traffic having to drive along the pavement in order to get past obstructions at the same time as there is a large number of young pedestrians in the vicinity. Adding more housing, and a further junction, will only add to what is already an intolerable situation. I see nothing in the notes for this site that suggests that there will be any mitigating measures introduced.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Robert Reynolds	Response-00260	Beech Lane is already extremely busy, especially at school drop-off and pick-up times, and when football matches are being played. More houses will just make this worse.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Ruby Reid	Response-00119	Dangerous parking along beach lane and other areas of the village especially around school times which would only increase with an increase in population
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	sam richards	Response-01467	This location is one of the main routes people use for drivers and pedestrians - particularly young children out playing on their bikes or walking to the shop and back to the park or over to the cricket club. the junction where Hallam way meets beech lane is already particularly dangerous which is directly opposite the proposed site. parked cars all along beech lane already provide risks to other drivers and walkers. the school buses also regularly get stuck due to parked cars on beech lane and hallam way causing further traffic disruption. plans have not been released as of yet so it is difficult to know, but hopefully the hedgerow along beech lane will remain there, as having multiple driveways along the road would be very dangerous.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Sarah James	Response-01085	Opposite the school. Traffic accidents waiting to happen.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Sarah Taylor	Response-00115	Beech lane is a route used by school children, it becomes congested around school hours and more traffic poses more risk and blocking the only way in from Derby causing potential obstruction for emergency services as WH has elderly residents. With regards to congestion of parked cars lining the street on Sunday mornings when football has taken place I have been bullied onto the kerb from an oncoming driver when it was my right of way as cars were parked on their side not wanting to wait in an aggressive manner. Causing damage to my wheels in the process.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Scott wright	Response-00089	Roads already too busy and dangerous for young children commuting to school and attending the field/Park.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Serena Bostock	Response-00125	The traffic is horrendous in West Hallam already. The parking is a nightmare as people have started parking on bends etc... which has become hazardous. Too many houses with 3 or 4 people who have cars and don't utilise their driveway. This will only add to this!
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	sharon hickson	Response-01430	with the amount of cars parked on the road with households let alone the school traffic that is parked ,having a housing development on beech lane directly opposite a school ,would increase a child being hit by a car ,lorry , work van is a massive possibility, as in the last few years I know of 2 children being hit by a car in west Hallam.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Simon Hinsley	Response-00106	beech Lane is already busy and particularly so at school time. additional traffic onto beech Lane is likely to cause more congestion and pose a safety risk to other road users around the school
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Simon Reeve	Response-01080	The roads simply aren't built for the traffic we already have without adding more homes with more cars; I grew up in West Hallam (High Lane East) in the 80s, spending time in West Hallam Village and there were approximately 1 car for every 1.5 homes, now there's 2 for every house. The junctions at Millhouse Garage and the Bottle Kiln have poor visibility with huge queues up St Wilfreds every rush hour and simply aren't suitable for supporting more homes
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Sophie	Response-01105	Same as my traffic comment, how is an already busy through road going to cope with 90+ extra vehicles consistently using it?
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Stacey Eady	Response-01529	If you have ever visited Beech Lane, you will know that the road is currently already very busy during peak times, such as school drop off and pick up. Cars regularly park on both sides of the road, which causes major disruptions to ongoing traffic driving through the village. It is one of only two routes in and out of a village that has already expanded way beyond its initial infrastructure and is the major road that haulage uses to get deliveries through the village to the main centre, The Dales. Beech Lane also has a large recreational ground and children's playground adjacent to the school, which is used regularly during evenings and weekends to facilitate both football matches and cricket games meaning it's busy all day, most days. The road dimensions on Beech Lane are much narrower than those of a normal major road. It is not wide enough to be marked with central white lines (I'm guessing that's why it was originally termed a 'lane') which means it's even tighter when cars park on one or both sides and, at times, this has caused delays with emergency services/buses, simply being unable to get through. I also note that as a bus route, the road should be at least 6.2 m wide, and this is not the case. Living on Beech Lane, I regularly see people driving up onto the pavement to get up the road, which simply is unacceptable, considering the closeness to the school. The road has a 20mph speed limit during school times. However this is very rarely observed, and in my time on Beech Lane, I have never seen speeds being monitored. With the school blocking off a huge portion of the Lane for its own Keep Clear Zone, which is required to be kept clear at all times to comply with rule 243 of the Highway Code, I'm unsure how any safe or practical solution could be arrived at to allow access to the proposed new site from Beech Lane. The road to the school is currently also required to be left clear (hence the single white line on the opposite side), so quite where the access to and from the proposed site is going to be situated is a mystery. My concern is that this site has been identified on several previous occasions, as suitable land to build on, but the process has always been stopped, mainly due to the concerns regarding traffic. These issues have not changed and indeed have significantly worsened due to the natural increase in population, so I'm unsure why or how this proposal has been approved this time around. With an extra 90 houses (+ 32 dwellings within the 'safeguarded land' they wish to develop), this will total 122 houses, which seems ludicrous with this specific site having only one access in and out of the new development, meaning an extra (potentially) 244 cars coming on and off Beech Lane. This is, in my opinion, a disaster waiting to happen. I have also been made aware that the Erewash Planning team have not yet consulted with DCC highways up until this point, which worries me further! Obviously, you must undoubtedly understand that feelings are 'running high' within the West Hallam community and the need for transparency at every stage of the procedure is essential. If not, rumour-mongering and suspicion is bound to occur and there is a fear that the use of consultancy companies may, at worst, cover up any indiscretions and, at best, cloud the issue. Are there any assurances in place to maintain the necessary complete transparency? Can I ask if DCC Highways will have the 'final say' in the Traffic Safety and suitability of this
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Stacey Eady	Response-01529	site or will this be left in the hands of a consultancy firm/Erewash Council planners? Some of the other sites within the area could better facilitate the increase in traffic but they could also offer the key for the whole village. For example, the possible development of the site West of Station Road (CSR0016) is just on the lead into the village and has a large lay-by area that could be used as a filter lane to allow traffic on and off the site onto the existing road which has the major-road dimensions required. The North of West Hallam site (CSR0048) is on High Lane, a major road that is a straight one. A possible change here could be the reduction of speed used on this road, from 40mph to 30mph, to assist traffic on and off the site, which would be a positive impact to pedestrians within the whole village. The St. Wilfrids site (CSR0004) would benefit from the installation of a mini roundabout at its junction with High Lane. Further along towards Stanley Common, this new roundabout would ease the congestion currently suffered at the High Lane- Station Road junction, (Mill House Garage junction) where a blind bend already causes problems.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Stephen Wood	Response-00139	Dangerous for children at school drop off and pick up.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Steve Bailey	Response-01022	Similar to the previous comment, more cars means more congestion. People trying to cross the road will become harder with more cars about.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Tarnia	Response-00199	That road is already dangerous enough , especially at school pick up times. The buses struggle to get though. A child is going to get injured. There are already enough empty houses around west hallam ie the ones where the old pub was . They've been empty 2 years !
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Teresa Faulkner-Day	Response-00242	There are already numerous small accidents along this stretch of road. I personally avoid using it yo get in and out of the village because I can. Other people are not always able to fo this.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Teresa Webster	Response-00086	Major concerns as this area is directly opposite the school which is already a very busy road at peak times - my concern is the primary aged children crossing an already busy road
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Tina Jay	Response-01801	It would also make it considerably more dangerous for children walking to school and crossing the road.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Toni Tomlinson	Response-00204	Dangerous for children leaving school and football matches. A turning circle for school would need to be included in any development.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Tracey Barks	Response-00111	Road safety in this area is already an issue as the school is located opposite the proposed entrance to the development. Safety in terms of pedestrians and vehicles should be a top priority when considering the development
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Tracey BURDUS	Response-00141	Access to the village along Beech Lane at certain times of the day is dangerous at the present time, further housing would make this an even worse situation.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Val Stevens	Response-01070	The proposed exit for the site is opposite a large primary school and near the exit from an already large established estate. We already have parent parking problems and no crossing patrols so the proposed build will further increase safety risks for children and parents.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Vicky Buckley	Response-00182	People speed, dont look for children
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Vicky smith	Response-00171	Beech lane is already highly congested at peak times and can be quite dangerous when school pick up and drop off along with weekends when used for football matches on the recreational ground. Creating higher volumes by erecting 99 new properties will contribute to the potential of blocking the junction of beech lane and station road upon these times due to awaiting oncoming vehicles to pass and the potential of more accidents as people don't like to wait their turn.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Road Safety	Victoria Walker	Response-00228	Cars are very often parked on Beech Lane, a road coming out at this junction, with cars for 90 houses, will lead to more potential accidents.
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Adam willetts	Response-00083	The parking outside the school is horrendous as it is
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Alice Johnson	Response-00093	i believe the school will struggle capacity wise with possibly adding 200 children
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Alison Reynolds	Response-00243	Local schools cannot cope as it is, and with pressure from other local planned housing projects (e.g. in Kirk Hallam)
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Alistair	Response-01138	Schools are already full and we are fighting for a spot
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Andrea Cochrane	Response-01485	The primary school is currently at capacity and will struggle to cope with an influx of new pupils . Should the development go ahead, this will either mean adding to the school buildings and thereby losing the play areas on the school grounds which benefit pupils, or families having to take children into Kirk Hallam or Ilkeston to other schools with space. This will add further to the road congestion and pollution.
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Andrew and Julie Douglas	Response-00146	The school is over subscribed as it is
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Ann Toplis	Response-00271	The school is already full so more houses would make it harder to get into this school
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	A Redshaw	Response-00287	The school does not have capacity
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Barbara Glaves	Response-01046	Too many overcrowded schools already please don't make West Hallam another one
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Carl fox	Response-00067	Only one small school in West Hallam additional housing will over crowd schools
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Charles Brooks	Response-00535	I fully appreciate that Scargill School numbers are in decline from the days of new families coming to West Hallam and into the large new estate that was build in the late 70's and early 80's. In time the school may become unsustainable due to the maintenance of the additional buildings built during the peak of pupil number. I also understand that the school would benefit from more pupils and each child generates income for the school. In life we always have to make choices and in my opinion increasing pupil numbers should not trump the health and safety risks of increasing traffic around the school.
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Chris Collins	Response-00037	The local school goes through cycles in terms of numbers on roll. I used to be a governor but haven't seen the numbers for a few years now. The Erewash birth rate suggests that school numbers shouldn't be a problem but the school does attract from a wide area so this is one that needs to be seen through the lens of someone who has the actual numbers to hand.
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Chris Reid	Response-00136	Can the school cope?
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Christine	Response-01019	Does the school have capacity for the extra children this development will hold?
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Christopher Chambers	Response-00172	Scargill School has a capacity of around 420 pupils, with a current term roster of 310. Whilst this appears to offer headroom for intake, this is unlikely to align with the expected requirements of up to 90 households, assuming no other intake is considered.
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Claire dean	Response-00069	Not enough spaces in local schools as it is.
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Craig Johnston	Response-00234	School is at capacity already
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Daniel Clark	Response-01094	There is no parking now at the school making it dangerous for drivers and children with cars parked on the narrow roads and your perposal will add to this. There is no way of expanding the school to accommodate more children
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Daniel hickson	Response-00177	School is only small and classes are at a maximum at Scargill
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Daniel Stanbridge	Response-00099	Schools in the area are already at capacity
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	David Henfrey	Response-00118	Schools not big enough
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	David Mosley	Response-01062	Have Scargill been consulted about an influx of children and their capacity? My daughter is in a class that already has 33 children in the class which I believe is around the maximum there can be.
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Emily Reynolds	Response-00149	Scargill is already at max capacity and so are the surrounding primary and secondary schools. Most people moving to the new homes will likely be families or people who intend to start families. Lets say 1 child per home. 90 children. Where are those children going to go to school? Unless you plan on building another school I don't see how this development could possibly be successful. We do not have the infrastructure to support the proposed development.
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Emma Lound	Response-00187	The school already provides places for 300 children. This is already an extraordinary amount for a primary school. There is no mention of any provision for extra places or funding for the school to cope with extra students.
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Francesca Dean	Response-00221	None with two more sites proposed. The school already has none catchment pupils
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Gary Hamson	Response-00052	Has anyone from planning checked with the school on vacancies for new pupils?

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Glenn Richardson	Response-00316	Scargill school is already nearly full to capacity & its almost impossible to get pre school places & child care
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Graeme Taylor	Response-01131	The local school has no additional capacity and has no way to expand
			Guiliano Ricci	Response-01010	I
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Helen fox	Response-00064	The existing school capacity may be adversely affected. An influx of new residents could lead to overcrowded classrooms, straining educational resources and diminishing the quality of instruction. This situation could ultimately hinder the village's development, as a well-functioning school is essential for attracting families and fostering a vibrant community. The potential decline in educational standards may deter new families from settling in the area, thereby stunting the village's growth and vitality.
			Helen Johnson	Response-00170	Over subscribed
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Helen Stanley	Response-01555	Current staff levels would not permit more students
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Helen Vickeds	Response-00062	The school is already a very popular school attracting children from outside the area. An additional of more housing attracting further families will put strain on the school
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Homewood	Response-01074	Schools are already at capacity - is there going to be a new primary and secondary?
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Iain Harrison	Response-01214	As a parent with children attending the local school?and living right next to it?I can say with certainty that the school is already at full capacity and struggling. Despite the best efforts of the dedicated staff, the school is underfunded and frequently relies on parents and the community to raise money for basic supplies and equipment. It?s difficult enough to meet the needs of current students, let alone absorb an influx of new children from additional housing. Exactly where are these new families expected to send their children? Or is the push for profit now outweighing critical considerations like education, healthcare, traffic safety, air quality, and environmental preservation?
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Jacqueline Shakh	Response-00095	Need a bigger school for extra children
	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Jade Harland-Toomer	Response-00217	The school is stretched as it is
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	James William Allen	Response-01280	The buildings at Scargill school have expanded massively since I attended over 40 years ago. It is clear that the school is already at capacity for pupils, so adding even more pressure on spaces will be disadvantageous.
	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Jane Taylor	Response-01023	I believe the school is already at capacity for the area
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Jenny Stanbridge	Response-00088	Not enough space as it is
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Jonathan Purkis	Response-00159	The local school is already at capacity. Both my children have previously attended and I cannot see how classroom sizes could be increased to accommodate children from all the new houses.
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Jon Skelson	Response-01025	Has anybody checked the capacity of the local schools ?
			Judith Hare	Response-01014	At the minute it?s ok but 90+ plus houses. If each household only had one child would Scargill cope?
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Julie Harbon	Response-00022	Scargill school would need to make adjustments to cater for an additional 90+ families. This would need to be carefully scrutinised to make sure they have the capacity for this, which I highly doubt.
	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Julie Harker	Response-01073	The school is over subscribed as it is so they will not be able to provide for more children in the area
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Karen Squire	Response-01040	Yes it may add to existing numbers but children have to go to school somewhere.
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Kay	Response-01030	I think the school would end up over crowded and pick up and drop off is already a nightmare
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Ken Mitchell	Response-00763	It would be very unlikely that Scargill school would be able to offer enough places to fulfil the needs of an additional 90 households. This would mean a school run by car to Ilkeston, causing further traffic congestion on Beech lane and also at the dangerous junction of High lane and St Wilfrids road.
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Ken Musson	Response-00900	The village does not have the infrastructure to support more housing in terms of schooling (particularly senior schools in the area)
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Kerry	Response-01034	Services stretched already
	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Kerry Barratt	Response-00168	Class sizes impacted
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Kerry Middleton	Response-00266	The school is already a large junior and infants, which doesn?t have the space to expand or offer extra support for children who may need more.
	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Kevin Fox	Response-00682	Without doubt the school is at capacity a further additional housing estate will need to create an additional school or an extension
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Kirsty Oliver	Response-00558	Not applicable to me
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Kristen Hamilton	Response-00209	Schools are struggling with capacity already
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Laura Egglestone	Response-01027	The school probably does have capacity however, would question their ability to cope with the demand as ofsted reports have been a concern recently
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Lesley Foulkes	Response-00130	I don?t know if our village school is full to capacity, my children are too old so I don?t have contact with Scargill anymore but I do know that many of the children at the school come from outside our village. I know this because of the amount of traffic that comes into the village in a morning and at school end. Is there really capacity for children from a further 90 homes?
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Lindsey Lyons	Response-00071	Scargill School already struggles to accommodate the school children that use the facilities, with the before and after school club already servicing notice on the school (vacating 20th June). Additional housing will create the need for more school places that I strongly believe Scargill cannot accommodate in its current form, coupled with the lack of wraparound care needs to be carefully considered as local childminders are already full. I do not see any reference to how the school has been considered, extreme careful planning is required to accommodate the needs of existing children and potential new children using the area.
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Louise Annison	Response-01049	School is already running with larger class sizes, extra homes will just put increased pressure on children and staff.
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Mandie frith	Response-00247	Over stretched as it is need more schools less houses
			Mark	Response-00164	Hardly big enough now never mind with more adjacent housing!
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Mark Baker	Response-00110	Has there been a study done on the impact to local School places? Funding? Infrastructure?

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Mark Power	Response-00276	Our son went to Scargill and could hardly cope then
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Matt Haddon	Response-00696	Already very busy and popular school meaning that existing local residents may not be able to secure places for their children at the local school
	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Matthew Lyons	Response-00061	The school is already full with years being mixed with negative feedback. How will the increase in potential demand be managed
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Maureen Briggs	Response-00190	It could impact on school if it had to take more children .
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Melanie Johnson	Response-01133	There is no school capacity roads always blocked green belt where my kids play not good for the village at all as it will increase anti social behaviour with over 100 homes.
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Michelle	Response-00148	The school isn't big enough to cope with more intake this will then put pressure on teachers with class sizes increasing. More staff will be off sick with stress which in turn costs the council money in sick pay
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Michelle Cox	Response-00138	The school is ridiculously full already I don't even send my own child there and I live in the actual village
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Mr and Mrs Mellors	Response-01797	The local primary school is near capacity, and there are limited childcare and youth services available in the area. Adding more families without expanding essential services would place an unfair and unsustainable burden on current facilities, negatively affecting both existing and new residents.
	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Mrs Caroline Hooton	Response-00231	School is already at capacity. How do they propose to give spaces to school age children
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Mrs Glenda Orchard	Response-01490	Scargill school is full
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Mrs Strelley	Response-00233	The school is busy. It will need to be able to take on more pupils. It is stretched already with special needs and additional support for pupils.
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Nick Craddock	Response-00145	As per my comments for other West Hallam Proposal
	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Nicola Elkington-Horridge	Response-00079	The school already has more than enough pupils, as does the preschool.
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Nina Walters	Response-00244	Yes
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Paul Aldred	Response-00152	Schools big enough
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Paula Piggott	Response-01041	West Hallam has a small village school. It couldn't cater for more residents. You would be compromising the teacher / pupil ratio therefore compromising education taught and learnt.
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Pauline Wood	Response-01100	Will the school be able to cope
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Peter Lilley	Response-00161	Where are the potential 150 children going to be educated?
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Rachel	Response-01015	Schools in the area are very small.
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Rhonda Holt	Response-00237	Scargill school has classes of 37 already. The school cannot accommodate any more pupils.
	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Richard Fearn	Response-00180	Scargill school already has very large class sizes.
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Robert Reynolds	Response-00260	My understanding is that local schools (especially Scargill in this case) are already at capacity. I haven't seen anything to indicate new schools will be built.
	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Rosemary Moorby	Response-00222	Understand the local adjacent school is already full.
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Sam Richards	Response-01467	I do believe at this current time the primary school is not at its full capacity, however due to staff cuts and mixing classes, I believe all or at least most classes are at their capacity. There are no secondary schools in the village so residents have to apply to schools out of the area which can be very competitive some years.
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Sarah James	Response-01085	I'm assuming the school is bursting at the seams.
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Sarah Taylor	Response-00115	There is one school in WH which is of a good standard with my experience of my children going there both pupils and staff are very positive. However, they are stretched enough as it has 40 pupils to a class with a high amount of children needing special educational needs. They are recruiting more TA's to cope with demand.
	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Scott Wright	Response-00089	The school is already busy and at capacity, the other local schools also do not have parking facilities for another 50 families.
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Simon Reeve	Response-01080	There simply isn't enough resource for the children already attending school in the area. There hasn't been needed investment and it's only getting worse with needs for investment in SEND taking investment from the mainstream; they cannot cope with the demands already.
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Sophie	Response-01105	The school is already at capacity
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Stacey Eady	Response-01529	The school has capacity, it's the infrastructure around that school such as the road and the parking on Beech Lane for school drop off and pick up that I feel is the concern, winding the road for the possible new development will not help as they will still bottle neck further down the road at the recreation ground side. Other sites in West Hallam could also provide the school with more children.
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Teresa Faulkner-Day	Response-00242	The school in the village is at capacity with no scope to expand.
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Teresa Webster	Response-00086	Scargill school is already a large and busy school - I don't believe there is capacity or space for a potential large influx of children
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Tracey Barks	Response-00111	This should be of great concern to the Authorities. The local school is already at capacity and the potential of 90 houses with families and children moving to the area would make the education provision unsustainable
1.9	South of West Hallam	School Capacity	Vicky Buckley	Response-00182	Already overcrowded
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Adam Spencer	Response-00054	Traffic during school times and at weekends when the football pitches are in use is already a nightmare, adding this extra development will make the problem even worse especially during the building phase of the development. Having plant machines and articulated lorries driving through an area which there are already restrictions in place on the roads for certain types of vehicles is unsafe and especially directly opposite the school
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Adam Willetts	Response-00083	Already too busy in the village

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Alesha Johnson	Response-00783	The traffic and congestion through the village at peak times is already dangerous .I?m a resident in West Hallam and my daughter attends Scargill School. The roads and infrastructure in the village will not be adequate enough for this many houses to be built opposite the village school.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Alice Johnson	Response-00093	traffic is already awful on this road during school pick up and drop off hours also at weekends when football tournaments are on
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Alison Fletcher	Response-00198	Beech Lane is already busy with increased traffic during peak times. Parking is hazardous at school start and finish times and further increased traffic will pose serious risk of incidents at this time.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Alison Milner	Response-00120	The traffic situation is already terrible now, especially at school drop off and collection times. The infrastructure just isn't there to support this.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Alison Reynolds	Response-00243	Congestion due to school and sports clubs already make it dangerous pulling out of Pavilion Court and driving along Beech lane
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Alistair	Response-01138	Already such a busy road and even more busy on school times
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Amy	Response-01031	Already nowhere to park for school drop off and pick up leaving Beech lane a one lane road. Lots of congestion on Beech lane at school times.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Amy Cartwright	Response-01017	The residential roads in this area are already overloaded with traffic both in the week and at weekends. It would be a safety issue and an accident waiting to happen should more traffic be using this road
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Andrea Cochrane	Response-01485	The road is already at full capacity, especially during school drop-off/collection times. Trying to leave Hallam Way and travel along Beech Lane is nearly impossible at the moment without adding in extra vehicles from the proposed development and another junction opposite the school. If you add in to this the delivery vehicles heading into the estate at these times, nobody will be able to move. What then will happen if an emergency vehicle needs to get into the estate?
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Andrea Reed	Response-00123	Beech lane is terrible at school pick up time and when football is on as it is
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Andrew and Julie Douglas	Response-00146	Beech Lane is very congested already. Cars mount the pavement to get by parked cars. At school time and when there is football on the park the lane virtually comes to a stand still. Buses have to wait for cars to move before continuing their journey. Children have to cross the road between parked cars
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Andrew Zielinski-Raynor	Response-00135	Beech Lane is already very busy especially at school drop off and collecting times. Because of parked cars traffic it is already limited to a single lane causing extensive congestion as cars wait to get through adding more traffic coming from a third way would make this bad situation even worse.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Andy Flindall	Response-01013	Traffic is already busy near the school adding more traffic that this site will do is an accident waiting to happen and smacks of greed over common sense
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Angela Reid	Response-00134	Beech Lane and surrounding roads are already very busy and congested
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Anita Lawrence	Response-00726	Traffic is a nightmare during school drop-off and pick up times, with vehicles, reducing Beech Lane to single track causing considerable delays for those entering and exiting the village. I have myself been very late for medical appointments due to the weight of traffic already using this Lane. Traffic outside peak school times is often backed up by the volume of parked vehicles using the playing fields and recreation area. It can be very difficult to enter or leave the village. I have witness some very frustrated residents trying to access their homes. The Dales shopping centre has limited parking causing congestion and difficulties for those wishing to use the centre facilities or visit the doctor.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Anita Lawrence	Response-00726	There are also large delivery lorries servicing Tesco in The Dales causing further congestion and reducing available parking. Vehicles park on neighbouring roads adding to the general congestion of the area and again causing difficulties for those accessing their doctor or collecting medication. There are frequent lengthy delays at the crossroads at the top of St Wilfrid's Road with A609 and Mapperley Lane.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Anna	Response-00112	It's already a heavily congested area that can't cope with any additional traffic that these new homes will bring
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Ann Ainsworth	Response-01096	Only two roads out of the village including the road where the development will take place. Frequent traffic jams on Beech Lane
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Anna Richardson	Response-00162	There is already a very dangerous situation outside the primary school. There have been multiple accidents due to traffic levels outside the school which is directly opposite the site
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Anne Vanstone	Response-01216	Beech Lane is not equipped to handle more traffic. The road is narrow, often reduced to a single lane due to parked cars. Local shops at The Dales are already oversubscribed, and the car park is often gridlocked. This puts additional strain on surrounding streets, many of which aren't built to support overflow parking. We lack a reliable bus service, and the nearest train connections are not easily accessible. This makes it almost certain that new households would rely on private vehicles for everything from commuting to basic errands. The knock-on effect on traffic and pollution cannot be ignored.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Ann Toplis	Response-00271	Building here will make the traffic worse on Beech Lane near the school where it is already very bad at school times.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	A Redshaw	Response-00287	The area is not suitable due to The Road infrastructure
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Benjamin Price	Response-00257	Beech Lane is already busy road, with cars parked on both sides of the road often only allowing single file traffic through. There is no pedestrian crossing there and so causes a danger to pedestrians
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Ben Rodney	Response-00122	On school days, the road is congested as it is, let alone adding in at least another 90 cars
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Bruce Broughton	Response-01534	Beech Lane is limited in width and often congested ? both weekdays and weekends ? as a result of parking by football teams and others using Beech Lane Recreation Ground and by parents delivering or collecting children from Scargill School. The junctions at Beech Lane/Station Road, at Cat & Fiddle Lane and at the Millhouse and Mapperley crossroads already have regular traffic tailbacks due to the volume of traffic. It is understood that Derbyshire County Council's Highways Department acknowledged problems at these junctions when approached by the Parish Council about them a year or two ago. There are however no signs of any improvements in the pipeline to achieve improvements and this proposed further development will only make matters worse.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Carl fox	Response-00067	Increased traffic especially during building.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Carol Hart	Response-01829	The report even mentions facilities in the Dales shopping area, this again is not capable of taking more cars, already cars cannot park in the car park and they then park in the village centre causing congestion yet again. We are talking of 90 houses in the plan but with a safeguarded section adjacent, you might only be judging on the 90 but it is obvious once access was obtained then a further application would follow. It could mean up to 150 or more houses, even with one car per household that would be catastrophic but as we all know most houses now seem to have more than one car. The bus service is non-existent, 6 buses in each direction in a day and nothing before 9 a.m. or after 6.30 p.m. It means residents have to rely on their own transport. This Core Strategy was commenced when I was Leader at EBC and officers were tasked to list all possible sites in the Borough that might be used for development. Myself along with my Deputy and other Executive Members along with the Planning Team and Green Spaces visited every site and we consulted with Derbyshire County Council about any highway problems. I still have the feedback from DCC on the West Hallam Site, they acknowledge that access/egress to and from West Hallam is difficult, they mention the awkward Beech Lane/Station road junction, awkward to make safer, they then mention the T junction with Cat & Fiddle Lane, they commented that signalization but also admit the topography is not suitable. They then go on to mention the other two junctions, Millhouse crossroads and Mapperley cross roads and say work would need to be done on those junctions. Yes the number of houses being suggested are slightly different but the concerns still are relevant.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Carolyn Wojtas	Response-01052	I live in Beech Lane and the parking and traffic is horrendous a lot of the time ~ school drop off and activities on the recreation ground which is nearly every evening and every Saturday and Sunday.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Cat Hope	Response-00127	West hallam is a village, now soon will be an estate like oakwood! Traffic is horrendous, more so parking. Empty houses already on where the former white hart is. This once attractive village, will soon by awful. Ilkeston as the nearest town can't handle more traffic. Our villages are losing our green belt areas! Years ago Erewash would never budge, eg dale road stanley. We need to protect our green space! Soon will be none. Huge overcrowding happening. Criminal activity needs protection also! Our police can't cope as it is now.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Cathy Bostock	Response-00181	Already problems with on street parking during school drop off/pick up and football matches
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Charles Brooks	Response-00535	The chosen site directly opposite Scargill School and adjacent to Beech Lane will significantly increase an already congested area particularly during school hours and most noticeably at the beginning and end of the school day. Beech Lane is not a normal width road and there are always instances of cars mounting the pavement near the school to get my. There will inevitably be more traffic congestion on Beech Lane as a result of the proposed development and the entrance on Beech Lane itself. Its clear to me that Councillors have not visited the site and I encourage them to do so. The development represents a serious health and safety issue so close to the primary school. Furthermore the centre of West Hallam which is approx. 100 yards away is continually busy with parked cars and through traffic. Even the occasional bus that comes into the centre often struggles to get through.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Charlotte broughton	Response-01475	Too much traffic in area without the new houses
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Charlotte Lun	Response-00150	Traffic on Beech Lane especially and surrounding areas is dreadful particularly around school drop off and pick up times. Adding additional housing will only contribute to the chaos. The safety of the school children needs to be taken into consideration as the area is already an accident waiting to happen.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Chris Collins	Response-00037	Beech Lane and surrounding streets (The Village, Hallam Way, Scargill Road etc) are extremely congested at school drop off and pickup time, often leading to buses being unable to pass along their routes. It is already dangerous for young children to cross the roads with the current level of traffic, this was obviously exacerbated a few years ago when DCC withdrew funding for the school crossing patrol. There couldn't be a worse place from a safely standpoint to build further housing than opposite Scargill School with the extra traffic that this would bring to the immediate area.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Chris Reid	Response-00136	Beech lane area is already difficult to get through in mornings due to school
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Christine	Response-01019	Already huge parking problems in and around this area, especially during term times, making it impossible to see at junction
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Christine Barnes	Response-00640	Beech Lane is already a heavily congested lane with inconsiderate parking. So many working parents find it necessary to use cars to drop children off and pick up children after school and parking is already a massive problem. Anyone who has carried out a risk assessment must acknowledge the increased use of the lane, dodging between cars is a huge hazard for children and indeed parents with pushchairs. Ninety plus houses will inevitably mean quite a number of children will have to cross the lane to the new houses.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Christine Barnes	Response-01827	Beech Lane is a narrow lane which is already heavily used by traffic entering and leaving the village. Additional traffic from the development will also impact on junctions at Station Road, Millhouse Garage, St Wilfrid's Road and High Lane West, which already are very busy junctions.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Christopher Chambers	Response-00172	The local authority should carry out traffic frequency surveys on Beech Lane at the following times: Mon-Fri 0830 - 0930am Mon-Fri 1500 - 1600pm Sat-Sun 0930-1130am Sat-Sun 1300-1700pm This should illustrate the existing traffic conditions that cover school entry/exit and use of the recreation ground over the course of a typical week. The survey needs to be when both cricket and football seasons are in progress and during term times. This illustration will highlight the folly of granting consent to a development of houses that is likely to add 100+vehicles at some or all of the proposed times.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Claire dean	Response-00069	Beech lane is a very well used narrow road, the site opposite is home to west hallam football club and host many games, the traffic congestion is already a concern so adding to this is ludicrous.
			Connor Gratton	Response-00232	Traffic is already very congested. Further traffic will be untenable
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Craig Johnston	Response-00234	Roads not adequate

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Daniel Clark	Response-01094	Traffic Congestion The Village is already busy with poor access at school and busy times. The parking in and around the village is dangerous and congested
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Daniel hickson	Response-00177	Very busy road especially when school starts and ends
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Daniel Stanbridge	Response-00099	The village is already busy
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Dave Stone	Response-00140	The area in question is already a bottle neck at key school times and is often dangerous due to parked cars.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	David Fretwell	Response-00133	Already lots of complaints due to heavy congestion at school times plus recreational use at weekends. Adding further volume could potentially grid lock beech lane
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	David Henfrey	Response-00118	Beech land already very unsafe at school times
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	David Morrell	Response-00477	Traffic is an issue around the village centre and this development will further impact on this and impact on the West Hallam Conservation area
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	David Mosley	Response-01062	Beech lane is already really bad for parking around school drop off and pick up and even on weekends when there is football on the field as the parents have nowhere to park other than Beech Lane
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	David Richards	Response-01465	Traffic is a key concern. School drop-off / pick-up times are chaotic and all of Beech Lane is effectively reduced to a single track lane. This will be worsened by the proposal. It will also affect surrounding villages and access for service and emergency vehicles.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Dean Wright	Response-00094	Increased traffic in an already busy area, particularly at the start and end of the school day
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Diane Reynolds	Response-00216	It's already a very busy road to have more cars would not help. The traffic is already bad trying to get out of the villages. With queues are already bad on st Wilfred, station road and cat and fiddle cross roads. With most family's having at least 1 car this is a concerned that this will only get worse. Even with currently families in the village as their kids get older this will already increase as there will then be more people with cars so adding to this with more houses is a real concern. The congestion at the shops is getting even worse already with the car park being full and spilling over onto the road
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Dominic Tye	Response-01016	The development will dramatically increase the volume of traffic in our village which will have a detrimental impact on all those who live in our gorgeous village.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Ebony Eaves	Response-01497	Beech Lane can?t cope with any more traffic, there?s limited bus links, It is already really congested at peak times and when recreation ground in use and it also has a huge affect on the wildlife and the village amenities
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Eileen Bailey	Response-01053	Traffic is terrible overcrowding
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Emily Reeve	Response-01495	The area is already very busy at times. Often with people parking the entire length of the road making it into a road where only one car can drive. There is limited visibility from one end of the parked cars to the other causing vehicles to come from both directions which causes back ups of traffic.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Emily Reynolds	Response-00149	Traffic is bad enough around the village already especially at school pick up time. West Hallam does not have the road infrastructure to support more homes. Building houses will without a doubt cause crashes and will make it much much harder to get around the village. The road/connection on beech lane you have planned will not be enough to offset this.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Emma Lound	Response-00187	Beech Lane is already heavily congested during the day. On road parking, the school, the main turning into the estate and the already heavily congested routes into West hallam already struggle to cope. At school times there are hundreds of children and their parents in the area. More cars and another junction will mean higher risks. I already find it dangerous to turn on to my drive at the junction of Beech Lane and Station Road and even more traffic will increase the risk to myself and other users of Beech Lane.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Emma Newsham	Response-00117	Beech lane is already externally congested at school pick up and drop offs and when the field is in use for football
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Emma Stanley-Smith	Response-01564	Serious concerns around traffic congestion and children?s safety. Junction and surrounding roads already extremely busy during key times. This development could endanger a child?s life.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Fiona Petrie	Response-00274	At school start and closing times this road and those around it is already congested. Adding more traffic to this area is ludicrous.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Francesca Dean	Response-00221	Beech lane is chaos at all times of the day. There is no parking for houses that already exist, for school, for football, for cricket, for anything. You can barely pass the parked cars. The pavement is too thin either side and dangerous.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Gary Hamson	Response-00052	The proposed entrance to the site is directly opposite the main entrance to the school on what is one of two roads out of the village, the other being St Wilfred?s Road. The road is gridlocked from around 8-30am to 9-15am and from 2-50 pm to 4-00pm Has the site been visited by any of the planning dept who chose this site ??
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Gillian Bosworth	Response-00921	Already extremely busy / jams at school times.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Gilly Turrini	Response-00151	This road is already a parking and traffic hazard due to the school and existing road junction . Also site traffic will be hazardous
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Glenn Richardson	Response-00316	Beech lane is already a highways nightmare. parking (especially at school time ) is at best dangerous..Numerous accidents have occurred involving both pedestrians & vehicles..It?s a miracle no child has been seriously injured ..All week the park is in constant use with especially grassroots football which again causes traffic problems with very often cars parked along the whole of beech lane ..Anyone with any common knowledge would realise that any sort of developments on the land would add to the problems.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Graeme Taylor	Response-01131	Beech lane is already heavily congested this is a safety hazard and will endanger life if new development goes ahead
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Guiliano Ricci	Response-01010	Traffic already very busy especially at school times and football time Very dangerous for children and families
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Heidi Spencer	Response-00189	Beach lane is already heavily congested especially on school drop off and pick up, adding these houses into the mix will make it a lot worse
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Helen Blackwell	Response-00456	Beech Lane is always congested, especially at school drop off and pick up. At minimum a car park for parents would be needed.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Helen Collins	Response-00034	Beech Lane is already a busy road through the village. It is particularly congested at peak times of the school day and sports sessions on Scargill Recreation Ground. To add another possible 90 - 180 cars exiting onto this already busy road would not only be dangerous, but also cause unacceptable levels of congestion in the immediate area and at the main exit points in and out of the village, St. Wilfreds Road and Station road onto Hight Lane and Beech Lane onto Station Road.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Helen fox	Response-00064	The village is too small to take on that much more traffic which would likely lead to more accidents in the narrow village. School time is already horrendous as it is for parking never mind adding more cars to the scenario it would just be a waiting game for a child to become injured crossing to get to school.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Helen Johnson	Response-00170	Traffic is horrendous already in morning rush hour . Parking for the school is a real safety issue
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Helen Patenall	Response-00868	Beech Lane is a congested area of West Hallam, particularly at the start and end of the school day and at the weekends when the Powtrell recreation ground is being used. Cars are parked on both sides of the road. I have witnessed on several occasions drivers approaching the village 'running the gauntlet' from the end of the parked cars (near to Pavilion Court T -junction) at some considerable speed to get past the parked cars and onto the village before the approach of oncoming traffic. This driver behaviour is putting children and their parents at risk and is quite the reason why the village speed-watch has to operate in this area. Building more properties will increase the volume of traffic at the congested times even more thus adding more risk to pedestrians in the area.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Helen Stanley	Response-01555	The village can't cope with the though traffic currently. The number of houses proposed could add another 240 to already narrow roads and bust junctions with the village itself and at the major junctions to high lane and at station road to Stanley
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Helen Vickeds	Response-00062	This area is very close to the school which already is a traffic black spot at the start and end of school. The roads become heavily blocked with parked cars which will be increased with more junctions in and out of Beech Lane
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Holly Mohamed	Response-00076	Increased Traffic: The addition of approximately 90 homes will significantly increase traffic on Beech Lane and surrounding roads. Currently, these roads are already experiencing congestion, particularly during peak hours. The increased traffic could lead to longer commute times and increased frustration for current residents. Infrastructure Strain: The existing road infrastructure may not be equipped to handle the additional traffic. This could lead to potential bottlenecks and delays, especially at key junctions and intersections. The increased wear and tear on the roads could also result in higher maintenance costs for the local council.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Homewood	Response-01074	Already issues on main roads, not enough routes through to main towns. Will be especially bad at school drop off times
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Iain Harrison	Response-01214	Traffic congestion is also a major and growing problem. The village shop car park is consistently overflowing, and the road leading up to St Wilfrid's Church is lined with parked cars on both sides, reducing it to a narrow and often dangerous route. Beech Lane is effectively a single-lane road much of the time, due to constant on-street parking near the park. Adding more housing in this location will dramatically worsen an already chaotic traffic situation. It is unthinkable that further development is even being considered in such an overburdened area. The idea of building more homes on greenbelt land in a village already at capacity is not just short-sighted?it?s a gross failure of proper planning and governance.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Ian Brown	Response-00163	too near school , parking at school would cause serious conjection at shool times
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Iris Howes	Response-01169	Beech Lane is not equipped to accommodate the traffic levels this development would bring. It becomes gridlocked during school runs
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Jack	Response-00278	Already this road is terrible for traffic and key times of the day. The increased housing will add further stress on the road etc
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Jacqueline Shakh	Response-00095	Too much traffic now
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Jade Harland-Toomer	Response-00217	The traffic outside of the school now is dangerous adding housing opposite will make this worse
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	James Johnson	Response-00183	West Hallam suffers from congestion on and off the estate currently and a further 90 homes could see up to 180 cars. I don?t oppose building in the area but a new traffic entrance onto the estate needs to be provided.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	James Morris	Response-01060	There is already too much traffic joining other nearby areas
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	James Painter	Response-01119	The chosen site is situated opposite vehicular entrance to the infants and primary school,Beech Lane is relatively narrow road that is very congested much of the time.With access and exit to the village only possible by the Station Road/Beech Lane junction or High Lane/St. Wilfrids Road cross roads these junctions are already extremely congested with several accidents occurring in the recent past .With the addition of probably upwards of more than 100 cars this can only exacerbate the situation.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	James Tilford	Response-00103	Increased traffic at an already busy junction
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	James William Allen	Response-01280	Having lived in the area for 52 years, I can confidently state the Beech Lane is already a notorious traffic bottleneck due - primarily - to parking for Scargill school and the adjacent playing fields. If this site is chosen, clearly that problem would be exacerbated. Two possible mitigations spring to mind: 1) stipulating that the developers have to provide a free car park for general use in the vicinity of Scargill school; 2) providing road access to the site from Station Road to the west, as well as from Beech Lane to the north.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Jane Marshall	Response-01172	To even consider access onto Beech Lane, is honestly ridiculous and opposite a primary school is crazy.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Jane Taylor	Response-01023	Beech lane is already congested and as it is the main entrance to the primary school, increased traffic will be a hazard and a danger to the school children. The road through the village is also very narrow and restricted with a very tight corner at the church entrance.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Jane Zielinski-Raynor	Response-01095	Beech lane already too busy, no capacity for more traffic
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Jennifer Noble	Response-01012	School pick drop off / pick up is already a hazard I'm surprised no one has been killed yet as it is it'll only add to the congestion. The village can't cope with it
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Jenny Butler	Response-00202	Parking along Beech Lane is already a massive issue at school times, during football matches and community events. This development will make it far worse
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Jenny Stanbridge	Response-00088	Near a school so deemed unsafe
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Jessica Rogers	Response-01524	This area is already constantly congested at school times. Further houses will increase that congestion and increase risk to life

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Jo-Anne Attenborough	Response-00129	Around school is already very busy and congested, parking along Beech Lane is extremely hazardous already. Adding more roads, cars and people will result in accidents and most likely fatalities.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Joe Rice	Response-00063	Traffic on Beech Lane at school times and weekends when football is on the recreation ground is already a big problem. Cars are constantly forced to mount the kerbs to get through and the additional housing is going to make this much worse. Beech Lane is the main route out from this site and in my opinion it can't accommodate more traffic.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Johnson	Response-01037	West Hallam traffic already extremely busy especially in the proposed area, excess/exit to west Hallam already an issue. Beech lane extremely congested already, more so at school times and the activities on the recreation ground.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Jonathan moon	Response-00273	Beech lane at school and community football times in the week and at wkds that road can easily become gridlocked adding 90 houses that would need access to beech lane is not a safe and suitable idea. This would need a very detailed highway assessment most houses have 2 cars so another 180 cars ro an already tricky road is not ideal
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Jonathan Purkis	Response-00159	The traffic in Beach Lane is already an issue. Especially during school drop off/pick up times. Also during the regular sporting events held on then community field and whenever there is an event in the village. Given that Beach Lane is one of only two primary routes out of the village this will make the traffic situation significantly worse and more dangerous for residents/visitors.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Jonie centro	Response-00730	parking in this area is already difficult
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Jon Skelson	Response-01025	The traffic is already horrendous around school drop off and pick up times. Also, generally, this area is already hugely busy. We really do not need to add to this.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Josh August	Response-00084	Getting in and out of West Hallam is already a nightmare, let alone more houses being built
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Judith Hare	Response-01014	It?s already a nightmare on beech lane without lots more cars that will come from 90+ houses. It?s dangerous to drive and walk and if you live on beech lane you cannot get in and out of your drive easily.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Julie August	Response-01064	This area is often congested already
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Julie Harbon	Response-00022	Traffic is awful along Beech Lane now. It is a bus route, it is the main access to Scargill School, the main route to the shops and doctors, and people use it as a cut through to get to the top of St. Wilfred?s to get onto High Lane. There is no doubt that additional housing will further compound this problem , particularly during the building phase.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Julie Harker	Response-01073	The traffic at certain times of the day is bad enough already especially when cars are parked up for events on the park, eg football matches. Also at school pick up and drop off and events.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Julie Stewardson	Response-00282	Beech Lane is already a nightmare with parked cars using the recreation ground and Scargill School. The left turn from Station Road onto Beech Lane is already quite dangerous and very very busy. Sometimes you can wait ages to turn right from Beech Lane
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Julie Wright	Response-00091	There is a lot of traffic already
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Kara walters	Response-00258	Beech lane is a danger hazard already traffic wise
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Karen Squire	Response-01040	In a weird way this may have a positive impact on traffic congestion as there will be more parking available for school drop offs and pick ups. Residents may not like people parking outside their house but as someone who grew up living opposite a school it?s just one of those things
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Karina Cooper	Response-00267	Already experiencing heavy traffic and dangerous to add to this
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Katherine Earley	Response-01075	With the school it?s dangerous and adding more cars to the mix would grid lock the area and would be unsafe. There have been a number of near misses already.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Kathryn Fearn	Response-00100	It is already extremely difficult to druve in Beech Lane, due to school traffic and cars parking on the road for the beech lane recreation park.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Kathryn Gilbert	Response-01574	Beech lane is already congested with school traffic and when football matches in progress at the playing field opposite development.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Katie	Response-00047	Parking at school times alone beech lane and Hallam way onto Scargill road is dangerous and already too many near misses with cars, pedestrians and most importantly school children. The traffic at peak times to get off west Hallam is already concerning and at peak.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Katie Rice	Response-00036	Beech lane is already congested and unsafe at school times and when any sporting event etc is happening on beech lane! The village only has 2 entrance/exits which are already unable to cope with the traffic
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Kay	Response-01030	Already vehicles everywhere on that main road we make it even worse
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Keith Atkinson	Response-01050	Beech Lane is already highly conjested, particularly at school time. Buses and large vehicles often have great difficulty navigating along there.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Ken Mitchell	Response-00763	Beech lane is infamous locally for traffic congestion. The road is narrow and , at certain times of the day, parked cars on the school side of the road enable traffic to flow in one direction only. This causes tailbacks towards the village and the junction of Station road. The problem is exacerbated by the fact that it is also a bus route. I have witnessed buses being unable to proceed down Beech lane ,near the school, and cars having to mount the pavement as a result of the road being obstructed by parked cars. The existence of an additional junction and a major increase in traffic so close to a primary school is a serious health and safety issue. I believe that this site has been turned down on numerous occasions for this very reason.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Ken Musson	Response-00900	After years of rejections on planning, why has now this land been considered when nothing has changed. In fact, there are strong arguments to say that the area has got worse in terms of traffic levels and lack pf parking in the area. Beech Lane is not the required width of road for modern day traffic numbers, residents there must park on the road due to lack of drive space. The village in extremely congested with parking on one side of the road from Beech Lane all through the village and onto the top of St Wilfrid?s Rd
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Kerry	Response-01034	Enough congestion already., especially around school times. New houses = more cars. Small village roads. Buses struggle to get through as it is.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Kerry Barratt	Response-00168	Beech Lane is crazy at school times and weekend football matches
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Kerry Middleton	Response-00266	The traffic is already busy and chaotic within this village and this proposal would be detrimental.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Kevin Fox	Response-00682	Congestion is already at a peak and further housing will bring chaos and increase accidents. There's only 2 access roads into the village. If the plans go ahead an additional road access other than off station road into beech lane and at mapperley cross roads to st Wilfred's will need to be added..
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Kian	Response-01493	Beech Lane gets really congested, especially when school times are. Adding more houses will just worsen the traffic
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Kirsty Oliver	Response-00558	I regularly visit my parents in west hallam and already find it difficult on many occasions to negotiate traffic on beach lane due to traffic. Due to football which is in the week and weekends and school traffic.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Kristen Hamilton	Response-00209	There is high traffic congestion as it is without the need for more
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Laura Egglestone	Response-01027	Beech lane is already contested at peak times - during school drop off/ pick up and whenever the recreation ground is used. Cars often mount the curbs due to the parking and the build up of traffic. This makes it unsafe for pedestrians and we personally had a near miss with our children and a police account was raised. It also blocks buses and emergency vehicles Car parking is also a concern nr The Dales, with the parking often spilling out into the village causing more issues. Photos and videos can be provided upon request. The effects on neighbouring villages should also be considered.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Lindsey Lyons	Response-00071	The traffic congestion on beech lane and surrounding areas are already heightened with existing households already having multiple vehicles. Parking on beech lane is already at a dangerous level, I have witnessed multiple near misses of not only vehicle collisions but children being run over through poor visibility. Adding additional traffic to this location is extremely concerning.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Louise Annison	Response-01049	The traffic is already horrific for this area, I avoid that area at certain times of the day already because of how busy the village is. Adding 90 extra homes would be horrendous and even more dangerous.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Louise Hunt	Response-01032	Traffic is already poor at school pick up and drop off times.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Louise williams	Response-01011	There's too much traffic as it is. School times are already dangerous People that live in the village still drive their children to school, they park over driveways blocking people in. The school isn't big enough for more children
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Lucy corrigan	Response-00142	That road is already busy with school drop offs either side
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Mandie frith	Response-00247	It's already terrible for traffic and around the school isn't easy to manoeuvre. Accident waiting to happen
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Margaret Lewis	Response-01499	As a community the road already gets congested by traffic especially at peak times this will Further cause more delays and pollution due to stationary cars
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Mark	Response-00164	Already a stalom between parking at most times of day on Beech Lane and many heated arguments about access.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Mark Baker	Response-00110	Beech lane is already blocked at school drop off periods as well as when the sports field is in use. Additional housing will make this situation even worse
			Mark Mason	Response-01194	Traffic is already very bad without this development.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Mark Newton	Response-00179	This road already gets snarled up with traffic at peak moments during the day, with high volumes of speeding traffic 40mph+ at other times; it's congested with parking on weekends due to sports events on the playing field. To add more housing here is going to make things spectacularly worse.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Mark Patenall	Response-00851	Beech Lane is already frequently jammed with a line of parked vehicles for it's whole length . The line of sight is restricted making navigation without meeting an oncoming vehicle very difficult. More traffic will only make the situation worse. The Dales shopping area car park is always full so the village will be even more busy with parking
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Mark Perrin	Response-00223	90 properties will equate to an average of between 180 -270 vehicles accessing beech lane which is not equiped to cope especially as road parking outside the school and playing field is already a constant problem. Additional off road parking needs to be provided by the developers as part of the plans for approx 40 vehicles to ensure beech lane is clear at all times.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Mark Power	Response-00276	Traffic through Beech lane is already busy. Beech Lane is very busy through out the day with school pick ups, football team and this causes congestion and for people to mount kerbs and speeding to get past parked cars
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Matt Haddon	Response-00696	The proposed site would significantly increase the volume of traffic around the village which is already very congested at times. The T junction at the end of Beech Lane where it joins Station Road is already a problem junction at time and the significant increase in traffic from this site would make that significantly worse with increased congestion in the area. This is also likely to result in an increase of cars driving through the village to try to exit the estate via St Wilfreds Road, which again can be very congested with long queues at peak times. The village and estate are not capable of dealing with this extra volume of traffic due to only have the two roads in and out.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Matthew Lyons	Response-00061	Traffic bad especially around school times making it's dangerous for home owners and children.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Maureen Briggs	Response-00190	Traffic is terrible at school times with parking and parking is a nightmare at times. There is parking at the Tesco shopping area but sometimes even that is full. So more cars will make that a bigger problem.!!
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Max Egglestone	Response-01278	The current road infrastructure around Beech Lane is not designed to accommodate additional traffic. The lane itself is narrow and often obstructed by parked vehicles, creating bottlenecks during school hours and at weekends. The additional traffic will also impact neighbouring villages such as Stanley and Stanley Common both with schools on the main routes through. Also, the larger vehicles which would be required during the development would cause absolute chaos. Shops at The Dales are already under strain, with frequent congestion in the car park and surrounding streets. Introducing a high number of additional households without expanding local services will result in overcrowding and frustration.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Max Longdon	Response-00128	The village is already far too busy. Speeding cars and dangerous levels of congestion. This being planned on a road with the school on which already is dangerous at busy periods is not for a small village

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Michael Earley	Response-01039	It's dangerous at multiple times of day. This would cause absolute gridlock to surrounding roads
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Michelle	Response-00148	Traffic is awful down the road, many parking. School hours make it dangerous.
	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Michelle Cox	Response-00138	Traffic is mayhem at school time
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	M Mcfartane	Response-00147	Traffic is already congested in this area when schools open/close or have events and football games are being played? this will impact road safety in a huge way with more cars in and out of West Hallam
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Mr and Mrs Wood	Response-01826	Having lived in West Hallam for over 40 years and having our children attend Scargill School I have witnessed how increasingly busy Beech Lane becomes around school time and at weekends during football
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Mrs Bird	Response-00045	The village centre of West Hallam lies along Beech Lane, which is narrow with parked cars along its length, especially during school run times. In addition, the lane itself is not wide enough for further traffic from a new development. The junctions of station road and beech lane is on a blind bend, further traffic would only worsen this. In addition, traffic through Stanley and Stanley Common would in read with traffic cutting through. The junction of station road and cat and fiddle is incredibly tight, busy and visibility is terrible. More traffic would compound these issues.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Mrs Caroline Hooton	Response-00231	This area is already a busy area at peak times. To add extra traffic at an already busy junction near a school would add congestion resulting accidents
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Mrs Glenda Orchard	Response-01490	Have to queue haphazardly at school times
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Mrs Judith Pittson	Response-00753	Beech lane is narrow and very congested particularly when the playing field is being used and at the start and end of the school day. Pavement parking often happens meaning wheelchairs and pushchairs can't use the pavement.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Mrs Strelley	Response-00233	Extra traffic would be dangerous. There is a school on Beech Lane. Parking is already at a premium.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Natalie Payne	Response-01523	Traffic around the school is already at dangerous levels.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Neil Fletcher	Response-01063	Congestion is already bad at school drop-off and collection times. Adding more houses here will only make things worse.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	N Gregory	Response-01066	Traffic is already an issue during the week especially around the school. Either junction onto the main road at high lane are notoriously difficult to exit. Possibly a mini roundabout at the millhouse jct would ease this?
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Nick Craddock	Response-00145	As per my comments for other west Hallam Proposal
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Nicola Elkington-Horridge	Response-00079	Already too much traffic in the village and around school. This would put all children and their families in danger everyday.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Nicola holmes	Response-01168	Already a nightmare on beech lane
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Nicole Brookman	Response-01559	The traffic is really bad in this area already, especially during school pick up time and drop off. You can not drive down beech lane. You also can not park outside your house during this time outside your own house. The traffic in and out of tescos is really bad and you often can not get a space, it is dangerous so it doesn't need any more cars needing these facilities. The main junctions out of west hallam can be very busy and dangerous and there have been several crashes i am aware of getting out of the village near the bottle kiln on high lane.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Nina Walters	Response-00244	Beech Lane is already congested and dangerous when parked cars are there at school times and when football matches take place on the recreation ground / events in the village.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Pamela Fox	Response-01242	Traffic is already at a peak and further housing will bring chaos and increase congestion. There are only two access roads into the village. If plans go ahead an additional access road needs to be considered.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Patricia Eady	Response-00114	Beech lane is a busy rd especially at pick up and drop of at the school making it really hard to get up and down the rd especially when emerging from existing drive ways I dread to think what the congestion would be like if the proposed site goes ahead
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Patrick Barber	Response-00280	The proposed development will increase traffic congestion in the area.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Patrick Hynes	Response-01902	Beech Lane, while technically a two-way road, lacks the width and capacity to handle any notable increase in traffic. It was built for the original size of West Hallam and now struggles to cope with the volume of vehicles ? particularly at school drop-off and pickup times, when parked cars reduce access and force drivers onto pavements. The junctions surrounding Beech Lane, including Station Road and Cat and Fiddle Lane, already experience regular congestion. Adding more cars from over 90 homes will severely worsen safety and flow.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Paul aldred	Response-00152	It's a death trap now
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Paula Piggott	Response-01041	There is already too much traffic. This is a small village. There is a school and many bungalows with pensioners. It is a accident waiting to happen. Also dog walkers, horse riders and lots of wildlife. Seriously someone will get hurt. It is a small village and more traffic flow will have such a detrimental impact.
	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Pauline wood	Response-01100	Beech Lane gridlocked on occasions already. Not safe for children having more traffic. No pavement. Road narrow
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Peter Lilley	Response-00161	Beech Lane is already heavily congested/ impassable when cars are parked near the Recreation ground and school. An extra 90 homes will create gridlock.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Pete Vanstone	Response-01164	Beech Lane is a narrow, substandard road with limited visibility and inadequate width for the volume of traffic it currently supports ? let alone any increase. At peak times, including school drop-offs and when the nearby recreation ground is in use, traffic grinds to a halt. The car park at The Dales shopping area is often overwhelmed, with overspill parking frequently clogging up adjacent streets. It is already challenging to access local services due to this. The proposed development would create an untenable situation for both current and future residents.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Philip Davies	Response-01116	The traffic on Beech Lane is already close to chaotic during school run times and also when football matches and training takes place during evenings and weekends. More housing will no doubt add to this problem.
	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Phil Sloan	Response-01038	Already far too much traffic flowing through the village which causes congestion
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Rachel	Response-01015	This little village already has too much traffic flowing. The school parking/traffic is already an issue for such a small village.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Rebecca Ricci	Response-00102	At school times Beech Lane is already dangerous for children and their families with parked cars and traffic entering and leaving the village. With only two routes to enter and exit the village, we don't need anymore traffic.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Rhonda Holt	Response-00237	Roads in West Hallam are at capacity especially at rush hour. There are only three exits out of West Hallam and these will be overstretched.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Richard Brewell	Response-01028	Beech Lane is already congested, busy and narrow. Any further housing will only exacerbate this in the area. Further, parking is also congested around West Hallam village, and wider and this will also be made worse.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Richard Fearn	Response-00180	Beach lane is already tight and very busy around school time.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Richard Walters	Response-00546	Core Strategy Review Amendment - Public Consultation In response to your call for comments on the Core Strategy Review Document I hereby submit my views for your further consideration . My views will be largely confined to the Site Selection Paper, in particular as it relates to West Hallam and more specifically proposals relating to the Land South of West Hallam (CSR-0044) although my comments could equally apply to the other projected site in the village Land North of West Hallam (CSR0048). Point 1 - I note that in relation to site CSR-0044 the Paper states 'the site falls on land that fails to make an important contribution to the Green Belt?' (ref p10, first full paragraph 1). I consider this statement, at best, a very subjective construct based on, what appears to be, unsubstantiated opinion. I presume that the justification for this is the assessment against the criteria of Safeguarding the Countryside from encroachment Checking the Unrestricted Sprawl of Large Built-Up Areas, and Preventing Neighbouring Towns Merging I further note that four sites at the Junction of St Wilfrids Road and High Lane Central ( CSR0004 & CSR0004 a, b and c) were rejected as meeting the above Green Belt criteria. I am unable to discern or find any evidence in the review as to why these sites meet the criteria and those at CSR0044 and CSR0048 do not. This distinction seems to arise purely from the unsubstantiated and subjective views of the paper's author rather than any detailed and objective in depth analysis of the respective sites contribution to the Green Belt. In fact a case may be made that the Beech Lane site (CSR0044) indeed makes a greater contribution in meeting the criteria vis Safeguarding the Countryside from encroachment :- the immediate presence of large scale urban encroachment is far more apparent on the Beech Lane site, sitting as it does on the edge of West Hallam central/core housing developments. Whereas the rejected sites (CSR004 etc) only lie adjacent to the lesser populated ribbon developments of the village. Over my time living in the village I have monitored the habitat contribution of the Beech Lane site. I have for example, to date recorded 53 bird, 15 mammal and 4 amphibian species on this site. As such it makes a valuable contribution to the countryside that would be jeopardised rather than safeguarded if housing development were to proceed. Taken as a whole the Beech Lane site has, at least as diverse a range of countryside attributes (hedges, adjoining woodland, wetland habitat, ditches, grassland perfect for ?predator? hunters such as owls and hawks) as any of the ?rejected? sites. Checking the Unrestricted Sprawl of Large Built Up Areas:- with a current population of c.6000 in 2600 households (2001 census) West Hallam already has a population that surpasses that of several East Midland towns. This raises the existential question as to what is the fundamental nature of West Hallam as a community. Again the pressure from built up area sprawl is already more keenly felt at site CSR 0044 than at the ?rejected? village sites so it is difficult to understand why the Green Belt criteria apply to ?rejected sites? and not the Beech Lane site. Preventing Neighbourhood Towns Merging:- Suffice it to say that I can perceive no more justification in saying this criteria applies to the rejected sites than in doing so for the Beech Lane site (CSR0044). If there is a distinction to be made it needs to be justified/quantified. Point 2 Tr
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Richard Walters	Response-00546	affic and Services The main core of the village, the Village and the Estate, is already poorly served by access and egress roads. This already creates excessive traffic congestion particularly at peak periods. This can be further exacerbated by:- the frequency of road works necessitated by the aging services infrastructure of the village e.g. utilities and the subsidence legacy of the mining past The presence of the village school and main playing fields adjoining one of those main access/egress points. Further housing development without improved/additional road infrastructure, as currently envisioned, is only going to worsen an already problematic situation. In Summary I note both the rejected and proposed housing proposals. However I cannot see that any case has been satisfactorily made justifying why some sites have been deemed to meet the Green Belt criteria and others do not do so. The only rather spurious justification appears to be that of expedience and opportunity! That the Land South of West Hallam (CSR0044) has an absentee owner who is only too willing to facilitate its development and, in doing so, meet the Authorities targets. In particular I would expect far greater transparency and justification as to why the report states that some sites meet the Green Belt criteria while others do not. THERE IS NO EVIDENCE OF ANY TRAFFIC IMPACT ASSESSMENT HAVING BEEN UNDERTAKEN
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Robert Dodd	Response-00201	Traffic is already bad in the village and trying to get onto High Lane from Station Road or St Wilfred's is already nightmare at certain times
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Robert Flatley	Response-00978	This stretch of road along Beech Lane is already incredibly congested due to both pick up and drop off at Scargill School and the use of the playing field by West Hallam Jnr Football Club which often results in one side of the road being taken up entirely by parked cars creating queues of traffic at either end of Beech Lane. The addition of a junction for the proposed development would further add to this with the likelihood of additional cars using Beech Lane for access/egress.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Robert Hall	Response-00630	Development on this site would increase the existing problem to an unacceptable level . Beech Lane is not a full width road. Already a considerable problem for traffic at school time.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Robert Mee	Response-01511	See my comments on Road Safety
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Robert Reynolds	Response-00260	Beech Lane is already extremely busy, especially at school drop-off and pick-up times. Also when football matches are being played.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Rosemary Moorby	Response-00222	Already a busy road opposite a primary school. Plus a park and playing fields for football. Parking very busy at key times.
			Ruby Reid	Response-00119	Traffic is already congested especially around the school on beach lane. Plus dangerous parking

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	sam richards	Response-01467	As a homeowner right by the proposed planning site, I simply cannot believe the council believe this is an acceptable site to build on. Beech Lane is one of the main roads through the village, and there is very heavy traffic particularly at school drop off and pick up times. recent temporary traffic lights caused havoc for a week, let alone for the duration of 90 new homes being built. There are always cars parked up all the way down beech lane throughout the day for school workers, and at weekends for sport events. traffic around school drop off and pick up times is already extremely dangerous, around beech lane and hallam way which leads up to beech lane. i cant imagine how much worse this will get with all the extra traffic from the new builds. i am aware that in the past plans for this site have been refused by the highways due to problems at several junctions., which makes me wonder what has suddenly changed?
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Sarah James	Response-01085	Beech lane narrows at this point so congestion and potential accidents due to the need of passing will increase. Parking during school drop off and collection will be a problem, even more so during potential construction. Is Beech Lane fit enough for construction traffic?
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Sarah Taylor	Response-00115	With regards to Beech lane there is heavy traffic as it is a main route into WH. Football training and school drop offs and pick ups also cause a lot of congestion. Adding to this WH cannot cope.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Sarah Taylor	Response-01819	It's entrance or exit onto Beech Lane is onto a narrow road which is very congested at school times and at the weekend when the Recreation Ground is being for team games. It is also directly opposite the Scargill Primary School. There is insufficient parking for the Dales shopping area. The roads around have to be used for parking causing more driving difficulties. More cars from the houses mean that West Hallam crossroads and Mapperley crossroads will have more problems than Highways have already said they have. Also more traffic at the junctions between Beech Lane and Station Road and Station Road to Stanley and the junction between Cat and Fiddle Lane and the B6001 from Ilkeston through to Derby.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Scott wright	Response-00089	West Hallam does not have the infrastructure to support increased traffic, nor can the shop/amenities support bigger footfall.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Serena Bostock	Response-00125	The traffic is horrendous in West Hallam already. The parking is a nightmare as people have started parking on bends etc... which has become hazardous. This will only add to this!
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	sharon hickson	Response-01430	I travel on beech lane to work daily and the traffic is always backed up not only at school times , when there is any sporting event on the playing fields at night as well ,let alone people visiting the shops, houses in the village and the delivery drivers adding to the congestion in west Hallam to put any more traffic coming in or out of the village would create massive issues
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Shelly Meer	Response-00116	Already a bad site for traffic due to the school. Further traffic to the new site will add to this
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Simon Reeve	Response-01080	The roads simply aren't built for the traffic we already have without adding more homes with more cars; I grew up in West Hallam (High Lane East) in the 80s, spending time in West Hallam Village and there were approximately 1 car for every 1.5 homes, now there's 2 for every house. The junctions at Millhouse Garage and the Bottle Kiln have poor visibility with huge queues up St Wilfreds every rush hour and simply aren't suitable for supporting more homes
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Sophie	Response-01105	Ridiculous idea considering there is a school opposite the proposed site that already has an obscene amount of traffic.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Stacey Eady	Response-01529	If you have ever visited Beech Lane, you will know that the road is currently already very busy during peak times, such as school drop off and pick up. Cars regularly park on both sides of the road, which causes major disruptions to ongoing traffic driving through the village. It is one of only two routes in and out of a village that has already expanded way beyond its initial infrastructure and is the major road that haulage uses to get deliveries through the village to the main centre, The Dales. Beech Lane also has a large recreational ground and children's playground adjacent to the school, which is used regularly during evenings and weekends to facilitate both football matches and cricket games meaning it's busy all day, most days. The road dimensions on Beech Lane are much narrower than those of a normal major road. It is not wide enough to be marked with central white lines (I'm guessing that's why it was originally termed a 'lane') which means it's even tighter when cars park on one or both sides and, at times, this has caused delays with emergency services/buses, simply being unable to get through. I also note that as a bus route, the road should be at least 6.2 m wide, and this is not the case. Living on Beech Lane, I regularly see people driving up onto the pavement to get up the road, which simply is unacceptable, considering the closeness to the school. The road has a 20mph speed limit during school times. However this is very rarely observed, and in my time on Beech Lane, I have never seen speeds being monitored. With the school blocking off a huge portion of the Lane for its own Keep Clear Zone, which is required to be kept clear at all times to comply with rule 243 of the Highway Code, I'm unsure how any safe or practical solution could be arrived at to allow access to the proposed new site from Beech Lane. The road to the school is currently also required to be left clear (hence the single white line on the opposite side), so quite where the access to and from the proposed site is going to be situated is a mystery. My concern is that this site has been identified on several previous occasions, as suitable land to build on, but the process has always been stopped, mainly due to the concerns regarding traffic. These issues have not changed and indeed have significantly worsened due to the natural increase in population, so I'm unsure why or how this proposal has been approved this time around. With an extra 90 houses (+ 32 dwellings within the 'safeguarded land' they wish to develop), this will total 122 houses, which seems ludicrous with this specific site having only one access in and out of the new development, meaning an extra (potentially) 244 cars coming on and off Beech Lane. This is, in my opinion, a disaster waiting to happen. I have also been made aware that the Erewash Planning team have not yet consulted with DCC highways up until this point, which worries me further! Obviously, you must undoubtedly understand that feelings are 'running high' within the West Hallam community and the need for transparency at every stage of the procedure is essential. If not, rumour-mongering and suspicion is bound to occur and there is a fear that the use of consultancy companies may, at worst, cover up any indiscretions and, at best, cloud the issue. Are there any assurances in place to maintain the necessary complete transparency? Can I ask if DCC Highways will have the 'final say' in the Traffic Safety and suitability of this

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Tracey Eady	Response-01529	site or will this be left in the hands of a consultancy firm/Erewash Council planners? Some of the other sites within the area could better facilitate the increase in traffic but they could also offer the key for the whole village. For example, the possible development of the site West of Station Road (CSR0016) is just on the lead into the village and has a large lay-by area that could be used as a filter lane to allow traffic on and off the site onto the existing road which has the major-road dimensions required. The North of West Hallam site (CSR0048) is on High Lane, a major road that is a straight one. A possible change here could be the reduction of speed used on this road, from 40mph to 30mph, to assist traffic on and off the site, which would be a positive impact to pedestrians within the whole village. The St. Wilfrids site (CSR0004) would benefit from the installation of a mini roundabout at its junction with High Lane. Further along towards Stanley Common, this new roundabout would ease the congestion currently suffered at the High Lane-Station Road junction, (Mill House Garage junction) where a blind bend already causes problems.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Stephen Wood	Response-00139	It's terrible around the school and dangerous for the children.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Steve Bailey	Response-01022	That area around the park and the top of Hallam Way is already overly busy and sometimes dangerous during school pick up and drop off. Another 90 houses will only add to this, and make the area worse. When football matches or cricket matches are taking place, cars park around the area causing more congestion. This will only increase with more cars.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Suzanne Campbell	Response-00087	Additional traffic into the village could be an issue as the village does sometimes become congested in that area.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Teresa Faulkner-Day	Response-00242	Traffic along this stretch of road is always congested. With both the school, pavillion and cricket club not having adequate parking facilities creating numerous issues. To add to this with more vehicles would be a disaster waiting to happen
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Teresa Hall	Response-00270	Beech Lane is already too busy as one of only two access routes to the village. Beech Lane exit has an extremely difficult junction where it is often difficult to turn right leading to traffic queuing up towards the village. It has a primary school & a children's playground on it so the road is regularly blocked on one side by cars. More cars along here would make it an accident hotspot.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Teresa Webster	Response-00086	Beech Lane is a busy road through the village especially at peak times - the proposed site is directly opposite the entrance for the school and will hugely increase congestion plus increase the risk of accidents with children crossing those roads
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Tilly Fletcher	Response-00317	Beech Lane cannot cope with more rush hour or school time traffic. It is a safety hazard and will create awful delays.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Tina Jay	Response-01801	The proposed site is directly opposite Scargill Primary School with 300+ pupils, which is not a full width road, and it is already heavily congested several times a day and at weekends for football games on the Beech Lane Recreation ground. The proposed planning of 90+ houses in this area (with the proposal open for further development which is also additionally highly concerning and problematic) would mean an extra high influx of traffic, making this road exceptionally more difficult to pass through and during school pick up and drop off hours/football events, unacceptably congested. When these sites have been approached previously, Highways have raised problems at both the junctions of Millhouse and Mapperley Crossroads, as well as those at Beech Lane, Station Road, and the T junction at Cat and Fiddle Lane. It is therefore difficult to understand how these sites could now be considered suitable, when traffic problems have only increased and brought more difficulties. Adding to the congestion of the road area, the Dales shopping area car park is now constantly full, with a heavy increase over the last few years, causing overspill parking into the village, School Square and Orchard Close. These additional housing developments, and with the high number of houses involved is not suitable for a village location, and would cause a further unacceptable influx of traffic/parking which the village would not be able to cope with. Also the public travel links for West Hallam are very limited, with no evening service at all, with cars being the main use of transport, and any new housing developments of this size bringing further difficulties.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Tina Rice	Response-00096	An absolute nightmare already. Emergency vehicles would have a nightmare getting brought at school drop of and pickup times also when the sports fields are in use at the weekends
			Toni Tomlinson	Response-00204	Extremely dangerous road. Impossible to get out during football matches, school pick up. Entry should be from Cock Orchard.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Tracey Barks	Response-00111	On average, 2 cars for each of the 90 proposed houses will add to the increased traffic already experienced in West Hallam Village, especially around school times and when the recreation ground is used by groups for sports. This will make our beautiful village a relatively no go area for residents at particular times of the day and evening
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Tracey BURDUS	Response-00141	Traffic on Beech Lane is already a concern, especially at pick up and drop off at school, the road would be even more dangerous than it is currently for residents and people trying to get in and out of the village
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Val Stevens	Response-01070	Traffic congestion is already a problem in the village especially on Beech Lane. The proposed building site will make this worse with more vehicles competing to enter and exit the village. Beech Lane is aptly named, not a wide road so traffic already has to either queue or mount the pavements at busy times.
			Vicky Buckley	Response-00182	It is already a death trap with parking
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Vicky smith	Response-00171	Beech lane is already highly congested at peak times and can be quite dangerous when school pick up and drop off along with weekends when used for football matches on the recreational ground. Creating higher volumes by erecting 99 new properties will contribute to the potential of blocking the junction of beech lane and station road upon these times due to awaiting oncoming vehicles to pass and the potential of more accidents as people don't like to wait their turn.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Victoria Walker	Response-00228	Beech lane is heavily congested already, especially at school times. It is the main way into the village from Derby. Adding in 90 houses will increase the number of cars using this village road. It is dangerous to have it near a school.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Yvonne	Response-00207	The traffic is hugely contested already
1.9	South of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Anna Richardson	Response-00162	Housing has been built nearby and has been standing empty for over two years. This planning decision was unbelievably poor, no consideration was taken regarding road safety or flooding. The front garden of one is already sinking. This site needs investigating and all homes should be occupied before any further new homes are built in the area. I would like to call for a full investigation into the mistakes that were made regarding this development.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.9	South of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Carolyn Wojtas	Response-01052	Is this genuinely housing for the West Hallam community. Is it going to bring issues in the village that we don't suffer from now?
1.9	South of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Charles Brooks	Response-00535	None please. There are generally enough houses in West Hallam. The existing infrastructure struggles to cope. Personally I am not a NIMBY and not against new houses but very against the proposed site opposite the primary school and the associated issues this will create.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Charlotte Lun	Response-00150	The majority of new build housing will not last more than 50 years. They are badly built by mostly under skilled workers that do not care about their workmanship.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Chris Collins	Response-00037	The wider area is in dire need of affordable nice housing. There are countless brown field sites that should be developed prior to green belt being prioritised. I understand that brownfield is more expensive but that's a legacy we all have to clean up these sites and redevelop them for the next generation.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Emily Reeve	Response-01495	I would be concerned about the type and quality of housing. We currently have new buildings on Station Road that are unoccupied and need work to make them more habitable. The houses have been crammed in there with no regard to vision around a corner. Can you guarantee that the housing would be of suitable quality for the village where we pay a premium to live?
1.9	South of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Emily Reynolds	Response-00149	I think if you did build some homes it would be good to incorporate some environmentally friendly features into them such as bat boxes, swift boxes, and hedgehog corridors between the gardens. Solar panels would also be a good feature but I understand that would be a big ask.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Guiliano Ricci	Response-01010	West Hallam is a mainly owner occupied village Social housing will have a detrimental effect on the house prices of the village - social deprivation, antisocial behaviour, drugs and criminality
1.9	South of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Heidi Spencer	Response-00189	There are currently new builds at the top of Beach Lane that have sat empty since being built. Unsure there is demand for additional housing in the village. Lots of houses up for sale and not selling due to the current financial climate.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Helen Collins	Response-00034	Many houses in the village are being bought and developed, selling at a high price. More affordable housing is needed everywhere. If such a number of houses were to be built, it would be more appropriate to provide 100% affordable homes.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Helen fox	Response-00064	The influx of new homes may disrupt the village's character and social fabric, leading to overcrowding and strain on local resources. Additionally, the type of housing planned may not align with the village's architectural style or cultural heritage, further diminishing its unique identity. Such developments could also result in environmental degradation, affecting the natural landscape and quality of life for existing residents. Overall, the introduction of these housing projects could prove detrimental to the village's long-term sustainability and well-being.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Helen Patenall	Response-00868	Type of housing is irrelevant. Whichever 'type' is proposed is not required and would lead to a drain on already strained local services.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Hollie Briggs	Response-00040	Absolutely do NOT want social housing!
1.9	South of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Holly Mohamed	Response-00076	Reputation of Developers: Some developers have a reputation for cutting corners to reduce costs, which can compromise the quality and safety of the homes. This can result in homes that do not meet the expected standards and require significant repairs shortly after purchase. White Hart Development Example: The White Hart development in West Hallam is a prime example of cutting corners. Residents have reported issues such as poorly finished interiors, inadequate drainage systems, and insufficient parking spaces. These problems highlight the risks associated with new developments and the potential for similar issues in the proposed residential development.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Homewood	Response-01074	Not an area where social housing would be suitable as you need to drive or use transport for most facilities - already limited
1.9	South of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Jane Taylor	Response-01023	No housing is appropriate in this site due to traffic issues and increased population for an already large population
1.9	South of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Jo-Anne Attenborough	Response-00129	No housing should be built on this site.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Julie Harbon	Response-00022	Would the proposed ?affordable housing? truly be affordable? House prices are driven up here because it's a nice area, well maintained, good community spirit, decent school etc. I doubt prices will be ?affordable? for many.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Julie Stewardson	Response-00282	Large houses, who can afford them?
1.9	South of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Kerry	Response-01034	Cheap, crammed in housing. Tiny drives. Cars parked on streets
1.9	South of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Kerry Barratt	Response-00168	no thought of local people
1.9	South of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Kerry Middleton	Response-00266	Further housing would be detrimental to the current skyline, thus ensuring the mental health of residents would decline.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Kevin Fox	Response-00682	Affordable housing? great! Does that mean cars on axle stands, grubby gardens and just an apathy to how folk live their lives? no thanks!
1.9	South of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Kirsty Oliver	Response-00558	I feel it's too large a project for the size of this village.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Lindsey Lyons	Response-00071	The proposal gives no indication to the type of housing being developed. Given existing housing in the village is required to keep with the ambience of the village, how do you propose this will be maintained? This is crucial to making sure the village is kept to a standard that has always been expected by the council for existing housing extension and singular builds approved. Take for example, the small cottage that was built in previous 4 years just off Beech lane that had to keep with the ambience of the village else it was rejected by the council.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Mark Newton	Response-00179	Look. This is bordering an historic CONSERVATION area, of beautiful period housing. To see more ugly modern housing crammed here is just going to forever - FOREVER - scar this last remaining beautiful area in the region. If you just blaze through to approve housing to meet arbitrary targets without fully considering the destruction of an iconic village landscape, and school children safety, and traffic damage, then please make the houses an example of what can be achieved with BEAUTY and not the hideous, ugly housing that is thrown up today. Take an example from King Charles in seeking to add beauty - such as Poundbury. Try to create something future generations will look back on with a sense of respect and pride, not harming heritage, conservation and more.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
		Type of Housing	Mark Patenall	Response-00851	Irrelevant what type of housing is proposed. Whether it's social or for multi millionaires, we have enough
1.9	South of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Matthew Lyons	Response-00061	The house are next to the village, originally rules were housing design must keep with the theme of the village. How will this be managed
		Type of Housing	Michelle Cox	Response-00138	Too many house it the area already
1.9	South of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Mr and Mrs Wood	Response-01826	And my last point is in regards to the algorithm, if indeed one even exists and I am being too kind that determine the percentage of affordable housing which I have heard could be as high as 4 in every 10 households; this an unprecedented high proportion compared to other nearby developments and it is a question, even though it?s an uncomfortable one to ask that needs to be answered.
		Type of Housing	Mrs Judith Pittson	Response-00753	90 houses seems far too many for the proposed site
1.9	South of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Mrs Strelley	Response-00233	What housing is going to be built there? Exclusive? Or for the more affordable market? Either way, West Hallam hasn't got the facilities to benefit a bigger population.
		Type of Housing	Nick Craddock	Response-00145	As per my comments for other west Hallam Proposal
1.9	South of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Nicola Elkington-Horridge	Response-00079	The council should spend more time restricting landlords from buying all the afforhkises in west hallam and restrict how much they can charge before anything else.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Paul aldre	Response-00152	We do t need more housing regardless of affordable or not. We don?t need welfare housing to create more trouble and fraction there?s enough theft and trouble now
1.9	South of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Paula Piggott	Response-01041	You can't keep destroying the countryside destroying habitats, killing wildlife and it all not have a knock on effect. You are destroying the air we breathe. We need flowers, we need bees these things the world can't exist without. The wildlife will seriously be impacted. You will destroy the habitats of many animals needed for the world to survive. This is a small village. With lots of precious animals, insects, flowers, trees etc you will kill these insects and animals when you destroy their habitats thus destroying the air we breathe. There is a school and many bungalows with pensioners. It is a accident waiting to happen. Also dog walkers, horse riders and lots of wildlife. Seriously someone will get hurt or worse killed! It is a small village without the capacity for more houses. The roads are not built for so many extra residents. You will totally destroy the area and you will totally destroy the clean air killing lots of wildlife and their habitats in the process.
		Type of Housing	Pauline wood	Response-01100	Why no bungalows
1.9	South of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Phil Campbell	Response-00109	The greatest identified need for social housing in Erewash is for single people and this should be taken into account when deciding which properties to build on the site.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Rebecca Ricci	Response-00102	People pay a premium to live in an area where there is no social housing. Social housing comes with unemployment, deprivation, crime, drugs and anti social behaviour. We need to protect our village and our house prices
1.9	South of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Robert Reynolds	Response-00260	The type of housing is irrelevant. This site does not require development. As already stated, local infrastructure is already at very high capacity.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Type of Housing	sam richards	Response-01467	plans have not been released so it is unclear what types of houses are in the plans.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Sarah Taylor	Response-01819	Planning permission has been denied in the past even for agricultural buildings.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Type of Housing	sharon hickson	Response-01430	we just don't need any more houses in west Hallam , there are plenty for sale in the village and we have a good mix of social ,bungalow and houses
1.9	South of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Simon Reeve	Response-01080	The types of housing isn't too much of a concern, that said all housing developed anywhere in the UK should be legislated to have solar, heat pump etc to ensure self sufficiency as the grid is at breaking point. As are the sewers and refuse collection services that often aren't considered. There needs to be more affordable housing £120k - £280k but not more social housing; more needs to be done for working people on lower wages as they are the group missed out when housing strategy is planned and yet they're working hard and paying taxes
		Type of Housing	Stacey Eady	Response-01529	The issue is the amount and the position of the proposed site.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Steve Bailey	Response-01022	West Hallam has always been a sought after area, and adding more houses will dilute this and make it into more of a estate rather than village.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Teresa Webster	Response-00086	West Hallam has a diverse and interesting mix of houses which adds to the charm and character of the village. Adding in an ?estate? of identical house will massively detract from the overall ambience
1.9	South of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Tracey Barks	Response-00111	Depending on developer, we could end up with 90 substandard houses making out beautiful village an eye sore
		Type of Housing	Vicky Buckley	Response-00182	already overcrowded
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Alison Fletcher	Response-00198	Damage to the environment, open green space and the natural habitat of flora and fauna .
		Wildlife / Biodiversity	Alison Stills	Response-01057	The area is home to deer and many other flora and fauna.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Alistair	Response-01138	Building on fields
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Andrea Cochrane	Response-01485	The proposed development site contains a number of mature trees, hedgerows and open space. These together act as a buffer zone between the estate and open country and house an array of different birds and wildlife. I have seen bats in the area, and tawny owls, plus foxes, rabbits and badgers. If these are lost due to development, another valuable learning resource will disappear.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Andrew and Julie Douglas	Response-00146	We will see the demise of the barn owl who often hunts in the field
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Andrew Zielinski-Raynor	Response-00135	The proposed site is what gives West Hallam its village/countryside feel. There are vast numbers of birds including birds of prey, woodpeckers, pheasants, jays etc that daily frequent and feed in this area. Plus all the other wildlife that you would expect to see in a rural area.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Angela Reid	Response-00134	Impacting the natural environment in the area

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Anita Lawrence	Response-00726	The development would have a negative effect on the biodiversity of the proposed and surrounding areas during and after build.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Anna	Response-00112	West Hallam is a pretty village that is home to many nice walkways and wildlife, it will be spoilt by builders trashing the landscape
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Anne Vanstone	Response-01216	This site supports a range of wildlife ? including protected and rare species. Pushing ahead with this build would destroy an important ecological space and chip away at our village?s green character.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	A Redshaw	Response-00287	This area is a natural wildlife field without disturbances from any current interference
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Carl fox	Response-00067	Will spoil the village feel. Village is too small to build more housing
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Carly Denham	Response-00292	These are our green spaces. There is a huge amount of wildlife in this area
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Cat Hope	Response-00127	West hallam is a village, now soon will be an estate like oakwood! Traffic is horrendous, more so parking. Empty houses already on where the former white hart is. This once attractive village, will soon by awful. Ilkeston as the nearest town can't handle more traffic. Our villages are losing our green belt areas! Years ago Erewash would never budge, eg dale road stanley. We need to protect our green space! Soon will be none. Huge overcrowding happening. Criminal activity needs protection also! Our police can't cope as it is now.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Charles Brooks	Response-00535	In todays world people are more and more concerned about wildlife and biodiversity. The proposed development land is rich in wildlife which should not be disturbed. There is currently a wonderful vista looking across the land. West Hallam is a rural village where I believe a large development like the one proposed can only significantly reduce the feeling of living in a rural environment. I moved to West Hallam to enjoy being surrounded by green fields and the sound of wildlife.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Charlotte Lun	Response-00150	The planned building site is a lovely area of green land full of wildlife. Turning the area into housing will destroy the wildlife.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Chris Collins	Response-00037	The area in question is currently a haven for lots of wildlife, in the heart of the village. There are daily sightings of birds of prey hunting in the field, the field provides a habitat for a wide range of small mammals and other animals, grasses, plants and trees. Losing a habitat such as this will drive out / destroy the environment for countless animals.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Claire dean	Response-00069	There's is a significant amount of wildlife in this land, I have known times people have been unable to access this due to this and to respect the wildlife.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Connor Gratton	Response-00232	This is a very large greenbelt area. I have more concerns over the negative impact on the local wildlife.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Daniel Clark	Response-01094	We live in a village for the wewis and wildlife and more houses should not be approved to this beautiful area
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Daniel hickson	Response-00177	Ecosystem will be damaged
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Dave Stone	Response-00140	Using green areas for development should not be allowed.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	David Richards	Response-01465	The field has much wildlife including pheasants, kestrels, owls, badgers etc. It should not be acceptable for the loss of this to be mitigated via another site miles away. The Oak tree on the frontage of the site along with the established hedgerow should not be allowed to be change - this is an important visual characteristic of the village.
			Dean Wright	Response-00094	Considerable loss of greenery and wildlife habitat. That this development is even being considered is utterly unacceptable.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Diane Reynolds	Response-00216	There are a family of pheasant that frequent over the field. Birds of prey and many other wildlife that would be effected by the build. We see many animals such as pheasants family, see and hear owls, woodpeckers and many other birds that will be effected
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Emily Reeve	Response-01495	The area set out has a population of birds and animals. It is hunting grounds for birds of pray including buzzards, kestrels and owls. All seen on a regular basis. Obviously if the birds of prey are there, there must be a population of small animals to sustain them. The housing would impact on the natural habitat.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Emily Reynolds	Response-00149	Building houses will have a big impact on the species living in and around the field. The field itself youd be destroying habitats. No amount of putting in hedges and grass edges "for biodiversity" will replace that. It won't be the same. For species around it in terms of feeding/hunting ground. You will reduce the amount of biodiversity around west hallam which make it such a nice place to live.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Emma Lound	Response-00187	The fields behind Beech Lane and Station Road are a hive of activity for wildlife and birds such as Red Kites, pheasants and Bats. Building on this land will force them out of their habitat.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Emma Newsham	Response-00117	Using up more green space,
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Emma Stanley-Smith	Response-01564	Current area is used by a wide variety of wildlife.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Gary Hamson	Response-00052	Has a check been done for wildlife on the site - bats, newts or slo worms ?
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Gilly Turrini	Response-00151	We need to keep our green belt for nature, habitats and cleaner air
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Glenn Richardson	Response-00316	I've got numerous videos and pictures of the amazing diverse wild life around the questioned area ..It?s corridor for wild life ..It?s a habitat for deer ,badgers,foxes bats & hundreds of varieties of birds ..from kestrels,barn owls& buzzard to woodpecker,pheasant & owls ?not to mention the common bird.im a regular user of an app to recognise bird calls & the variety is amazing ?.this development would have a massive negatively affect on this
			Guiliano Ricci	Response-01010	This is a green belt area - it has wildlife and should not be spoilt
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Helen Blackwell	Response-00456	Building on grassland will inevitably have a negative impact on wildlife.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Helen Collins	Response-00034	Obviously it's reducing the amount of green space around the village which mean a direct loss of wildlife habitat in the immediate area and ffect upon the surrounding area.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Helen fox	Response-00064	The proposed construction of additional housing in a small village poses significant risks to local wildlife and biodiversity. The disruption of natural habitats can lead to the decline of various species, ultimately upsetting the ecological balance. Furthermore, the loss of biodiversity can have detrimental effects on the village itself, as it may diminish the natural resources and ecosystem services that the community relies on, such as clean air and water, pollination of crops, and recreational opportunities. This development could compromise the village's environmental integrity, making it less sustainable in the long term.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Helen Johnson	Response-00170	Again affected by volume of traffic

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Helen Patenall	Response-00868	The proposed are for development is teeming with wildlife, it is currently a field covered in grass. Birds, insects and other wildlife will be lost by developing the area. I walk on a very regular basis past the proposed site and the area is constantly frequented by birds.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Helen Stanley	Response-01555	Th isnis a lovely open space with our village, providing habitats in the long grass and surrounding hedgerows These will be permanently lost
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Helen Vickedes	Response-00062	Removal of an area that has been untouched for many years which has a large variety of wildlife & vegetation will negatively impact the biodiversity in the area.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Homewood	Response-01074	It's an area with rich wildlife and diverse species which will end up being affected
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Iain Harrison	Response-01214	he proposed site is a wild, open field that currently supports a variety of local wildlife. My family and I regularly see foxes and other animals in this area?it is part of a fragile but vital natural ecosystem that contributes to biodiversity and supports pollinators, birds, and small mammals. Building over it would be a permanent loss, not just of greenbelt land, but of habitat. According to the Wildlife Trusts and other conservation groups, building on greenbelt and greenfield sites often causes irreversible damage to local biodiversity, fragmenting habitats and disrupting the natural corridors that wildlife rely on to survive. This is particularly unjustifiable when there are numerous brownfield sites and derelict properties across Ilkeston and the wider borough that remain unused or underutilized. National planning guidelines (such as those from the Campaign to Protect Rural England and the government?s own National Planning Policy Framework) encourage the development of brownfield land before greenbelt is even considered. Why is this not being enforced? Why are we targeting wildlife-rich, undeveloped land when there are more sustainable alternatives readily available? Once this green space is gone, it is gone for good. The loss of biodiversity, access to nature, and clean air cannot be undone.
			Ian Brown	Response-00163	open land for walking and bird watching
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Iris Howes	Response-01169	Wildlife including deer, birds of prey, and protected newts are frequently observed in this area. Development would destroy their habitats and disrupt the local ecosystem.
			James Johnson	Response-00183	The area proposed is home to a beautiful barn owl as well as kestrel?s.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	James Johnson	Response-01125	The area north of West Hallam includes valuable greenfield land that supports a variety of wildlife, including birds, small mammals, and important plant species. Development here would result in the irreversible loss of natural habitats and corridors essential for biodiversity. With increasing awareness of ecological decline and climate challenges, preserving this natural environment should be a planning priority.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	James Morris	Response-01060	Pushing wildlife further back away from the village
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	James Painter	Response-01119	The site in question bounded on one side by a wood that supports a variety wildlife that also uses the site in question with road and playing field on one side and the cricket ground on the other side this site allows wildlife to have space and is becoming a wildlife meadow
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	James Tilford	Response-00103	Loss of important biodiversity and habitat including veteran tree
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jane Taylor	Response-01023	The area concerned is a wildlife haven and any development would cause damage to the wildlife and biodiversity
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jane Zielinski-Raynor	Response-01095	The field is a beautiful resource in the village,
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jenny Bexon	Response-00185	These wild grassland area and woodland allow natural biodiversity to bloom. The trees provide a haven for wildlife such as owls and bats. I walk through here almost daily and appreciate the nature all around this site
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jo-Anne Attenborough	Response-00129	The field is a haven for many species of wildflowers. It is an important habitat for insects. Building on this site will destroy the biodiversity and have a negative impact on on wildlife.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Joe Rice	Response-00063	As this is technically a green belt site that has been delisted there are wildlife and biodiversity issues. It will push the houses out even further into the surrounding countryside removing more hedge rows and trees.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Johnson	Response-01037	Taking away green belt land is detrimental to our local wildlife. Barn owl often seen in this area
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jonathan Purkis	Response-00159	The proposed site is unmaintained and is a natural habitat for many wild animals.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jon Skelson	Response-00157	We need to stop building on green belt land. The community needs it's greenery for everyones well being. This is why we choose to live here.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jon Skelson	Response-01025	We need our green areas, They are hugely important. Evew if it looks unused, there will always be a huge selection of wildlife.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Josh August	Response-00084	Building houses on fields with hedges, trees, bushes and plants will eradicate a lot of wildlife already living around this area
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Judith Hare	Response-01014	The fields on beech lane have lots of wildlife being there for so many years. It would be so sad to see these removed for housing
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Julie Harbon	Response-00022	The proposed area is green belt. West Hallam is a sought after area because it?s nicely maintained and has green spaces. If all the green spaces are filled, we will lose that. It is also a home to lots of wildlife- many birds have been seen there, owls, buzzards, sparrow hawks, kites, robins, blue tits, gold finches, woodpeckers to name but a few. There are also lots of squirrels, field mice and hedgehogs etc around.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Julie Harker	Response-01073	We picked West Hallam as a place to live because of the green spaces and abundance of wildlife. Quiet spaces to walk for your mental health. Don't want to lose the wildlife that there is left in this area
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Julie Stewardson	Response-00282	Taking away well used green spaces from the Community!!
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Kate Halls	Response-01035	The field behind Beech Lane which has housing allocation will adversely affect the wildlife and biodiversity. It?s such a beautiful place, and would be enormously damaging to wildlife and also to those people who enjoy using the field. It will mean less accessible places to walk.
			Kathryn Fearn	Response-00100	The field is an untouched part of the area, ideal for wildlife
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Katie	Response-00047	This is land that has plenty of wildlife.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Katie Rice	Response-00036	The fields and woodland area are home to lots of wildlife and This would be destroying their habitat
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Kay	Response-01030	Lots of wildlife in the area would be a shame to put houses there
	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Kerry	Response-01034	Ruining a wildlife area.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Kerry Barratt	Response-00168	Greenbelt development means wildlife affected
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Kerry Middleton	Response-00266	This proposal would be detrimental to the surrounding wildlife, destroying hedgerow habitats.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Kian	Response-01493	Animals that live in the area will have to relocate effecting the UK?s wildlife population
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Kirsty Oliver	Response-00558	Speaks for itself! this area has been has only ever been fallow land. Is also a big dog walking area.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Kristen Hamilton	Response-00209	This will affect local wildlife
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Laura Egglestone	Response-01027	There are often hedgehogs, rabbits, owls and pheasants seen in the area with the odd sighting of deer and also known to have gold crested newts living on the site.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Lindsey Lyons	Response-00071	The area that has been put forward is a large part of land that houses Wildlife (rabbits, foxes, badgers to name a few). Wildlife are crucial to the biodiversity of the area and with little other areas for them to reside on an already large housing area in West Hallam this is saddening to think about. What are the plan for wildlife? I strongly believe this has not been considered.
	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Louise Annison	Response-01049	The village is a lovely rural gem and a haven for wildlife.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Lucy Corrigan	Response-00142	That field is a lovely addition to west Hallam wildlife and its majority of the nice view we have in west Hallam it does not need houses on it
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mandie Frith	Response-00247	Would A big impact on wild life in that area we need more wildlife areas not houses
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Margaret Lewis	Response-01499	We have a depleted wildlife as it is and removing more of there homes is having an impact on were they live and where they end up going into housing estates then they get killed by traffic
	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mark	Response-00164	The area has Owls and wildflowers and of course was designated green belt. Not that you seem to care
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mark Newton	Response-00179	I know the council doesn't care about this, but it is one of the last precious green spaces in the village that allows grassland and important biodiversity to the region. But I know for a fact the council doesn't care.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mark Patenall	Response-00851	The site is green field with much flora and fauna. The site has previously been turned down for development so what has changed now?
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mark Power	Response-00276	Pheasants, bird of prey are regular at the back of houses plus other animal?s habitat would be destroyed. The fields at the back of Beech Lane have varied Wildlife and to destroy natural habitats and Greenbelt is a disgrace.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Matt Haddon	Response-00696	There is significant wildlife that would be impacted with horses, rabbits, birds (including birds of prey), butterflies and bees that can all be regularly seen at this location. These habitats would be lost as a result of allowing building on this site.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Matthew Lyons	Response-00061	Taking green area away from the local community who have paid more money to live where they do is neither necessary or acceptable. Devaluing people?s homes who have worked hard to pay for them is irresponsible
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Maureen Briggs	Response-00190	The field is a green area for the wildlife and insects etc. And people enjoy the green open space and would not want houses to spoil it.!
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Max Egglestone	Response-01278	This site is home to a variety of wildlife, including deer, pheasants, owls, hedgehogs and protected species like the gold-crested newt. Development here would mean the destruction of important habitats and a loss of biodiversity that cannot be easily replaced.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Michelle	Response-00148	There is a lot of wildlife in the fields including bees. To kill these to build houses is murder
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Michelle Cox	Response-00138	Nice to see a bit of wild life when you can
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mr and Mrs Mellors	Response-01797	The proposed site is a vital habitat for diverse and protected wildlife species, including: Bats ?legally protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. Palmate newts ? often found in local ponds and at risk from habitat loss. Owls, kestrels, and woodpeckers ? all of which rely on the fields, hedgerows, and mature trees for nesting and feeding. Developing this greenfield site would destroy this irreplaceable habitat and permanently damage local biodiversity. It is imperative that such ecosystems are protected, not sacrificed for urban expansion.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mrs Caroline Hooton	Response-00231	Removing an area with an abundance of natural wildlife affects our biodiversity along with the increased pollution
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mrs Judith Pittson	Response-00753	There is a beautiful mature oak tree opposite Hallam Way which must be protected.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mrs Strelley	Response-00233	There are many varieties of birds spotted in the field. The building of dwellings will reduce the hedgerows and habitats of the local wildlife. The marsh-like ground lends itself to usual flora and fauna. Not the ideal setting for footings and stable foundations for houses.
	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Natalie Payne	Response-01523	There is so much wildlife in this area that a housing estate would have a very negative impact on the habitat
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Nick Craddock	Response-00145	As per my comments for other west Hallam Proposal
	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Nicola Elkington-Horridge	Response-00079	This is a beautiful area that should be preserved to keep the village full of wildlife and birds
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Nicole Brookman	Response-01559	at the moment we have a lot of wildlife and birds and i will loose that. my wildlife comes from this field
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Nina Walters	Response-00244	Yes
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Pamela Fox	Response-01242	We have an abundance of wildlife in the fields where planning permission is being sought, many birds live in the trees and take refuge in the hedgerow, we have Blue Tits, Great Tits, Goldfinches, Wood Peckers, hedge sparrows, black birds, squirrels and hedgehogs all live in and around the field not to mention the Bats which are regularly seen flying around at night. I fear that all these creatures will be lost to the area forever.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Patricia Ryan	Response-00132	This area should be left for wildlife and humans to enjoy.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Patrick Hynes	Response-01902	There are frequent sightings of deer, owls, and other wildlife in the proposed development area. These creatures will lose their habitat if construction proceeds, and we may never see their return.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Paul aldre	Response-00152	The village has been overdeveloped already and wildlife areas are less and less
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Paula Piggott	Response-01041	You can't keep destroying the countryside destroying habitats, killing wildlife and it all not have a knock on effect. You are destroying the air we breathe. We need flowers, we need bees these things the world can't exist without. The wildlife will seriously be impacted. You will destroy the habitats of many animals needed for the world to survive. This is a small village. With lots of precious animals, insects, flowers, trees etc you will kill these insects and animals when you destroy their habitats thus destroying the air we breathe.
	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Pauline wood	Response-01100	Conservation area. How can building be right
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Peter Lilley	Response-00161	The loss of another green space in an already highly built up area is deplorable
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Pete Vanstone	Response-01164	The development site is a known habitat for deer, owls, pheasants, and protected species such as the gold-crested newt. Disturbing this natural environment would be ecologically irresponsible and damage the biodiversity of the area.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Philip Davies	Response-01116	Like many of the residents we have spent a lot of time and effort in providing spaces in our garden for birds, insects and animals. We have put bee and butterfly friendly plants in the garden and encouraged biodiversity. A housing complex backing onto our gardens will destroy all of this hard work and effort.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Rachel	Response-01015	The site is home for so much wildlife.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Rebecca Ricci	Response-00102	This site has wildlife and building houses on will remove their natural habitat. West Hallam needs to be kept rural.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Richard Walters	Response-00546	Core Strategy Review Amendment - Public Consultation In response to your call for comments on the Core Strategy Review Document I hereby submit my views for your further consideration . My views will be largely confined to the Site Selection Paper, in particular as it relates to West Hallam and more specifically proposals relating to the Land South of West Hallam (CSR-0044) although my comments could equally apply to the other projected site in the village Land North of West Hallam (CSR0048). Point 1 - I note that in relation to site CSR-0044 the Paper states 'the site falls on land that fails to make an important contribution to the Green Belt' (ref p10, first full paragraph 1). I consider this statement, at best, a very subjective construct based on, what appears to be, unsubstantiated opinion. I presume that the justification for this is the assessment against the criteria of Safeguarding the Countryside from encroachment Checking the Unrestricted Sprawl of Large Built-Up Areas, and Preventing Neighbouring Towns Merging I further note that four sites at the Junction of St Wilfrids Road and High Lane Central ( CSR0004 & CSR0004 a, b and c) were rejected as meeting the above Green Belt criteria. I am unable to discern or find any evidence in the review as to why these sites meet the criteria and those at CSR0044 and CSR0048 do not. This distinction seems to arise purely from the unsubstantiated and subjective views of the paper's author rather than any detailed and objective in depth analysis of the respective sites contribution to the Green Belt. In fact a case may be made that the Beech Lane site (CSR0044) indeed makes a greater contribution in meeting the criteria vis Safeguarding the Countryside from encroachment :- the immediate presence of large scale urban encroachment is far more apparent on the Beech Lane site, sitting as it does on the edge of West Hallam central/core housing developments. Whereas the rejected sites (CSR004 etc) only lie adjacent to the lesser populated ribbon developments of the village. Over my time living in the village I have monitored the habitat contribution of the Beech Lane site. I have for example, to date recorded 53 bird, 15 mammal and 4 amphibian species on this site. As such it makes a valuable contribution to the countryside that would be jeopardised rather than safeguarded if housing development were to proceed. Taken as a whole the Beech Lane site has, at least as diverse a range of countryside attributes (hedges, adjoining woodland, wetland habitat, ditches, grassland perfect for ?predator? hunters such as owls and hawks) as any of the ?rejected? sites. Checking the Unrestricted Sprawl of Large Built Up Areas:- with a current population of c.6000 in 2600 households (2001 census) West Hallam already has a population that surpasses that of several East Midland towns. This raises the existential question as to what is the fundamental nature of West Hallam as a community. Again the pressure from built up area sprawl is already more keenly felt at site CSR 0044 than at the ?rejected? village sites so it is difficult to understand why the Green Belt criteria apply to ?rejected sites? and not the Beech Lane site. Preventing Neighbourhood Towns Merging:- Suffice it to say that I can perceive no more justification in saying this criteria applies to the rejected sites than in doing so for the Beech Lane site (CSR0044). If there is a distinction to be made it needs to be justified/quantified. Point 2 Tr
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Richard Walters	Response-00546	affic and Services The main core of the village, the Village and the Estate, is already poorly served by access and egress roads. This already creates excessive traffic congestion particularly at peak periods. This can be further exacerbated by:- the frequency of road works necessitated by the aging services infrastructure of the village e.g. utilities and the subsidence legacy of the mining past The presence of the village school and main playing fields adjoining one of those main access/egress points. Further housing development without improved/additional road infrastructure, as currently envisioned, is only going to worsen an already problematic situation. In Summary I note both the rejected and proposed housing proposals. However I cannot see that any case has been satisfactorily made justifying why some sites have been deemed to meet the Green Belt criteria and others do not do so. The only rather spurious justification appears to be that of expedience and opportunity! That the Land South of West Hallam (CSR0044) has an absentee owner who is only too willing to facilitate its development and, in doing so, meet the Authorities targets. In particular I would expect far greater transparency and justification as to why the report states that some sites meet the Green Belt criteria while others do not. THE SITE SELECTION PAPER FAILS TO MAKE ANY SUBSTANTIVE CASE WHY SOME SITES MEET THE GREEN BELT CRITERIA BUT OTHERS DO NOT. THE SITE HAS BEEN SELECTED WITHOUT ANY APPARENT WILDLIFE/BIODIVERSITY SURVEY BEING UNDERTAKEN
	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Robert Hall	Response-00630	Development would inevitably harm existing wildlife and biodiversity.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Robert Reynolds	Response-00260	Building these houses would have a negative impact on local wildlife, from insects (especially pollinators) to birds and small mammals since it would remove an area in which they live.
	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Ruby Reid	Response-00119	Disrupt the wildlife habitats in the fields and surrounding woodlands

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	sam richards	Response-01467	living opposite this piece of land, i always see how much wildlife exists there. owls, kestrels and pheasants can be seen on a daily basis and we have also seen a badger too. the large oak tree (which i hope is protected) provides vital space for animals to shelter, feed and breed.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Sarah Taylor	Response-00115	The area provides a home for wildlife which is largely contradicting Erewash's re-wilding vision. I have seen field mice, barn owls, rabbits, various hedge birds that the RSPB do an annual count on. This area doesn't look like there is much going on however it is a haven for wildlife.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Serena Bostock	Response-00125	People live in West Hallam because they want to be away from busy, overcrowded areas and enjoy their surroundings and nature. This will destroy that. It will become another Ilkeston town and push people out.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	sharon hickson	Response-01430	the field has always been a habitation for wildlife and has been kept as wild for years, so the amount of wildlife in the field alone is worth leaving and would fore fill the governments wild areas commentment
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Simon Reeve	Response-01080	The fields between High Lane, West Hallam and Shipley/Heanor Road, Ilkeston support a diverse population of wildlife with open fields, woodlands, marsh land, lakes and streams/ivers. Removing any part of this environment for housing should be banned on this basis alone, there be no home for nature and "not cutting the grass verges" (to save money) won't make a difference.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Sophie	Response-01105	The site will remove necessary green spaces for wildlife
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Stacey Eady	Response-01529	I have been advised that this most recent inclusion of the Beech Lane site is not due to the recent changes in the Green Belt policy that was implemented in late 2024, as you have confirmed to me that you are not using this policy. I'm lead to believe that you are using the previous version of the policy that was in place at the beginning of the revised core strategy, and this was much earlier(2022). This merely creates more confusion about the desire to include the land in question. As the alternative site (CSR0004) on St Wilfrids Road in West Hallam had been rejected during this policy period, as a result of satisfying the Green Belt criteria, you will surely understand, having visited both sites, that this St Wilfrids site offers far less in terms of the Green Belt criteria than that of Beech Lane. This latter site has several mature trees that promenade the front of Beech Lane, not to mention the thousand of birds/wildlife and plants it houses and it's vital contribution to the mainainance of the conservation area that is within very close proximity. With the Safeguarded Land that is being discussed still been used for agricultural purposes, I feel that there is some misjudgment as to how these different sites scored and maybe this was influenced by the sudden need to deliver outcomes quickly rather than actually scoring this appropriately. As such, I wish to challenge the findings as the report doesn't clearly outline the process. My concerns are also that whilst the Beech Lane piece of land is a 'developers dream' and the land owner is eager to sell, these decisions should not be influenced merely by this aspect. The land is situated adjacent to the centre of our historic village, which dates back to as early as the Domesday Book, and which is currently part of the vital Conservation Area. As you will know, this area was initially designated and implemented to protect and preserve the local area. The proposed new development will be very close to this crucial area and will, in everyone's opinion, add very little visual benefit. Indeed it will, in all probability, have a negative impact on the Conservation Area, while being in no way in keeping with the current historical aesthetics of a traditional village centre that was built many years ago. To allow access to this historical village centre to become clogged with the excess traffic that will be generated by the current proposal is, in the opinion of most residents, intolerable.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Steve Bailey	Response-01022	The field that is being suggested provides the local wildlife and a nice area to walk to the cricket ground.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Teresa Faulkner-Day	Response-00242	There is a wealth of wildlife in the village that can't be found in the surrounding areas. This would be lost forever.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Teresa Webster	Response-00086	We have pheasants nesting in the field, a family of deer living in the woods and a family of buzzards that have been living in the trees near here for years. I also understand that the newts are protected
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Tilly Fletcher	Response-00317	Building houses in this area will completely decimate all wildlife.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Toni Tomlinson	Response-00204	There are foxes, rabbits and deer using this land .
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Tracey Barks	Response-00111	The proposed development on a buffer green way between The Storage Depot and the village will add to the erosion of wildlife habitat areas around our village. The woodland next to the area is home to many nesting birds including buzzards with the potential for the red kites that are now in our area, nesting there.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Vicky Buckley	Response-00182	we need green spaces for wildlife
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Victoria Walker	Response-00228	The proposed land is on fields where animals and birds live. It is a nesting site.
1.9	South of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Yvonne	Response-00207	This area is full of birds and wildlife ..
1.10	North of West Hallam	Air Quality	Alesha Johnson	Response-01122	Air quality in the area is of vital importance to the residents. Alot of people who live in West Hallam already feel the effects of air pollution on especially on High Lane. We all know how dangerous the side effects can be.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Air Quality	Andy Williams	Response-00184	This area is on the edge of the country parks & nature reserves and the air quality is clearly going to be affected with built up area.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Air Quality	Anita Lawrence	Response-00660	Increased pollution. More vehicles accessing High Lane West will raise pollution levels unless public transport is improved and utilised. Levels of pollution along High Lane West and onto Belper Road, Stanley Common are high, especially particulate matter which can be clearly seen as it settles onto windows, vehicles and penetrates into homes, this together with less visible pollution is a considerable health risk especially to the very young, elderly and other vulnerable people.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Air Quality	Charles Brooks	Response-00933	Additional housing can only make air quality worse. The proposed land is lovely and green and used by animals and wildlife. Residents who live on the High Lane by the proposed development have wonderful views over the countryside.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Air Quality	Claire Dean	Response-00068	Noise and air pollution would have an effect on the local area without a doubt. The quality of the air from the use of vehicles is already poor so again adding to this with not only transportation but household activities such as burning solid fuels such as cooking, heating and everyday living activities which would occur should you increase the number of households and occupants in the area.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
	North of West Hallam	Air Quality	Claire Hunter	Response-00709	More traffic will Mean added pollution in the area affecting the residents and wildlife in the area
1.10	North of West Hallam	Air Quality	Cory page	Response-01425	More people more pollution and ruining the wildlife and increasing this pollution is selfish.
	North of West Hallam	Air Quality	David Whitehead	Response-01051	The development will cause a degradation in air quality from construction machinery fumes and dust.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Air Quality	Hannah	Response-00252	Already high lane west station road much busier than when we moved especially station road, the crossroads are a death waiting to happen
	North of West Hallam	Air Quality	Helen Patenall	Response-00872	Air quality will be impacted by the increase in traffic in the area. More housing = more vehicles (possibly several vehicles at one property) = less clean air.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Air Quality	Helen Stanley	Response-01558	More cars more pollution
	North of West Hallam	Air Quality	Jane Garner	Response-01076	Air quality will decrease with the extra traffic on the roads.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Air Quality	Jayne Trueman	Response-00427	The extra volume of traffic and construction off the development will add to the already high amount of traffic emissions.
	North of West Hallam	Air Quality	Jonie Centro	Response-00729	more heating/cars/congestion will all increase air polution and lower general quality of life and air
1.10	North of West Hallam	Air Quality	Julie Harbon	Response-00026	Congestion will be detrimental to air quality
1.10	North of West Hallam	Air Quality	Kathryn McCartney	Response-01042	Traffic is ever increasing, many of the existing homes in the surrounding area have more than one vehicle, air quality is diminishing as a result. Hampered by the inevitable destruction of trees and hedgerows increases reducing air quality.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Air Quality	Kerry Middleton	Response-00265	This proposal would be detrimental to the air quality, thus causing health problems to the residents.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Air Quality	laura slater	Response-01540	It is a 40mph road with heavy traffic at almost all times of day. the air quality will obviously get poorer with each new house owning at least one vehicle
1.10	North of West Hallam	Air Quality	Lee Hunter	Response-00176	This is a tree lined area adding natural beauty to our area
	North of West Hallam	Air Quality	Marie cox	Response-00105	More houses more traffic poorer air pollution
1.10	North of West Hallam	Air Quality	Matt Haddon	Response-00098	The increased volume of traffic, and increased queuing times of cars trying to join from Station Road or Park Hall Lane will generate significantly more car fumes in the area, which aside from the impact on residents is not good for the environment.
	North of West Hallam	Air Quality	Nick Craddock	Response-00144	More traffic in the area
1.10	North of West Hallam	Air Quality	Nicola Elkington-Horridge	Response-00082	It goes without saying about the amount of extra pollution this will cause.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Air Quality	Patrick Barber	Response-00279	The increase in traffic will reduce the local air quality
1.10	North of West Hallam	Air Quality	Paula Piggott	Response-01044	You can't keep destroying the countryside destroying habitats, killing wildlife and it all not have a knock on effect. You are destroying the air we breathe. We need flowers, we need bees these things the world can't exist without. The wildlife will seriously be impacted. You will destroy the habitats of many animals needed for the world to survive. This is a small village. With lots of precious animals, insects, flowers, trees etc you will kill these insects and animals when you destroy their habitats thus destroying the air we breathe. There is a school and many bungalows with pensioners. It is a accident waiting to happen. Also dog walkers, horse riders and lots of wildlife. Seriously someone will get hurt or worse killed! It is a small village without the capacity for more houses. The roads are not built for so many extra residents. You will totally destroy the area and you will totally destroy the clean air killing lots of wildlife and their habitats in the process. Keep building over land will cause flooding and lead to drainage problems as natural soakaway will be destroyed.
	North of West Hallam	Air Quality	Pauline Lawson	Response-00314	More traffic will inevitably add to the air pollution
1.10	North of West Hallam	Air Quality	Pauline Wood	Response-01099	Air quality would be affected
	North of West Hallam	Air Quality	Richard elks	Response-01422	Need I comment, air quality will certainly be impacted by the amount of properties proposed aswell as car usage.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Air Quality	Simon Reeve	Response-01059	The government needs to make their minds up whether they're taxing us to death over emissions or making money out of us with a green con. The addition of more homes on green belt land brings more pollution and the removal of fields and trees less carbon capture and converting greenery. Use the dead town of Ilkeston where shops are closed and convert those in to homes, use some of the land around Stanton, these brown field sites go untouched
	North of West Hallam	Air Quality	Sophy Cunningham	Response-00211	Further traffic congestion and additional cars in the area will affect air quality.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Air Quality	Teresa Faulkner-Day	Response-00240	With the high number of vehicles often heavy ones, already going through the village this way, causing poor air quality in this part of the village. This does not need adding to
1.10	North of West Hallam	Air Quality	Thomas Edward Tyler	Response-01079	Living on the main road means lots of traffic and therefore there is naturally going to be vehicle fumes especially from lorries. In the drier months there is a lot of dust deposited daily on windows and our vehicles. This is to be expected and no different to anywhere else adjacent to the roadside. However, we acknowledge this and use our rear garden area as a refuge where the noise and air quality levels are clearly better. Our concerns regarding developing to the rear of our property are that these benefits will then cease to exist.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Bus Services	Alesha Johnson	Response-01122	The proposed development area is poorly served by public transport, meaning most residents will be dependent on cars. This not only increases emissions and road use but also highlights the unsustainable nature of this development. No substantial infrastructure improvements appear to be included in the application to address this.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Bus Services	Andy Williams	Response-00184	Bus services in this area are already limited and do not operate in the evenings. Therefore necessary for increase in car journeys and cars parked causing congestions and safety concerns
1.10	North of West Hallam	Bus Services	Anita Lawrence	Response-00660	The bus service along the A609 is poor, quite unsuitable for further developing the village and incompatible for those needing to travel. The existing service will not reduce the use of fossil fuels from private vehicles.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Bus Services	Asha Haynes	Response-00059	There isn't a bus service after 6 so unless the new owners have cars they will be isolated. The bus service that exists is limited.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Bus Services	Charles Brooks	Response-00933	There are occasional buses along the High Lane but not always regular. West Hallam does lack a really good regular bus service between Derby and Ilkeston especially in the evenings.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
	North of West Hallam	Bus Services	Claire Dean	Response-00068	The bus services are poor in west hallam.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Bus Services	Claire Hunter	Response-00709	The bus service doesn't ring regular enough or late enough for the amount of audience we have in the village never mind with more people joining the area.
	North of West Hallam	Bus Services	Cory page	Response-01425	There are barely any buses, I rely on my bike.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Bus Services	Daniel Clark	Response-01091	They struggle to manoeuvre now with the high traffic and small roads and more houses in the area will make it worse
	North of West Hallam	Bus Services	Danielle Tyler	Response-01121	Virtually none existent as it is.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Bus Services	Ellen Haddon	Response-00065	There is a very poor bus service running from West Hallam. Putting social housing here, who may not have cars would be very restrictive for people and unworkable for them.
	North of West Hallam	Bus Services	Hannah	Response-00252	What bus service! Sunday for my teenagers none I have to take and fetch from work!
1.10	North of West Hallam	Bus Services	Helen Patenall	Response-00872	The bus service in West Hallam is woefully inadequate. The buses run very infrequently during the day and the last bus available in the evening is 18:20. A perusal of the bus timetables will support this point
	North of West Hallam	Bus Services	Homewood	Response-01069	Already limited service
1.10	North of West Hallam	Bus Services	Jane Garner	Response-01076	Very limited service so it's easier to use your car.
	North of West Hallam	Bus Services	Jane Marshall	Response-01171	Already way below par.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Bus Services	Jayne Trueman	Response-00427	The bus service is very limited in the area and ends early in the evening. Buses are also held up the traffic jams at the two crossroads particularly at school drop off and collection times.
	North of West Hallam	Bus Services	kelly centro	Response-00203	The bus service is shocking
1.10	North of West Hallam	Bus Services	Kerry Middleton	Response-00265	This would be detrimental to the bus services that run throughout the village.
	North of West Hallam	Bus Services	Lee Hunter	Response-00176	Buses dont run in this area after a certain time of day
1.10	North of West Hallam	Bus Services	Lewis Tyler	Response-01104	Virtually non-existent. Funding gets cut year on year
1.10	North of West Hallam	Bus Services	Marie cox	Response-00105	Only limited bus service through the village as it is
1.10	North of West Hallam	Bus Services	Mark	Response-00166	There a no bus services that cater for the shift worker! Or elderly shoppers this housing growth will lead to more cars
1.10	North of West Hallam	Bus Services	Matt Haddon	Response-00098	There are virtually no bus services these days therefore anyone without their own transport living at the site would feel isolated and unable to easily access essential shops and social venues
1.10	North of West Hallam	Bus Services	Melanie Lawson	Response-00848	There is no public transport in the area so the plot is not suitable as the community will be isolated. There isn't a bus service after 6.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Bus Services	Nick Craddock	Response-00144	The buses in the area run regularly, but may need to add more.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Bus Services	Nicola Elkington-Horridge	Response-00082	The bus service in West hallam is useless and poor. This will jot help it in anyway what so ever.
	North of West Hallam	Bus Services	Patrick Barber	Response-00279	The area is lacking bus services and the number of bus services is declining, with only services to Ilkeston and Derby now available.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Bus Services	Paula Piggott	Response-01044	The bus service is already limitd in West Hallam. Increasing this service will have a devastating impact on wildlife and the air we breathe. Also the roads are not safe for any more traffic
	North of West Hallam	Bus Services	Pauline Wood	Response-01099	Terrible bus service
1.10	North of West Hallam	Bus Services	P Newton	Response-00773	The current bus service is very poor anyway in the village , what we need is an increased bus service not more housing developments.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Bus Services	Rachael Winfield	Response-01537	Bus services are useless. One bus every hour isn't a service, if the houses are to be affordable housing, likely for people not to have a car. Bus service needs improving
1.10	North of West Hallam	Bus Services	Richard Brewell	Response-00193	Bus services are already poor, especially at weekends. As a result, travel and commuting links are already unsuitable.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Bus Services	Richard elks	Response-01422	It's poor, unfortunately unless you drive you would find it very difficult to leave this area.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Bus Services	REDACTED	Response-00178	REDACTED
	North of West Hallam	Bus Services	Simon Reeve	Response-01059	The bus services in the area are good, commuting links to Ilkeston, on the Nottingham or direct to Derby are good
1.10	North of West Hallam	Bus Services	Tina Jay	Response-01802	Also the public travel links for West Hallam are very limited, with no evening service at all, with cars being the main use of transport, and any new housing developments of this size bringing further difficulties.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Bus Services	Varley	Response-00290	Bus services are now on a reduced timetable due to funding. I know of people who have to walk from stanley common to west hallam to get the buses in to ilkeston.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Bus Services	Victoria noble	Response-00107	Bus services are already few and far between
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Andy Williams	Response-00184	This area already has significant drainage issues and any increase in water volume in existing drainage system will push beyond design capacity
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Anita Lawrence	Response-00660	The A609 is known to flood in the proposed area.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Asha Haynes	Response-00059	To my understanding the area floods and the field has a large area of flooding for most of the year. This can be seen from my bedroom window.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Bruce Broughton	Response-01533	The land is known locally to be liable to flooding with water overflowing onto public footpath no 2 at the eastern end of the site and the adjacent gardens, and even crosses High Lane West (A609) into gardens on the opposite side of the road. It is understood (from the Parish Council) that Severn Trent Water have visited the affected properties but have declined to do anything to remedy the situation. I can see nothing in the proposals to suggest that this has been considered.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Carol Hart	Response-01828	There are two major problems with this site, one is that it is constantly under water, this water floods the footpath adjacent the site and the garden of the house adjacent the site, the water crosses the road at times and floods the gardens of a couple of properties on the opposite side of the road. Seven Trent water know of the problem but have taken no actions to remedy this.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Caroline Tew	Response-01021	This area regularly floods in times of high rainfall and water is pumped out the garden of one house
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Charles Brooks	Response-00933	It is common knowledge that the proposed area is prone to flooding and the new build will increase the risk of surface water run-off. Please consult the residents that back onto the site. They will give you first hand information



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Christine Barnes	Response-00639	Houses at the bottom end of High Lane West are already affected by flooding. At times flood water crosses HLW affecting properties on the other side. With increased housing this problem would be exacerbated. Who will sort out this problem for the affected householders.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Christopher Chambers	Response-00169	This site is perpetually flooded, especially at the end opposite to Park Hall Lane. In heavy rains, the last 50m of the field is boggy or often underwater. There is a very well used footpath at this end as well as the access drive for the properties on High Lane West. Any development is to exacerbate the drainage issues and without extensive and potentially damaging (aesthetically, ecologically) drains and run off areas, the water that pools here will be moved to the footpath/drives access road. This development cannot take place without a detailed and proper groundwater survey, with mandatory compliances baked-in to any permissions granted. Examples of where the local authority has failed in this regard include former White Hart Public House Station Rd West Hallam which regularly floods as the building contractor has infilled the drainage ditches that were not adequately surveyed and the play park area off the Nutbrook trail to the rear of Elka's Rise Ilkeston, which is so poorly constructed that the meagre and rather desolate design of drainage is wholly inadequate for the needs of the site, which is largely unusable. The local authority needs to ensure that any planning consent includes strict mandates on drainage and that these are enforced.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Claire Dean	Response-00068	More hosing means strain on our water systems, pollution, which increases the risk of flooding an area that in the past has been known to flood.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Claire Hunter	Response-00709	We live next to the field and there is a major drainage problem that has been reported. We had to purchase our own pump to pump the water during times of rain or heavy snow. The water runs off the field onto the public footpath and onto our drive. Carol Hart has delivered sandbags before to us and this has been reported. This would be a major problem for the houses on this land
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Cory page	Response-01425	The land proposed does flood and has done in the past.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Danielle Tyler	Response-01121	The field has poor drainage already
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	David Whitehead	Response-01051	The field floods every winter and Autumn after moderate and heavy rain.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	E bayley	Response-00080	This area floods easily so increasing run off will cause flooding at other houses already present
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Ellen Haddon	Response-00065	The field on mention floods continuously often overflowing into the road and building up there. Surely putting houses on here will cause high lane to flood more frequently and more severe.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Francesca Dean	Response-00220	The entire field floods with any water. It also gets water from the houses and other fields on it due to it being lower. This also floods highland west making it lethal
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Gary Hamson	Response-00055	There is a ditch along the boundary on the roadside and the field is a terrible location in terms of flooding and no 49 High Lane West has dealt with this over the last few years
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Gillian Bosworth	Response-00920	This field is often flooded, the flooding spreading to neighbouring properties and the road. New housing can only make matters worse.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Hannah	Response-00252	We on station road on a high water table according to survey and our underneath our house and next doors regularly floods, we have reach out to council and private. It's all built on clay
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Helen Patenall	Response-00872	The land is a known flood problem and is always boggy and water logged for some time after any prolonged spell of rain, affecting gardens and footpaths in the area. I am led to believe Severn Trent Water are aware of the issues
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Homewood	Response-01069	Already have major issues
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Jane Garner	Response-01076	The field in question floods - why build on land that floods you are asking for future problems
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Jane Marshall	Response-01171	Field regularly floods and flows onto main road.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Jayne Trueman	Response-00427	The area constantly floods. Impacting property and the road. Drainage is not adequate to deal with this and is made worse by the extreme weather events we now see. It also froze in the road this winter causing dangerous conditions for road users.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Kerry Middleton	Response-00265	This ground is not suitable for building work to be carried out on it.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Laura Egglestone	Response-01500	Area is often flooded and already causes issues to nearby houses.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Lee Hunter	Response-00176	What measures will be taken to sort the drainage, our house has been threatened by flooding for the past 5 years and with more house doesn't this add even more pressure the drainage system. The current owner of the land has done nothing to stop any flooding of our property
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Lewis Tyler	Response-01104	I walk my dog in nearby fields and they already flood
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Linda Webster	Response-00747	My main objection concerns the flooding which Severn Trent Water have declined to remedy. The land floods, overflowing into the footpath and the adjacent gardens. It even crosses the A609 into gardens on the opposite side of the road!
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Marie cox	Response-00105	The field floods in the corner and onto the property adjacent to the Where is the sense in building on land that floods
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Matt Haddon	Response-00098	The current site is often partially under water during heavy rain and water often overflows on to High Lane. The proposed site is also very prone to flooding during heavy rain with water often overflowing on to nearby pavements and roads, as well as local gardens. Large parts of the field are submerged in water following heavy rain.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Melanie Lawson	Response-00848	The plot regularly floods and if built on this will cause increasing issues of flooding for more houses. Severn Trent are aware of this.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Mr and Mrs Wood	Response-01825	Climate change will undoubtedly make us more concerned about the removal of natural flood plains,
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Natalie Payne	Response-01520	Area floods
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Nichola Dodd	Response-00197	The land regularly floods, causing a safety issue to the local residents
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Nick Craddock	Response-00144	Already natural drainage is being destroyed by chopping down trees, making hard standings. Generally destroying natural drainage
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Nicola Elkington-Horridge	Response-00082	This area often gets waterlogged. Building here would add to the problem.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Patrick Barber	Response-00279	The site has poor drainage and run off from the site regularly floods nearby properties and on occasions the adjoining highway (High Lane West)
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Paula Piggott	Response-01044	Keep building over natural land will cause drainage and flooding problems. It is a small village that needs natural ground for water to escape to.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Pauline Wood	Response-01099	Land is already known for flooding. Will get worse
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	R F Smith	Response-00685	The land floods following heavy rain developing lakes and overflows onto the adjacent footpath and gardens. Drainage is therefore poor. There is no natural watercourse in the immediate vicinity. Should the land be developed presumably appropriate drainage systems will be required to drain excess water into the sewer system which may overload current capacity causing potential problems elsewhere in the village.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Rhonda Holt	Response-00236	I would say the water infrastructure has already had problems and there's problems of flooding in West Hallam.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Richard Brewell	Response-00193	The location highlighted already holds flood water during periods of heavy rain. Building hard landscaping in this area will only increase surface water runoff causing problems in the immediate area.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Richard elks	Response-01422	The proposed site has a reputation of flooding and it had impacted neighbouring properties in the past.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Robert Mee	Response-01790	There is also a problem with flooding at this location, which any local residents can attest to.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Robert Mee	Response-01507	There is also a problem with flooding at this location, which any local residents can attest to
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Simon Reeve	Response-01059	It's a joke, the area already has issues along Nutbrook, the new housing on Quarry Hill floods as does the entire trail around Manor Flood, moreso now than ever in my almost 50 years in the areas. Taking away fields and trees and replacing with tarmac and concrete with drains to "lose the water" to another location simply overloads another area....it can't continue
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Sophy Cunningham	Response-00211	This field often floods when there is heavy rain and a pump system has to be used to drain the field. If houses are built here this could impact drainage further down high lane for the existing houses and residents.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Stuart Dobson	Response-01114	This field is prone to flooding. Building on this site would cause this flooding to go down to other houses and areas
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Teresa Faulkner-Day	Response-00240	As we have seen with other developments in the village over the years, this increases the risk of flooding. Too often planning permission has been granted without the proper research in to the land that is being built on
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Thomas Edward Tyler	Response-01079	Usual concerns over building on any areas that are subject to any flooding.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	Tina Jay	Response-01802	Also the land floods constantly overflowing into the footpath and the gardens adjacent and even crosses the A609 into gardens on the opposite side of the road, causing further problems.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Flooding / Drainage	tracey knighton	Response-01228	Area floods regularly
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	Alison Bull	Response-00238	We should preserve our green areas such as this - they are something to be proud of and are becoming less and less unfortunately. If we continue to build on them the appeal of living in areas such as West Hallam will diminish
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	Alistair	Response-01139	Building on green belt and will build awful new builds that are crammed in with no gardens
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	Andy Williams	Response-00184	There are several brown belt areas that could be developed to ensure protection of the green belt in this area which has been reduced significantly over recent decades
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	Asha Haynes	Response-00059	The area is green belt and should be left as this.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	Bruce Broughton	Response-01533	In many ways Park Hall Lane represents the 'gateway' to the countryside from the built-up parts of West Hallam. It is widely used as a recreational route by walkers, runners, horse riders and cyclists, seven days a week. The proposals suggest only 'emergency' access from Park Hall Lane from the site, with houses presumably backing onto the lane. However, developing area D would create about 120m of new 'urbanised' frontage to Park Hall Lane, affecting the area's recreational and rural character. The development of this area would not respect or preserve identified landscape character nor have any positive impact on visual amenity.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	Carly Denham	Response-00291	These are our green spaces
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	Caroline Tew	Response-01021	It is important to protect the greenbelt for future generations. Everyone needs green spaces to enjoy and being in the natural environment within a village environment is the reason many people live in West Hallam. It is a well known fact that access to the countryside and open space helps with mental health difficulties
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	Charles Brooks	Response-00933	Please do not build on the green belt. As said previously, I moved to West Hallam to be in the country and I want to be surrounded by open spaces and to hear the sound of nature and wildlife.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	Chloe Parkin	Response-00153	Our green spaces are so valuable and cannot be recreated. Keep our green spaces for our beautiful countryside! Great for people's mental and physical health.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	Chris Reid	Response-00137	We should not be building on green belt land
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	Christopher Chambers	Response-00169	The local authority should not be actively seeking to meet Government housing quotes by targeting green belt land over brownfield or existing development areas. This particular site is not subject to former industrial development, such as the area behind Newdigate Arms further towards Ilkeston, and there is no obvious need, other than the desires of private developers, in seeking to irrevocably altering the landscape with this proposal.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	Claire Dean	Response-00068	We have several areas of brown belt so why try and take our green belt.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	Claire Hunter	Response-00709	This green belt land is what attracted us to the area. We moved here because we weren't surrounded by houses and now there will be affordable housing next to us. Animal habitats destroyed and the beautiful surroundings will disappear
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	Danielle Tyler	Response-01121	Land is green belt, should not be built on.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	David Whitehead	Response-01051	The green belt should be left while there are plenty of more suitable brown fields sites available for development.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	Francesca Dean	Response-00220	Needs to be protected. There are lots of houses that can be fixed up, brown sites can be used. Once it starts on this field it will continue all across our green belt!

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	Gale Harvey	Response-01130	More green space disappearing
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	Helen Blackwell	Response-00457	When there is so much land that is no longer in use undeveloped greenbelt land should not be used.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	Helen Patenall	Response-00872	By definition green belt is "an area of open land, on which building is restricted". I have always been led to believe that the proposed site is green belt land. It seems more than suspicious that all the area around the proposed site remains green belt on the map. It would seem to me that the green belt rules protecting the proposed site have been 'altered' to suit political aims, this is underhand and bordering on the deceitful/corrupt.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	Helen Stanley	Response-01558	Permanent loss of greenbelt, habitats and increased risk of future expansion with the proposed layout
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	Helen Taylor-Tipton	Response-00245	Never to be built on
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	Howard marshall	Response-00124	Green belt land is there for a reason! Wildlife needed! Money cause rules and not interested in the public.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	Jane Garner	Response-01076	Why build on green belt. There are plenty of empty unused properties in towns already built that could be redeveloped into apartments. Like what has been done to the Rutland mill building in Ilkeston and the old department store on the market place Ilkeston. Also there are plenty of brown field sites around the area that can be used to build on.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	Jayne Trueman	Response-00427	Green belt and green spaces should be protected to be enjoyed by our depleted wildlife and are vital for leisure, health and well being. People from all around this area come to horse ride, cycle and walk in these open spaces.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	Jon Skelson	Response-00156	It's called green belt for a reason. Nobody here needs more houses at the expense of wildlife and residents well being.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	Kathryn McCartney	Response-01042	Continued erosion of green belt, agricultural land is an easy option for developers instead of developing brown site areas. This erosion in small doses will destroy the area.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	Kerry Middleton	Response-00265	This should not be used for housing as it should preserved for wildlife and for locals to enjoy. The ground is not suitable for footings.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	Laura Egglestone	Response-01500	This is green belt and should be protected
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	laura slater	Response-01540	What is the point of having green belt if the amount of green belt is getting smaller and smaller. Reducing west hallams beauty and village idyllic feel
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	Lee Hunter	Response-00176	Isnt this a green belt site, we moved to this area for its beauty
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	Lenny	Response-00167	Green Belt used to mean unchanged areas and also and pull to leave in these villages. Putting up new houses, increasing traffic, increasing noise is not long what village life is about
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	Lewis Tyler	Response-01104	Go and build somewhere that isn't green belt
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	M. Morten	Response-00399	I welcome the inclusion of this site but access needs to be included to the northern boundary to facilitate future development into the green belt to the north and east of this proposal. It makes sense to round off the development edge to meet up with the long gardens further to the east down High Lane West . This site provides a valuable access point to High Lane West as identified in previous proposals which may be premature, but provide feasible development opportunities in the future when additional sites need to be sourced.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	Marie cox	Response-00105	The field concerned is green belt What has happened to the lands green belt status ???
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	Mark	Response-00166	You don't seem to care about ruining greenbelt. Once gone it is gone forever!
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	Matt Haddon	Response-00098	The proposed site will begin eating in to the beautiful greenbelt land we have around us, which should be protected for the future of all.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	Melanie Lawson	Response-00848	The area is green belt and should remain so
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	Molly	Response-01071	We need to conserve and protect the Green Belt land for wildlife.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	Mr and Mrs Wood	Response-01825	The Covid outbreak in 2019 was a stark reminder how important open spaces are to our mental health. The one thing I love about West Hallam is that feeling of well-being and connection with nature that you get when taking a stroll or walking the dog just a stone's throw from my house. The numerous fields that surround our village are natural spaces not those contrived by architects. All NIMBYs, I am sure make these points, maybe with justification as we all know that saying 'are these developments just the thin end of the wedge?'. Rumours are already circulating, and locals need reassurance.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	Mr Brown	Response-00192	No
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	Nick Craddock	Response-00144	Destroying our green and pleasant land. Communities just get bigger, with no infrastructure to support.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	Nicola Elkington-Horridge	Response-00082	Green belt should be left green! Or what is the actual point of having it?
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	Nigel Wright	Response-00101	No further development on the green belt should be considered as West Hallam needs open space.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	Patrick Barber	Response-00279	The proposed development site is on greenbelt land and so is reducing the green belt within the Erewash area.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	Paula Piggott	Response-01044	You can't keep destroying the countryside destroying habitats, killing wildlife and it all not have a knock on effect. You are destroying the air we breathe. We need flowers, we need bees these things the world can't exist without. The wildlife will seriously be impacted. You will destroy the habitats of many animals needed for the world to survive. This is a small village. With lots of precious animals, insects, flowers, trees etc you will kill these insects and animals when you destroy their habitats thus destroying the air we breathe. There is a school and many bungalows with pensioners. It is a accident waiting to happen. Also dog walkers, horse riders and lots of wildlife. Seriously someone will get hurt or worse killed! It is a small village without the capacity for more houses. The roads are not built for so many extra residents. You will totally destroy the area and you will totally destroy the clean air killing lots of wildlife and their habitats in the process. Keep building over land will cause flooding and lead to drainage problems as natural soakaway will be destroyed.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	Pete Vanstone	Response-00294	No need to build on green belt land.
			Rhonda Holt	Response-00236	The land is greenbelt. It needs to be left that way for wildlife and the environment.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	Robert Mee	Response-01790	My main reason for objecting to these developments is that I do not believe that the criteria set out in the NPPF has been met justifying any encroachment into the Green Belt at this time. The Core Strategy and this Amendment are developed in order to meet the housing targets allocated to the council by central government. I do not believe that the number of houses required by government constitutes, in itself, the ?exceptional circumstances? which are required under the Framework. This is particularly so in view of there being no published objective basis for the numbers allocated to each authority. The term ?exceptional circumstances? does include ?instances where an authority cannot meet its identified need for homes?. The waiting list for social housing in the general area might suggest that this is the case, but I do not accept that these plans will go far to address this issue ? the vast majority of the planned housing allocations are not even for affordable housing, let alone social housing. Additionally, I do not remember seeing evidence that Erewash has specifically quantified local (i.e. Erewash) housing needs. I also do not believe that much, if any, of the Green Belt selected for development would fit the definition of ?Grey Belt?. As a concept, I can support the idea of Grey Belt as originally reported, i.e. pieces of land within the Green Belt which have previously been developed ? indeed, I can think of a few locally, though they are all fairly small. I find the arguments that I have heard over distances between the edge of Derby and the edge of other towns, and how these distances will still be maintained, extremely spurious. The Green Belt in its entirety exists to prevent Nottingham and Derby from merging ? while building on any of these sites does not immediately make the two cities any closer to each other, it does reduce the green space between the two cities, which is precisely what the Green Belt was established to prevent. The Green Belt is a regional initiative, covering two counties and several local authorities. With Erewash having such a high proportion of its land earmarked as Green Belt it is incumbent on the region as a whole to find a solution to the housing shortage, rather than to expect our authority to have to sacrifice its green spaces.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	Robert Mee	Response-01507	My main reason for objecting to these developments is that I do not believe that the criteria set out in the NPPF has been met justifying any encroachment into the Green Belt at this time. The Core Strategy and this Amendment are developed in order to meet the housing targets allocated to the council by central government. I do not believe that the number of houses required by government constitutes, in itself, the ?exceptional circumstances? which are required under the Framework. This is particularly so in view of there being no published objective basis for the numbers allocated to each authority. The term ?exceptional circumstances? does include ?instances where an authority cannot meet its identified need for homes?. The waiting list for social housing in the general area might suggest that this is the case, but I do not accept that these plans will go far to address this issue ? the vast majority of the planned housing allocations are not even for affordable housing, let alone social housing. Additionally, I do not remember seeing evidence that Erewash has specifically quantified local (i.e. Erewash) housing needs. I also do not believe that much, if any, of the Green Belt selected for development would fit the definition of ?Grey Belt?. As a concept, I can support the idea of Grey Belt as originally reported, i.e. pieces of land within the Green Belt which have previously been developed ? indeed, I can think of a few locally, though they are all fairly small. I find the arguments that I have heard over distances between the edge of Derby and the edge of other towns, and how these distances will still be maintained, extremely spurious. The Green Belt in its entirety exists to prevent Nottingham and Derby from merging ? while building on any of these sites does not immediately make the two cities any closer to each other, it does reduce the green space between the two cities, which is precisely what the Green Belt was established to prevent. The Green Belt is a regional initiative, covering two counties and several local authorities. With Erewash having such a high proportion of its land earmarked as Green Belt it is incumbent on the region as a whole to find a solution to the housing shortage, rather than to expect our authority to have to sacrifice its green spaces.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	REDACTED	Response-00178	REDACTED
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	Simon Reeve	Response-01059	The fields between High Lane, West Hallam and Shipley/Heanor Road, Ilkeston support a diverse population of wildlife with open fields, woodlands, marsh land, lakes and streams/rivers. Removing any part of this environment for housing should be banned on this basis alone, there be no home for nature and "not cutting the grass verges" (to save money) won't make a difference.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	Sophy Cunningham	Response-00211	Green belt should be protected at all costs. All other land should be developed without impacting our green areas.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	Teresa Faulkner-Day	Response-00240	Green belt is the communities protected land, it has been given this status to protect it. How then is it allowed to become unprotected just because it suits the powers that be.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Green Belt	Thomas Edward Tyler	Response-01079	As previously mentioned. There is much talk across the whole country about lack of housing and we acknowledge that wholeheartedly. However, if it has to be Green Belt land, then please select areas which will have the least impact upon existing residential areas as well as meeting development requirements. Are there any other proposed areas within the West Hallam area that meet the criteria but have less impact upon existing housing? Better still, are there any other areas locally that would be suitable for development with less impact and erosion of the Green Belt.
			Victoria noble	Response-00107	Building would take away our beautiful countryside
1.10	North of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Alesha Johnson	Response-01122	Local schools and GP surgeries are already under considerable pressure, with limited capacity to absorb a large influx of new residents. No clear or deliverable plan has been provided to show how these essential services will be expanded to meet additional demand. Without this, the development would reduce the quality and accessibility of local education and healthcare for existing residents.
			Alison Bull	Response-00238	Our healthcare facilities are stretched already without adding to their burden
1.10	North of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Anita Lawrence	Response-00660	Services such as childcare and doctors are already unable to meet resident's needs. Addition of more housing within the village will put further strain on these services.
			Asha Haynes	Response-00059	You can't get an appointment now so more residents will add to an already stretched service.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Barbara Graves	Response-01047	Not enough doctors for the current population so dread to think what it will be like if the area grows

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
	North of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Ben Rodney	Response-00121	Can't get appointments as it is now let alone with more people adding to it
1.10	North of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Charles Brooks	Response-00933	The current healthcare facilities in West Hallam are extremely poor and insufficient to cater for the current population. Its extremely difficult to get an appointment to see a GP. Many people go straight to A and E at Derby Royal to be assessed. Even a simple blood test has to be done at Ilkeston.
	North of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Charlotte broughton	Response-01474	Can't get a doctors appointment as it is, never mind with loads of new houses appearing
1.10	North of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Christine Barnes	Response-00639	Doctors already unable to cope with local demand.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Claire Dean	Response-00068	There is already a huge demand for health services in the area and not enough resources to meet those demands, this will only get worse.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Claire Hunter	Response-00709	There is a strain on nearby doctors surgeries and not being able to make appointments as they are overstretched without more people moving to the area
	North of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Danielle Tyler	Response-01121	Already unable to get it at local GP practices, they would not be able to support increase of patients.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	David Whitehead	Response-01051	It is difficult enough to get an appointment at any of the West Hallam surgeries as it is.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	E bayley	Response-00080	Already cannot get appointments at local doctors and dentists
1.10	North of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Ellen Haddon	Response-00065	I am a pharmacist and know the pressures the NHS are currently under. I know this area first hand and doctors appointments are extremely difficult to get resulting in the pharmacy seeing a lot more patients and trying to help as best they can. With the lack of government funding to pharmacies over the past few years there is no money for extra staff and having this increased volume of patients would be unthinkable and unmanageable. People do not realise how on the edge pharmacies are and this would be the final push. The doctors surgeries in the area are extremely small and are not built for the increased demand. We also do not have the money or qualified doctors to increase appointments. This along with the poor bus services to get to other surgeries in Ilkeston makes the situation impossible.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Francesca Dean	Response-00220	What healthcare facilities? We already had to move to ilkeston due to lack of health care in west hallam. This will make it even worse
1.10	North of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Gale Harvey	Response-01130	GPS already very busy with poor capacity to serve local area
1.10	North of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Gillian Bosworth	Response-00920	Local health care facilities are already very stretched.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Helen Patenall	Response-00872	Again, another inadequate service in the village. The surgeries in the Dales often refer patients to Littlewick medical centre which is some 3 miles away, all too frequently the only service provided by the Dales medical centre is a consultation by telephone, this clearly is not satisfactory.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	James Johnson	Response-01124	We live in the village and can see that the health care provider is already overwhelmed. We struggle to get the help we need from the healthcare services available.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Jane Garner	Response-01076	Getting an appointment at the local surgery is hard enough already- so an increase in residents will make it even harder to se a doctor.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Jane Marshall	Response-01171	Difficult to see a health practitioner already.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Jayne Trueman	Response-00427	Healthcare in the area is virtually non existent despite there being two surgeries in the village. I have had to move to a practice in Ilkeston.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Jonie Centro	Response-00729	appts with GP is already hard enough - more residents will increase the pressure on local services
1.10	North of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Jon Skelson	Response-00156	The local GP surgery already struggle to fit in appointments. The last thing we need is more patients.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Julie Harbon	Response-00026	Local health care facilities are already full to capacity and beyond.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Kathryn McCartney	Response-01042	More housing will put pressure on an already over burdened health system, without necessary health care facilities being an integral part of the planning application this developent should not be approved.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	kelly centro	Response-00203	Drs already overcrowded
1.10	North of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Kerry Middleton	Response-00265	An already over used health care system within our area would be compromised by this proposal.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Lee Hunter	Response-00176	Can you even get an appointment already with the doctor?
1.10	North of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Louise Hunt	Response-01033	GP surgery in the village not big enough to accommodate.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Mark	Response-00166	Cannot get a doctors appointment now. There are no dentists for new NHS patients where will all these new patients go?
1.10	North of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Mark Baker	Response-00108	West Hallam surgery is already overcrowded
1.10	North of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Matt Haddon	Response-00098	The local Doctors surgeries are already struggling to cope with demand, with appointments being near impossible to get in the near term, so a significant increase in local population introduced by the proposed site would further exacerbate this already problematic situation. This site would also put a huge additional significant load on the Doctors surgeries, which are already heavily subscribed making it very difficult to get appointments, and would therefore be putting peoples health at risk.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Melanie Lawson	Response-00848	The village facilities are already stretched and building more house will put increased pressure on these facilities. The Drs in the village is already at capacity - so adding houses won't help
1.10	North of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Molly	Response-01071	Already at capacity and very limited availability
1.10	North of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Natalie Payne	Response-01520	It is already difficult to get an appointment with a GP at the surgeries in the village
1.10	North of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Nichola Dodd	Response-00197	Already difficult to get doctors appointments. Infrastructure of the village is not compatible with additional housing
1.10	North of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Nick Craddock	Response-00144	The medical centre is already maxed out. Trying to get an appointment is already a nightmare without adding more people.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Nicola Elkington-Horridge	Response-00082	Our doctors is already under too much strain to open fully this will add to the problem further
1.10	North of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Patrick Barber	Response-00279	The local health care facilities are currently over capacity with waits of over 2 weeks to see a GP in the area and a lack of NHS dentists.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.10	North of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Paula Piggott	Response-01044	Health care facilities are already stretched to maximum point. It's already extremely hard to get an appointment. More residents will make it impossible to get seen by a doctor which obviously could cause life changing consequences.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Pauline Wood	Response-01099	Not enough doctors for amount of people already here in west hallam
1.10	North of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Rhonda Holt	Response-00236	Littlewick, Dales and West Hallam Medical Centre are under pressure already.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Richard Brewell	Response-00193	The healthcare for Stanley Common and West Hallam from The Medical Centre at West Hallam is already extremely poor. There are currently only 1.5 GPs supporting the practice with long wait times for current patients. Littlewick is similarly overcrowded and more local housing will only make this situation worse. Further, the population around the area is typically older generation who will be increasingly demanding of the already limited service.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	REDACTED	Response-00178	REDACTED
1.10	North of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Simon Reeve	Response-01059	The ability to get a doctor's appointment is a bit of a joke, the doctors surgeries are all over prescribed, chemists are too busy trying to pick up the slack and dentists are near impossible to get in to, we travel 40 minutes away to a dentist. There simply cannot be more pressure through new housing on a breaking system
1.10	North of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Sophy Cunningham	Response-00211	It is already almost impossible to access a doctors appointment efficiently in the area.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Teresa Faulkner-Day	Response-00240	The local doctors surgeries, dentists and chemist already massively struggle to meet the needs of the local community.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Tina Jay	Response-01802	The Doctor's surgery/health care at The Dales Shopping Centre is not capable of coping with such a high influx of new patients. Current patients already now need to travel out of the village to Little Wick Medical Centre in Ilkeston and Ilkeston hospital for their appointments as West Hallam Medical Centre is not able to cope with the amount of appointments needed. Patients are also needing to wait far longer now for appointments, with the already increasing number of people in the area, and particularly for more serious conditions requiring the need to see a Doctor, which can involve waiting over a month to be seen.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Healthcare Facilities	Varley	Response-00290	If you can try, don't get sick. What services? Consistently getting messages from the dales that they are closed due to staffing issues and their opening hours are already inhumane.
			Victoria noble	Response-00107	I doctors which is already difficult enough to get an appointment at !
1.10	North of West Hallam	Landscape	Alistair	Response-01139	Destroying the landscape
1.10	North of West Hallam	Landscape	Bruce Broughton	Response-01533	I would reiterate what I said under the 'Green Belt' heading namely that in many ways Park Hall Lane represents the 'gateway' to the countryside from the built-up parts of West Hallam. It is widely used as a recreational route by walkers, runners and cyclists, seven days a week. The proposals suggest only 'emergency' access from Park Hall Lane from the site, with houses presumably backing onto it. However, developing area D would create about 120m of new 'urbanised' frontage to the lane, affecting the area's recreational and rural character. The development of this area would not respect or preserve identified landscape character nor have any positive impact on visual amenity.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Landscape	Charles Brooks	Response-00933	The landscape currently from the proposed development land is spectacular across fields and open spaces. Please leave it like this. There are surely better site in and around West Hallam. why not ask residents for their views instead of Councillors making decisions when i doubt they have even been to West Hallam to see for themselves. The decisions on housing are far to important to be made in Council Chambers. It should also not be a decision based on politics.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Landscape	Claire Dean	Response-00068	It would ruin the landscape end of.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Landscape	Daniel Clark	Response-01091	This will ruin the landscape and the nature around the area
1.10	North of West Hallam	Landscape	Danielle Tyler	Response-01121	New houses would ruin countryside feel. Ruin landscape for local houses. Reduced current property prices.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Landscape	David Whitehead	Response-01051	The site provides a natural break between west Hallam and Mapperley to the north.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Landscape	James Morris	Response-01061	All houses at the top of highland landscapes and view will be ruined
1.10	North of West Hallam	Landscape	Jayne Trueman	Response-00427	The landscape is outside the village boundaries and is green and open . Better smaller sites are available within the village.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Landscape	Jon Skelson	Response-00156	Nobody wants more green areas to go. We need to keep them and allow nature to flourish.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Landscape	Julie Harbon	Response-00026	I'm sure the people living opposite and close to the proposed site will not be pleased to have their lovely views spoiled.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Landscape	Kathryn McCartney	Response-01042	The area is rural and unspoilt the proposed development will destroy a landscape that has been unchanged for a considerable amount of time.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Landscape	kelly centro	Response-00203	It will ruin the landscape
1.10	North of West Hallam	Landscape	Kerry Middleton	Response-00265	The locals do not wish to lose this landscape or their skyline, to be replaced by grey buildings, which would be detrimental to people mental health.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Landscape	laura slater	Response-01540	Obviously countryside is a priority. West Hallam is stunning as it is without ugly new builds being erected everywhere
1.10	North of West Hallam	Landscape	Lee Hunter	Response-00176	These fields depict the beauty of our village
1.10	North of West Hallam	Landscape	Lewis Tyler	Response-01104	Does not fit where every view is a field
1.10	North of West Hallam	Landscape	Mark	Response-00166	runied!
1.10	North of West Hallam	Landscape	Matt Haddon	Response-00098	A new housing estate on the proposed site would be extremely detrimental to the current landscape and would not be in keeping with it.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Landscape	Nick Craddock	Response-00144	Eyesore


PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.10	North of West Hallam	Landscape	Paula Piggott	Response-01044	You can't keep destroying the countryside destroying habitats, killing wildlife and it all not have a knock on effect. You are destroying the air we breathe. We need flowers, we need bees these things the world can't exist without. The wildlife will seriously be impacted. You will destroy the habitats of many animals needed for the world to survive. This is a small village. With lots of precious animals, insects, flowers, trees etc you will kill these insects and animals when you destroy their habitats thus destroying the air we breathe. There is a school and many bungalows with pensioners. It is a accident waiting to happen. Also dog walkers, horse riders and lots of wildlife. Seriously someone will get hurt or worse killed! It is a small village without the capacity for more houses. The roads are not built for so many extra residents. You will totally destroy the area and you will totally destroy the clean air killing lots of wildlife and their habitats in the process. Keep building over land will cause flooding and lead to drainage problems as natural soakaway will be destroyed.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Landscape	Sarah James	Response-01086	Will spoil a beautiful area.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Landscape	Simon Reeve	Response-01059	We have a beautiful landscape, any changes to the natural environment will shatter the beauty of the area, you can't keep adding more and more homes
1.10	North of West Hallam	Landscape	Sophy Cunningham	Response-00211	What is being suggested will dramatically change the area of natural beauty that all of the existing residents enjoy for walks with pets and children. Green space should be protected.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Landscape	Varley	Response-00290	Keep the tree line up, plant more trees for less impact on the area.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Andy Williams	Response-00184	We are continually seeing large numbers of houses being developed on plots that provide minimal space for each property to maximise return on investment to property developers.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Asha Haynes	Response-00059	Far too many for the plot.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Bruce Broughton	Response-01533	The proposal to build around thirty-five houses on this site minimally addresses overall stated housing needs and, in my view, represents a significant, unnecessary intrusion into the Green Belt. A more appropriate option (if new housing is needed here) would be to extend the existing ribbon development on High Lane West, between 13 and 49 High Lane West (albeit currently Green Belt), accommodating about fifteen new houses without the need for wider encroachment into the Green Belt. This would be more in line with the suggestion of 'rounding off' in the Council's Core Strategy Amendment Report (March 2025 update).
1.10	North of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Charles Brooks	Response-00933	No more needed in West Hallam. The current infrastructure cannot cope and is inadequate. Infrastructure improvements must be actioned before new housing is considered (eg GP's, buses, shops, pub, parking)
1.10	North of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Claire Dean	Response-00068	35 homes is a significant amount, it means potentially 35 families which if it means families of 4 that's 140 people, 70 of those potentially using vehicles, footfall increases, noise, it just does not reflect the quiet calm area west hallam is now.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Claire Hunter	Response-00709	Feel concerned about how the houses will positioned in the field that is next to us. How will This look how will this effect us as the house next door. The fields which we once looked over which attracted us to this area could potentially be destroyed and actually would make us want to move like many other residents in the area
1.10	North of West Hallam	Number of Houses	David Whitehead	Response-01051	25 houses on that small field will cause so much upset on a green field site and all over the value of most first time buyers.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Francesca Dean	Response-00220	Far too many. The field always floods, there are mines, petrol station was previously on site.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Gary Hamson	Response-00055	30 is not going to make any positive impact on the VILLAGE!
1.10	North of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Helen Patenall	Response-00872	As previously commented upon, more houses are not required, infrastructure is already at breaking point
1.10	North of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Helen Stanley	Response-01558	Too many houses for such a small area Worrying that the layout would encourage future expansion and further loss of land
1.10	North of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Homewood	Response-01069	Not needed, there are so many other places where affordable housing where there is better transport to main towns
1.10	North of West Hallam	Number of Houses	James Johnson	Response-01124	90 new homes is too much for the infrastructure of the village. If each home then also has two cars this will overwhelm the roads and access to the school.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Jayne Trueman	Response-00427	Smaller developments would be more suitable to this already well stocked area.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Jonie Centro	Response-00729	should be 0 to 2
1.10	North of West Hallam	Number of Houses	kelly centro	Response-00203	Too many houses for the area mentioned
1.10	North of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Kerry Middleton	Response-00265	We do not need any further housing within this area.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Number of Houses	laura slater	Response-01540	This is by far too many houses for all of the above reasons.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Lee Hunter	Response-00176	High Lane West is busy enough already so why add more houses ?
1.10	North of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Lewis Tyler	Response-01104	There are plenty of houses for sale every year in West Hallam
1.10	North of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Mr and Mrs Wood	Response-01825	plus further pressure on local public services, as well as air quality and local wildlife and diversity.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Nick Craddock	Response-00144	Are all these houses necessary?
1.10	North of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Paula Piggott	Response-01044	You can't keep destroying the countryside destroying habitats, killing wildlife and it all not have a knock on effect. You are destroying the air we breathe. We need flowers, we need bees these things the world can't exist without. The wildlife will seriously be impacted. You will destroy the habitats of many animals needed for the world to survive. This is a small village. With lots of precious animals, insects, flowers, trees etc you will kill these insects and animals when you destroy their habitats thus destroying the air we breathe. There is a school and many bungalows with pensioners. It is a accident waiting to happen. Also dog walkers, horse riders and lots of wildlife. Seriously someone will get hurt or worse killed! It is a small village without the capacity for more houses. The roads are not built for so many extra residents. You will totally destroy the area and you will totally destroy the clean air killing lots of wildlife and their habitats in the process. Keep building over land will cause flooding and lead to drainage problems as natural soakaway will be destroyed.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Pauline Wood	Response-01099	Ear marking conservation land for even more houses is a worry for the same reasons given
1.10	North of West Hallam	Number of Houses	REDACTED	Response-00178	REDACTED

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.10	North of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Simon Reeve	Response-01059	Too many
1.10	North of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Sophy Cunningham	Response-00211	The number of houses is very large and will add significant traffic and people needing access to services in the area.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Thomas Edward Tyler	Response-01079	Obviously for any development to be financially viable, it would be necessary to have a minimum number of properties built. We would hope that common sense would apply here in terms of how many are actually considered.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Tina Jay	Response-01802	Both these proposed housing developments would also have a very detrimental impact on the village's identity, and on the Conservation area. This is a village area, which has already expanded greatly over the years with the building of a large housing estate and any further developments of these proposed sizes and in these areas would greatly damage the existing green belt and green open space of this rural village.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Number of Houses	Varley	Response-00290	Scrap the 40% social housing, make 100% beautiful properties and I will vote approve.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Other	Andy Williams	Response-00184	Why are we allowing development of extraordinarily large properties on High Lane & St Wilfred's instead of insisting development of two smaller (but still large) properties. This negating the need for additional groups of housing.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Other	Anita Lawrence	Response-00660	The Labour Party Manifesto 2024 states that 'Labour is committed to preserving the greenbelt which has served England's towns and cities'. Labour was elected on the basis of this manifesto, please leave this area to nature for the benefit of all.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Other	Beverley Dawn Kilby	Response-00235	these area is not part of West Hallam, would have a main road separating it from West Hallam
1.10	North of West Hallam	Other	Charles Brooks	Response-00933	It is clear that little thought has gone into choosing this as a suitable site for additional housing. Please come and visit and see for yourselves.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Other	Claire Dean	Response-00068	I really hope you consider the upset this is causing, it does not seem fair you can come and ruin what is now a lovely area to live in. We have worked tirelessly for year to buy the house in which we currently reside in, to have houses built directly behind us would cause a significant amount of stress and loss in value to our own home. Please carefully consider all of the reasons.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Other	Danielle Tyler	Response-01121	New houses not wanted.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Other	Ellen Haddon	Response-00065	Families have worked and saved hard, many for the NHS and government, to get houses looking over this field. It has been their dream home for their children with the perfect view. These houses will be destroyed and devalued massively. Is this the thanks they get for working and saving hard ?
1.10	North of West Hallam	Other	Gary Hamson	Response-00055	Again has anyone been from planning or the highways dept ??
1.10	North of West Hallam	Other	Hannah	Response-00252	I have no objections to houses but I cannot understand why these places, there are so many negative points and can't see any good points to it! It just seems there is no logical especially as mention empty houses at bottom station road and lots for sale.....
1.10	North of West Hallam	Other	Jayne Trueman	Response-00427	This proposed development will negatively impact an already crowded area. The infrastructure isn't adequate. The congestion in and out of the village is already an issue. The crossroads are accident hotspots and lives have been changed or lost in accidents at them over the years. The car park at the village shops and doctors is inadequate and cars have to wait to park causing congestion through the village. The general condition of the busy main roads is terrible with potholes damaging vehicles.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Other	Kerry Middleton	Response-00265	This proposal would be detrimental to the locals, both mental health wise, and the overall running of day to day services and lifestyles.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Other	Laura	Response-01531	None
1.10	North of West Hallam	Other	Louise williams	Response-01008	We don't need anymore houses, the school is already full, the parking at school times are horrendous and dangerous as it is
1.10	North of West Hallam	Other	Lynsey anderson	Response-01067	I am writing to object to both proposed building sites in Wwst Hallam. Firstly the site behind High lane West, putting houses here is dangerous. Access either directly from High Lane or from Park Hall Lane would cause traffic chaos. Park Hall Lane leads to a blind bend and is mostly single track. This is an accident waiting to happen. The field also floods into the gardens and out onto the road. Houses surely can not be built on a field that floods. I can not comprehend what the field would cost to compulsory purchase as the owner does not want to sell. My house backs onto the field that has been proposed behind High lane West and I did not buy here to be in the middle of building site or housing estate, I bought this house to live near the countryside. I was in attendance at the council meeting in Long Eaton and I found it laughable the reasons that were being given for both sites, apparently £230,000 + houses were going to solve a homeless crisis we have in Erewash. Most of the houses being £400,000 or above just does not make any sense that it would solve anything to do with the homeless issue. This argument was clearly just being used to tug at the heart strings. The only reason the council is so desperate to build houses is you are under threat of having your planning department removed and London making the decisions. This is no reason too destroy green belt, nature and take over our village. With regards to the site off Beech lane there are multiple highway issues here, wherever you would put the access roads again it is an accident waiting to happen and it would cause traffic chaos during rush hr. Both sites have been turned down previously. So what has changed now. The danger to the children at Scargill is also not acceptable, school drop off is already dangerous adding 100+ cars to the scenario is just incomprehensible. The houses would add this many cars as the transport links are minimal and unreliable. Again this would destroy green belt and the environmental issues are numerous. How would the shops cope of Beech lane, the car park already overflows and with no plans for another school, doctors, dentist then where are these new residents supposed to go. Everything adds up to the fact that no one in West Hallam wants this and we do not appreciate the council trying to rush this through and not coming forward correctly sooner with the proposal. If you were at the meeting in Long Eaton I am sure you could tell from the noise and boo's coming from all attendee's that no one wants any of these sites built on. I would hope that mine and all the other objections would be listened to and the council would make the right decision however I am pretty sure that the decision has already been made and no matter what any of us say or think it will not be heard. Please listen and realise you are potentially destroying a community, green belt and causing environmental issues at a time we should be doing the opposite.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.10	North of West Hallam	Other	Mark	Response-00166	Use the grey belt old factories and derelict empty building before ruining the environment for the children of the future. Sell off all the old derbyshire council building around the county or use these building to help people!
1.10	North of West Hallam	Other	Melanie Lawson	Response-00848	The village facilities are already stretched and building more house will put increased pressure on these facilities
1.10	North of West Hallam	Other	Nicola Elkington-Horridge	Response-00082	Whilst I appreciate a need for the council to make money, it needs to find new more innovative ways which do not include building more houses, and ruining the most beautiful and needed parts of the village. Most villages would welcome proper dog walking facilities, allotments more choice of local shops, a coffee shop, a dentist, a community hub ran buy the village for the village. Perhaps the council could look at taking over the punchbowl. This would be a perfect area for a coffee shop/tearooms, meeting rooms for local businesses and groups to hire out, a hub for elderly residents to meet, craft clubs, quizzes, youth work, it could be filled with local artists work, a function room, some small allotments in the old pub gardens which could be rented out, an official car parking area which the council could charge for, the council needs to work with the community and its needs. And as a village we are lacking greatly in community facilities they can be something to everyone and enjoyed by all.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Other	Paula Piggott	Response-01044	You can't keep destroying the countryside destroying habitats, killing wildlife and it all not have a knock on effect. You are destroying the air we breathe. We need flowers, we need bees these things the world can't exist without. The wildlife will seriously be impacted. You will destroy the habitats of many animals needed for the world to survive. This is a small village. With lots of precious animals, insects, flowers, trees etc you will kill these insects and animals when you destroy their habitats thus destroying the air we breathe. There is a school and many bungalows with pensioners. It is a accident waiting to happen. Also dog walkers, horse riders and lots of wildlife. Seriously someone will get hurt or worse killed! It is a small village without the capacity for more houses. The roads are not built for so many extra residents. You will totally destroy the area and you will totally destroy the clean air killing lots of wildlife and their habitats in the process. Keep building over land will cause flooding and lead to drainage problems as natural soakaway will be destroyed.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Other	Peter John Ball	Response-00706	This development completes the village. This could be developed further to the north without merging of urban areas. West Hallam is a popular location and the demand for housing is strong in this area.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Other	P Newton	Response-00773	More houses equals more traffic, just look at what has happened to Heanor road, Ilkeston on any day to see what effect new housing developments have done to increased traffic congestion and poor air quality within those areas.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Other	REDACTED	Response-00178	REDACTED
1.10	North of West Hallam	Other	sam richards	Response-01468	this area has a dangerous blind bend. at the moment traffic is fairly quiet but if new homes are to be built there this will inevitably increase traffic flow causing more risk of accidents. this is a country road used by families walking with young children, and horse riders. it will be a huge shame to change the feel to this area. once a few houses are built it opens it up to the whole area being built on
1.10	North of West Hallam	Other	Simon Reeve	Response-01059	Just stop it, look at the many brownfield sites in Ilkeston, Derby, Stapleford, Long Eaton, Nottingham and regeneration of those sites will deliver the homes without irresponsible damage of natural environment
1.10	North of West Hallam	Other	Thomas Edward Tyler	Response-01079	Finally,thank you for giving me the opportunity to voice my views. I have lived in West Hallam since 1964. Our two children and two grand children have all been born and raised here also. I hold all of the aforementioned issues very close to my heart.I love West Hallam and its surrounding areas and I am clearly deeply concerned that these development plans are given the utmost scrutiny before any decisions are made. Thanks again. Thomas Tyler 7 High Lane West West Hallam
1.10	North of West Hallam	Other	Varley	Response-00290	Affordable housing is a fancy word for social housing. How are the tenants going to be processed? How are you going to keep the locals safe, respected. As a young woman who walks the local green belt with a dog, will I feel safe? Will I feel safe at night? Will I feel safe in my own property. Social housing leads to social problems. Social problems in an area where people graft to work and pay to live in an area of beauty and safety.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Alesha Johnson	Response-01122	This road is enjoyed as a quiet road for local residents to bike with small children. Currently, it feels very safe, but if more houses were to be built on this land, this would quickly become dangerous. This cross road is very badly congested already at peak times of day.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Andrew Gotheridge	Response-00195	Park hall lane is commonly used by horses and pedestrians as a quiet country lane. I cannot see what changes can be made to make the entrance to the proposed site safe for these users. There?s no pavement now and no room to widen the road.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Andy Williams	Response-00184	Frequent near misses due to poor visibility around the Millhouse Garage crossroads. Speed issues on main High Lane add to this.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Anita Lawrence	Response-00660	The proposed site is very close to a blind bend and crossroads (A609/Park Hall Lane/Station Road). This is already a concern for locals and regular users of this junction. The A609 is frequently used by emergency vehicles proceeding at high speed, positioning a further exit at this site, so close to a blind bend and difficult crossroads: a. increases risk of accidents to emergency services b. increases risk to other road users from speeding emergency vehicles, including pedestrians who may cross to use the bus stop, post box, attend school, shops, doctor, play area, community hall etc. c. increases potential delay for emergency vehicles to arrive where needed.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Asha Haynes	Response-00059	The position is very close to a cross road and traffic travels on this blind spot. Any additional traffic will be dangerous.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Ben Rodney	Response-00121	As referenced in traffic
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Beverley Dawn Kilby	Response-00235	brow of a hill, 40 mph speed limit on this section of road

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Bruce Broughton	Response-01533	The crossroads at High Lane West/Station Road/Belper Road/Park Hall Lane are busy throughout the day. The high traffic volume and speed of vehicles on High Lane West and Belper Road (A609), along with restricted visibility to the west, make it a difficult junction to navigate safely. Although official accident records may not show significant issues, minor collisions and near misses occur regularly at this junction, as I have observed living nearby for over forty years. The creation of a new junction serving around thirty-five houses less than 250m east of the existing junction will inevitably aggravate the current situation.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Carly Denham	Response-00291	Junction is dangerous
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Carol Hart	Response-01828	Although for fewer houses from when this site was first considered there is still the major problem of access, the access would be close to the major Millhouse crossroads, the cross roads that had already been highlighted as a problem by Highways, there is also for some reason an emergency access on to Park Hall Lane, why is this needed and also Park Hall Lane is so narrow it is mainly used by walkers and dog users, to even access the A609 from Park Hall Lane is an accident waiting to happen as it is a blind bend to the right from Stanley Common.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Caroline Tew	Response-01021	It is near a very busy crossroads and it is already difficult to cross the road at busy times without additional traffic. I walk my dog every day down Park Hall Lane and it is already busy and at times dangerous to cross High Lane
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Charles Brooks	Response-00933	There are regularly instances of near misses with pedestrians trying to cross the High lane due to the sheer volume and speed of traffic. A new exit and entrance in the High Lane will only make the situation worse. Credit to the Parish Council who have installed two Speed Indicator Devices (SID's) to try to make motorists aware of the speed limit but it appears to have had little effect. There are not continual pavements on both sides of the High Lane. There is no pavement by the proposed new entrance/exit. I understand there is an exit/entrance proposed for the new development for emergency vehicles only on Park Hall Lane. What is the purpose of this? Current exit from park Hall Lane onto the A609 id very difficult and particularly if you want to turn right which is a blind bend. Park Hall Lane is used primarily for walkers and horses. leave our green spaces alone pkease.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Christine Barnes	Response-00639	This site would involve more vehicles using the crossroads at High Lane West and Station Road where visibility is poor. There would also be increased pedestrian useage at this junction from residents accessing the local school, and other village amenities; Tescos, is the only local shop in the area Doctors Pharmacy Village Hall Church
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Christopher Chambers	Response-00169	The proposed development of 35 homes is likely to generate a demand of around 50 vehicles (using the 3 cars per 2 dwelling allowance). I conservatively estimate a 100% increase in traffic in addition to existing usage, and this is likely to be heavily concentrated in the busiest 'rush hour' periods. The junction with High Lane West / Belper Road / Park Hall Lane is very busy and is blind to approach from Stanley Common direction. At night, it is difficult to retain sight of the road due to the positioning of right-turning vehicles into Station Road when arriving at this junction from High Lane West. The junction is not capable of carrying more traffic at busy periods and the lack of suitable pavement at the entry from Stanley Common side, combined with the tendency for the traffic from this direction to 'dip into' Park Hall Lane to 'undertake' vehicles turning right into Station Road can only be perilous for pedestrians and drivers wishing to exit Park Hall Lane. As the development is likely to contain a significant number of children that are likely to fall into the Scargill catchment area, the foot traffic in this area will therefore obviously increase and place a very heavy burden on a junction that is at capacity during peak periods. Park Hall Lane itself is used extensively by walkers, runners, cyclists, and families, and this is especially noticeable at weekends / evenings. There are multiple adjoining fields and livery stables containing horses and the lane is used for group riding, in a relatively safe area due to current limited vehicular use. The advent of up to 50 vehicles entering and exiting the lane is likely to be catastrophic for the wellbeing of those people who will no longer feel safe using this largely traffic free route. The local authority much not ignore that due to the capacity issues with the junction noted above, residents of the proposed development are very much likely to drive through Mapperley village to use the alternative entry to High Lane West at the junction with St Wilfrid's Rd. This is likely to be cause significant disruption to the hamlet as well as place additional burden on said junction, which is a known accident black spot. The addition of dozens of vehicles every day along Park Hall Lane is likely to be economically threatening for the owners and operators of the Park Hall Pods and livery stables and cause irreversible hardship for existing residents and users of the area.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Claire Dean	Response-00068	As previously mentioned the proposed site would significantly increase the traffic congestion. The proposed land is near to the blind bend before park hall lane which changes from 30 to 40mph in which many do speed up so it is an accident waiting to happen, I have first hand witnessed many near misses. More house means more people and vehicles, there isn't any means of crossings, traffic lights or support for those wishing to cross High lane in order to access the local amenities such as shops, schools, doctors etc Road safety should be a priority of the council and not adding danger to what is already a very busy road.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Claire Hunter	Response-00709	My children have to cross this already busy road to get the school bus. It is already very risk without the added traffic of new housing. There is no pedestrian crossing and often people park untangle on Highlane west blocking the view of people trying to cross.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Cory page	Response-01425	Cars travel at speed on this road, we've witnessed near misses and accidents and have only lived here for 7 months.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Daniel Clark	Response-01091	Busy with cars parked everywhere now. Adding potential traffic to a area that has high parking and traffic issues now. Is ridiculous and this will have more people coming in to the village to use the shops and schools.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Danielle Tyler	Response-01121	So damgerous already when trying to cross the road as a pedestrian, increased cars would make this worse.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	David Whitehead	Response-01051	Park hall lane is not suitable for an increase of traffic that this development would result in.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Ellen Haddon	Response-00065	Many children cross at this area of high lane for the school buses. They can be standing for ages as it is and you often see them making foolish runs as they have been there for so long. The extra traffic and pressure on this area would have unthinkable consequences.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Emma Stanley-Smith	Response-01565	Very busy road. Accident waiting to happen

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Francesca Dean	Response-00220	Speed limits are not kept, children cross here, the field already floods onto Highlane
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Gale Harvey	Response-01130	Will need lights coming onto high lane - awful junction
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Gary Hamson	Response-00055	This is a fast road in terms of the cars speeding with no speed cameras although they have been promised in the past and this just is not a safe place for an entrance to a cul de sac
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Gillian Bosworth	Response-00920	High Lane is a very busy road now. Adding a new road exiting onto High Lane adds more danger to those leaving the driveways of existing housing.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Hannah	Response-00252	Station road, crossroads many accidents/extremely busy area especially at peak times. Worry about access to both nursing homes- I know Ambulances already struggle down bagot/newidgate street
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Helen Blackwell	Response-00457	With millhouse junction being busy with limited visibility adding further traffic from both west hallam developments will cause the junction to become dangerous and will increase the number of road traffic accidents.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Helen Patenall	Response-00872	Exit from the proposed site to High lane West is real road safety issue due to the volume of traffic, particularly at busy times
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Helen Stanley	Response-01558	Dangerous junction already More car will try and cross straight over to access the village meaning greaterniak of accident
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Jade Harland-Toomer	Response-00218	The road quality isn't great
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	James Johnson	Response-01124	I fear for children and the elderly in our village. The roads are not adequate for a new housing estate opposite the school.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	James Morris	Response-01061	Accidents will happen just like at the crossroads near the bottle kiln
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Jane Garner	Response-01076	The speed along the A609 around this location is 40. You have a junction at Station Road, parking causing sight issues on the corner of Newdigate outside the Barbers, parking at Millhouse corner also causing sight issues, traffic travelling above 40 up and down the road from Stanley Common once they are out of the 30 zone. To have an extra junction or additional traffic coming out onto the 40 zone would be more dangerous.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Jane Marshall	Response-01171	40 mph speed limit too high. Unless traffic calming and or traffic lights/roundabout put in place it will be a nightmare.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Jayne Trueman	Response-00427	The development is on a crossroads on a blind bend making an already dangerous junction worse. It's difficult to navigate these crossroads for all road uses and pedestrian's. High land and Belper Road are busy roads and traffic speeds are dangerous. There are frequent accidents and near misses.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Jenny Butler	Response-00200	It's already a busy/ difficult junction to pull out of and this will make it worse
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Jessica Starling	Response-00259	High Lane is a busy road and fast so with extra pedestrians I worry about safety
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Jonie Centro	Response-00729	road is already more dangerous with many cars parked on high lane west
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Julie Harbon	Response-00026	Access to a 40mph road used as a main route to Derby and Nottingham, on a blind bend makes no sense at all. Even if access is via Park Hall Lane, it will cause massive congestion particularly around peak times.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Kathryn McCartney	Response-01042	Increasing the levels of traffic to an already busy junction, with no traffic controls in place increases the risk of accidents to both drivers and pedestrians. In addition there is a bus stop near to the junction which increases the risks of accidents.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Keith Atkinson	Response-01048	Access too close to busy major crossroads.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	kelly centro	Response-00203	Dangerous stretch for access and same comments as traffic
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Kerry Middleton	Response-00265	This would ensure that the safety of the residents is compromised.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Laura Egglestone	Response-01500	You cannot see clearly at this area of high lane and believe this will be dangerous.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	laura slater	Response-01540	As above, the bends are hard to see, there are always drivers overtaking especially when waiting for a car to turn onto station road.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Lee Hunter	Response-00176	This will add even more stress to an already busy road
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Lenny	Response-00167	The road is already a speed runway and the cross road is a death trap waiting to happen for motorists and pedestrians alike. The noise and pollution disruption in addition to the dangers should squash this petition. Belper Road already sees too much traffic and congestion at and near the school. Invest in a ring road please instead of houses 
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Lewis Tyler	Response-01104	West Hallam is an old village and roads aren't designed to handle the volume of traffic. Speeding around the village is atrocious.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Linda Webster	Response-00747	I am concerned about a new access onto the A609 so close to Millhouse crossroads and would question why an emergency access/egress is needed into Park Hall Lane. Is it a good idea to access the A609 at Millhouse crossroads with a blind bend from Belper Road?
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Lyndsey Taylor	Response-00250	Too many cars etc will using the main rd to get to the site
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Marie cox	Response-00105	The road is extremely busy already with several dangerous spots the development will add more traffic to an already busy road
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Mark	Response-00166	Busy road bad parking more traffic = disaster
			Mark Baker	Response-00108	The acceptance is on a concealed bend.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Matt Haddon	Response-00098	The crossroads the proposed site is already very dangerous due to the limited visibility of approaching traffic it offers due to the blind bend on Belper Road and rise in the road on High Lane West. There have been some awful collisions in this location and an increase in traffic and new access location will make this far worse and significantly increase the risk of accidents, injury and loss of life. The location would also result in a significantly increased number of children needing to cross the road from the proposed site to access the village, local school and bus stops etc. It is a very difficult and dangerous road to cross and more footfall will increase the risk of a child being knocked down and killed. In addition Park Hall Lane does not have any pavement, so again this would be a significant danger and risk to the increased number of pedestrians the proposed location would introduce. This site is planned very close to the already very busy and dangerous crossroads where High Lane West, Station Road and Park Hall Lane meet, where visibility for vehicles joining High Lane West is very poor due to the blind bend and rise in the road, and this has been the site of a number of serious vehicle collisions. Increased volume of traffic would further exacerbate the issue and increase the likelihood of vehicle collisions, injuries and fatalities. In addition to the the increased risk of vehicle collisions, the risk to pedestrians in the area is greatly increased as there will be an increased number of pedestrians needing to cross this dangerous road as all the local amenities such as the school, play areas, shops, Doctors, Pharmacy takeaways and hair salon/barbers are all in the existing village on the opposite side of the road. This presents a real risk of fatalities to both adults and children. There would also be an increase in pedestrians using Park Hall Lane, which does not have any pavements, and therefore again a significant increase in the risk of pedestrians being knocked down by cars.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Melanie Lawson	Response-00848	The community centre park is used by lots of children and this will cause safety issues
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Mr and Mrs Wood	Response-01825	I am sure others will make points about concerns regarding road safety around the two proposed sites, one directly opposite a primary school and the other near a busy crossroads. Climate change will undoubtedly make us more concerned about the removal of natural flood plains, plus further pressure on local public services, as well as air quality and local wildlife and diversity.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Nichola Dodd	Response-00197	Issues with speeding traffic already and cars now more regularly parking on High Lane West particularly overnight will increase safety problems
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Nick Craddock	Response-00144	Already an area renowned for excessive speeding, so will add to this with more cars in the area.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Nicola Elkington-Horridge	Response-00082	This development is right next to an area where all the children if westhallam play from football and skateboarding to the park and cycling. It will be highly dangerous.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Nigel Wright	Response-00101	Heavy traffic makes crossing the road difficult and dangerous for children who need to cross the road. Cyclists also need to be considered as the government is encouraging alternatives to cars.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Patrick Barber	Response-00279	The proposed exit for the site is onto a 40mph limited highway and is close to the West Hallam Cross roads which is a recorded accident black spot. The sight lines to the West Hallam Cross roads from the proposed junction are inadequate and will add to the safety issues at this location.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Paula Piggott	Response-01044	You can't keep destroying the countryside destroying habitats, killing wildlife and it all not have a knock on effect. You are destroying the air we breathe. We need flowers, we need bees these things the world can't exist without. The wildlife will seriously be impacted. You will destroy the habitats of many animals needed for the world to survive. This is a small village. With lots of precious animals, insects, flowers, trees etc you will kill these insects and animals when you destroy their habitats thus destroying the air we breathe. There is a school and many bungalows with pensioners. It is a accident waiting to happen. Also dog walkers, horse riders and lots of wildlife. Seriously someone will get hurt or worse killed! It is a small village without the capacity for more houses. The roads are not built for so many extra residents. You will totally destroy the area and you will totally destroy the clean air killing lots of wildlife and their habitats in the process. Keep building over land will cause flooding and lead to drainage problems as natural soakaway will be destroyed.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Pauline Lawson	Response-00314	More traffic means more accidents will happen
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Pauline Wood	Response-01099	Already a lot of traffic
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Pete Vanstone	Response-00294	Already too busy.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	P Newton	Response-00773	The current traffic levels on High Lane continue to increase yearly, so with this proposed site additional traffic onto High Lane will lead to potential safety issues at the site entrance to High Lane. The current crossroads at station road onto high lane have become a accident waiting to happen due to the speed and volume of traffic , by having another site entrance onto High lane will only lead to further potential health & safety issues on what is a fast road already.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	R F Smith	Response-00685	The A609 High Lane West is already dangerous for pedestrians wishing to cross in the daytime. Further development is likely to exacerbate the situation. The nearby West Hallam Crossroads at the junction with Park Hall Lane, Station Road and Belper Road is awkward and requires considerable care if collisions are to be avoided. Increased traffic from a nearby development can only worsen the situation. Increased vehicular access and egress onto the main carriageway from the potential site is likely to increase an already difficult situation in relation to road safety. It should be noted that speeding vehicles are a particular problem. Any usage of Park Lane in relation to the site would be entirely unsuitable as this is a minor narrow country lane.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Richard Brewell	Response-00193	As the lane comes to a dangerous, and busy crossroads with an A road, on the rise of a hill and round a corner, leaving Stanley Common, this will present a significant added road hazard.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Richard elks	Response-01422	The road in which I live, High lane west, is extremely busy, vehicles rarely adhering to the speed limit, only this weekend, Saturday the 16th did we have police outside after a road traffic collision. My concerns are that more houses equally means increased footfall, the proposed site regardless of where the entrance and exit may be will mean pulling out onto this busy main road. It's concerning that it's even being considered, safety should come first.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Robert Mee	Response-01790	from a road safety perspective, this is a ludicrous suggestion. Crossing the road near to the High Lane West / Station Road junction is already a dangerous activity. We may not have had any fatalities, but accidents do happen here (my own daughter still has the pins in her legs from 20 years ago to show what this road is like). Any residents in the new development will have to cross the main road in order to get to any facilities in the village (playgrounds, school, shops, doctor?s, etc.) There is no pedestrian crossing, and I notice that there is no requirement for a pedestrian crossing in the notes accompanying this amendment. Indeed, the nearest pedestrian crossings over the A609 are in Ilkeston and at Smalley Crossroads! Having often crossed the junction on a bicycle too, I know that this is even worse. If people are not going to walk into the village, then they will drive, which makes a mockery of any suggestion that this is a sustainable location for development.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Robert Mee	Response-01507	From a road safety perspective, this is a ludicrous suggestion. Crossing the road near to the High Lane West / Station Road junction is already a dangerous activity. We may not have had any fatalities, but accidents do happen here (my own daughter still has the pins in her legs from 20 years ago to show what this road is like). Any residents in the new development will have to cross the main road in order to get to any facilities in the village (playgrounds, school, shops, doctor?s, etc.) There is no pedestrian crossing, and I notice that there is no requirement for a pedestrian crossing in the notes accompanying this amendment. Indeed, the nearest pedestrian crossings over the A609 are in Ilkeston and at Smalley Crossroads! Having often crossed the junction on a bicycle too, I know that this is even worse. If people are not going to walk into the village, then they will drive, which makes a mockery of any suggestion that this is a sustainable location for development.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Sarah James	Response-01086	See congestion comments.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Simon Reeve	Response-01059	The roads simply aren't built for the traffic we already have without adding more homes with more cars; I grew up in West Hallam (High Lane East) in the 80s and there were approximately 1 car for every 3 homes, now there's 6 for every 3. The junctions at Millhouse Garage and the Bottle Kiln have poor visibility and simply aren't suitable for supporting more homes
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Sophy Cunningham	Response-00211	High Lane West is already a busy road and drivers are often speeding even though it is 40mph. Adding further cars to this road is a safety problem.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Teresa Faulkner-Day	Response-00240	Cars regularly speed down this road, it's extremely difficult to get on and off driveways as it is without adding more vehicles coming and going
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Thomas Edward Tyler	Response-01079	Speed of traffic as previously mentioned along here is in our opinion worse now than ever .We have lived here for 21 years .We frequently cross the road at school start and finish times assisting with our grandchildren but would never let them cross here on their own despite them being old enough to do so!
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Tina Jay	Response-01802	This site is also highly unsuitable for housing development, with new access onto the A609 and being so close to the Millhouse crossroads, which is already a very congested and problematic crossroads. This new access would also mean accessing the A609 at the Millhouse crossroads with a blind bend from Belper Road. The proposal for other access/egress from the site via a new access off High Lane West coinciding with the public footpath to the 'Blue Fly' area is also additionally dangerous and problematic.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	tracey knighton	Response-01228	Entry road in area of poor visibility
1.10	North of West Hallam	Road Safety	Victoria noble	Response-00107	Heavy traffic adds to accidents
1.10	North of West Hallam	School Capacity	Alesha Johnson	Response-01122	Local schools and GP surgeries are already under considerable pressure, with limited capacity to absorb a large influx of new residents. No clear or deliverable plan has been provided to show how these essential services will be expanded to meet additional demand. Without this, the development would reduce the quality and accessibility of local education and healthcare for existing residents.
1.10	North of West Hallam	School Capacity	Andy Williams	Response-00184	The local schools & pre-schools are already operating at capacity and increase in the community will further exacerbate the issues
1.10	North of West Hallam	School Capacity	Ben Rodney	Response-00121	Already a busy subscribed area for school places
1.10	North of West Hallam	School Capacity	Charles Brooks	Response-00933	Not an issue here. The school has spare capacity as it was extended a few years ago to cater for the huge demand created by the new estate in the village. When I was Chair of Governors the population of young children exploded. Now the estate is more mature the school population has declined.
1.10	North of West Hallam	School Capacity	Charlotte broughton	Response-01474	School will be over run
1.10	North of West Hallam	School Capacity	Claire Dean	Response-00068	The schools in the local areas would feel a great strain from increased occupancy in the area. We already have very large numbers in the main primary school located in west hallam which may mean those living in the area may have to travel to other nearby schools.
1.10	North of West Hallam	School Capacity	Claire Hunter	Response-00709	The schools will not be able to accomodate the amount of children possibly moving to the area. Senior schools are oversubscribed and places will be hard to find.
1.10	North of West Hallam	School Capacity	Daniel Clark	Response-01091	There is no parking now at the school making it dangerous for drivers and children with cars parked on the narrow roads and your perposal will add to this. There is no way of expanding the school to accommodate more children
1.10	North of West Hallam	School Capacity	Danielle Tyler	Response-01121	Very difficult to get secondary children in at chosen schools as it is without increased number of children.
1.10	North of West Hallam	School Capacity	David Whitehead	Response-01051	West Hallam only has a small capacity for school intake.
1.10	North of West Hallam	School Capacity	Hannah	Response-00252	Interesting one as yes birth rates declining however schools can't recruit , children have more needs no wrap around care for parents and with with proposals seems only so mang be affordable? Empty houses station road brand new
1.10	North of West Hallam	School Capacity	Homewood	Response-01069	Lack of school places traffic increase at drop off and collection
1.10	North of West Hallam	School Capacity	Jayne Trueman	Response-00427	School places are limited in the area.
1.10	North of West Hallam	School Capacity	Jessica Starling	Response-00259	Local Primary School, Scargill is a small village Primary School that will not have the capacity with already stretched funding. Local senior schools are also fairly full
1.10	North of West Hallam	School Capacity	Jonie Centro	Response-00729	local school cannot meet the need

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1-10	North of West Hallam	School Capacity	Kathryn McCartney	Response-01042	All the schools in our area are already under pressure, affordable housing is of course necessary, but likely to be families and therefore increasing the demand for school places at all levels.
1-10	North of West Hallam	School Capacity	Kerry Middleton	Response-00265	The school is up to full capacity and would be compromised by having an influx of further students.
1-10	North of West Hallam	School Capacity	Kristen Hamilton	Response-00208	Schools are struggling with capacity already
1-10	North of West Hallam	School Capacity	laura slater	Response-01540	I am not aware of how much room Scargill school has for new pupils but I do know there is absolutely no room for more school time traffic.
1-10	North of West Hallam	School Capacity	Lee Hunter	Response-00176	Schools are already over subscribed and parents are fighting to get their children already in limited place schools
1-10	North of West Hallam	School Capacity	Lewis Tyler	Response-01104	Would mean more children having to drive to a secondary school
1-10	North of West Hallam	School Capacity	Mark	Response-00166	I imagine the school is fit to bursting already
1-10	North of West Hallam	School Capacity	Matt Haddon	Response-00098	West Hallam is already a very large area for the size of the local school, and the significant increase in number of children the new development would bring to the area would undoubtedly cause this to be overloaded and potentially depriving children of access to their local school. Already very busy and popular school meaning that existing local residents may not be able to secure places for their children at the local school.
1-10	North of West Hallam	School Capacity	Nicola Elkington-Horridge	Response-00082	The school will continue to flourish without extra housing. We already have enough children for the school.
1-10	North of West Hallam	School Capacity	Nigel Wright	Response-00101	Local schools are at near capacity and funding is already inadequate for present schools.
1-10	North of West Hallam	School Capacity	Paula Piggott	Response-01044	There is not the capacity for more residents. There is a small village school but the staff to pupil ratio if stretched anymore will impact the quality of teaching and learning.
1-10	North of West Hallam	School Capacity	Rachael Winfield	Response-01537	Congestion around school is terrible. Cannot drive into west Hallam village at school times
1-10	North of West Hallam	School Capacity	Rhonda Holt	Response-00236	Scargill school is already bursting at the seams with classes of 37. There is NO leeway of more pupils.
1-10	North of West Hallam	School Capacity	REDACTED	Response-00178	REDACTED
1-10	North of West Hallam	School Capacity	Simon Reeve	Response-01059	There simply isn't enough resource for the children already attending school in the area. There hasn't been needed investment and it's only getting worse with needs for investment in SEND taking investment from the mainstream; they cannot cope with the demands already.
1-10	North of West Hallam	School Capacity	Stuart Dobson	Response-01114	The school already has to many students in each class
1-10	North of West Hallam	School Capacity	Varley	Response-00290	Every school is over subscribed. I work in an over subscribed school which puts pressure on staffing, facilities etc.
1-10	North of West Hallam	School Capacity	Victoria noble	Response-00107	1 local primary school in west Hallam so would add pressure on and people not being able to get places even when local
1-10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Alesha Johnson	Response-01122	West Hallam's roads, particularly those leading into and out of the village, are not designed for high volumes of traffic. Additional housing will significantly increase vehicle numbers, leading to congestion, longer journey times, and heightened risks to pedestrians and cyclists, particularly around schools and village centres.
1-10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Alison Bull	Response-00238	Traffic is heavy enough already without adding to it
1-10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Alistair	Response-01139	Busy T junction
1-10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Andrew Gotheridge	Response-00195	The road(park hall lane) is already a dangerous road and the junction will not cope with the increased traffic.
1-10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Andy Williams	Response-00184	This area already has significant traffic volume & frequent control issues around Millhouse garage crossroads with limited vision at the junctions.
1-10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Anita Lawrence	Response-00660	The A609 through West Hallam is already very busy with frequent speeding. Additional traffic on the A609 will also affect residents of Belper Road, Stanley Common, which has frequent problems with speeding traffic.
1-10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Asha Haynes	Response-00059	There isn't capacity for any more traffic on a 40 mile an hour road. The drives already on the road find it difficult enough to get out.
1-10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Barbara Graves	Response-01047	Hard enough to get onto High Lane at peak periods now so would only get worse
1-10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Ben Rodney	Response-00121	All ready a busy road and junction adding more houses will contest area
1-10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Beverley Dawn Kilby	Response-00235	access will need to be carefully managed, it is the brow of a hill and the road speed limit currently is 40mph. could be an accident black spot. increased housing will lead to more cars
1-10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Carly Denham	Response-00291	The road from park hall is single track , already congested. Many horse riders and dog walkers
1-10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Carol Hart	Response-01828	Again the site is quoted as 30 and this is only what you will be responding on but everyone in West Hallam knows that developers want to extend along the rear of High Lane West and again the pressure on the A609 is already a nightmare and again would put major pressure on the two junctions, Millhouse and Mapperley, again we also go back to the local transport which as already stated is practically non-existent and therefore your own transport is needed.
1-10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Caroline Tew	Response-01021	Traffic already backs up onto Station Road at busy times., this development will add to the problems. Turning right out of Station Road is already hazardous as the bend is not good towards Stanley Common. Turning out of the junction from Park Hall Lane is also dangerous, especially at busy times. It is very difficult to cross the road here. Additional traffic at the junction, even if it was further along would add to the problems
1-10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Charles Brooks	Response-00933	The High Lane in West Hallam is already an extremely busy road and the slightest issue can cause congestion and delays. I know this road is busy because i am a member of the village Community Speedwatch Group and it is surprising how many vehicles travel along the High Lane in both directions. Residents living on the High Lane often have difficulty exiting their drives onto the road whether turning left or right. A new entrance and exit on the High Lane will only increase the issues. Whilst the speed limit is 40mph many vehicles exceed this speed as the road is relatively straight.
1-10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Charlotte broughton	Response-01474	Too much traffic already in the village
1-10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Chris Reid	Response-00137	Access road near high lane will cause issues with traffic

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Christopher Chambers	Response-00169	This development will increase traffic congestion at both 4-way cross roads at Stanley Common end and West Hallam (Bottle Kiln) end. Traffic through Mapperley village will increase. The route is heavily used by horse riding schools and any traffic along its entirety will therefore be subject to negotiation of these hazards.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Claire Dean	Response-00068	High lane is already a busy road in which poses a great risk. The site in which your proposing to develop will not only add to the congestion but would also mean those living in the new proposed area would be pulling out onto a road of 40mph in which many do not adhere to the speed limit. Its an accident waiting to happen. Crossing this road on foot is also a huge danger and again adding to this and increasing habitats close by which increases vehicle usage is a threat to life. Not to mention the increased pollution and noise/disturbance from the traffic.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Claire Hunter	Response-00709	The traffic on this road is often congested and cars at times go well above the speed limit. This is a dangerous road without having the added risk of slowing traffic to access the housing. There have been many near misses with people turning right out of station road.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Cory page	Response-01425	The road is busy, I often walk my dog and to cross this road can take 10 to 15 minutes at times.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Daniel Clark	Response-01091	The Village is already busy with poor access at school and busy times. The parking in and around the village is dangerous and congested
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Danielle Tyler	Response-01121	Traffic is already very dangerous, we do not need increased amount of cars. Would be lethal trying to pull out at the crossroads.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	David Harasym	Response-01054	The traffic in a morning is already too heavy for the junction.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	David Whitehead	Response-01051	The development will increase traffic to an already difficult/hazardous crossroads
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	E bayley	Response-00080	Busy crossroads already with bus stops so increasing danger for school children
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Ellen Haddon	Response-00065	This is obviously a main road and extremely busy making pulling out of the junctions from Mapperley very difficult. With increased volume of traffic from the development and the poor vision due to the bend in the road this would be an absolute disaster and death trap.
			Emma Stanley-Smith	Response-01565	Very busy road. Accident waiting to happen!
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Francesca Dean	Response-00220	The junction prior to this field is already very dangerous and unsafe for everyone.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Gale Harvey	Response-01130	Will make an awful junction there !
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Gary Hamson	Response-00055	I have lived on High Lane West since 1988 and witness in a daily basis cars speeding in access of the 40mph limit for this road and to have an entrance on here is lunacy ? has anyone from your planning dept walked up and down this road at any time during the day ??
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Hannah	Response-00252	Crossroads at station road/park lane already black spot, surrounding streets choas parked cars station road accidents regularly, speeding
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Helen Blackwell	Response-00457	Millhouse junction has limited visibility and a busy junction. Housing here will add further congestion. Reducing the speed limit may help.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Helen Patenall	Response-00872	see following comment
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Helen Stanley	Response-01558	This is a busy and dangerous road junction without adding more traffic
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Homewood	Response-01069	Already huge issues with traffic
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Howard marshall	Response-00124	West hallam already congested heavily. This junction hazardous as it is! Leave our green land alone!
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Jade Harland-Toomer	Response-00218	Bad junction with 4 way traffic without adding more traffic
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	James Johnson	Response-01124	The traffic and congestion through the village at peak times is already dangerous .I?m a resident in West Hallam and my daughter attends Scargill School. The roads and infrastructure in the village will not be adequate enough for this many houses to be built opposite the village school.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	James Morris	Response-01061	That area of high lane is already congested
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Jane Garner	Response-01076	Traffic at the junction of station Road, Belper Road, High Lane West and Park Hall Lane is already busy. Any more traffic at this junction or a new junction further along Hugh Lane West would make matters worse.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Jane Marshall	Response-01171	The traffic in the area is already terribly high and getting access onto high lane almost impossible at times.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Jayne Trueman	Response-00427	The area already has an issue with congestion at the two crossroads junctions. This will be worsened by adding to this with further developments. There are long waits to exit the village particularly at work/school commute times.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Jessica Starling	Response-00259	Lots of traffic already in the area at peak times
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Joanne Vickerton	Response-00251	There will be an increase in traffic
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Jonie Centro	Response-00729	numerous objections - traffic conjection being the most prominent
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Jon Skelson	Response-00156	It's already too busy and chaotic around here. The last thing we need is more houses.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Julie Harbon	Response-00026	This will lead to a junction on a blind bend, on a 40mph road. Nonsensical!
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Kathryn McCartney	Response-01042	The crossroads are already busy form three directions, a fourth increase in traffic would create a higher risk of incidents, without the plan to put traffic lights in and safe areas for pedstrians to cross the safety issue is high. In addition the fourth road is narrow and not suitable for a higher level of two way traffic
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	kelly centro	Response-00203	Traffic is already bad . Speeding cars people parking on a 40 mph road at night with no lights Access will be dangerous
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Kerry Middleton	Response-00265	Further traffic congestion added to an already busy village with a huge volume of traffic.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Kristen Hamilton	Response-00208	We have high traffic congestion already we don't need more due to health reasons
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Laura Egglesstone	Response-01500	Access from high lane will be dangerous and park hall lane is too narrow.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	laura slater	Response-01540	It's already busy at the cross roads, there was a collision on 17th May 25. I have seen many a near miss. The traffic is particularly bad during school pic up times. The bend is nearly a blind bend that goes straight to a cross roads. Its also a fast road at 40 mph which is too fast for this type of congestion let alone more.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Lee Hunter	Response-00176	This road is already a race track and safety hazard with speeding cars all hours of the day
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Lewis Tyler	Response-01104	West Hallam is a rat run for the distribution centre on cat and fiddle lane. Traffic queues down station Road.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Louise Hunt	Response-01033	Going to cause a lot of traffic and congestion on an already busy road.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Lyndsey Taylor	Response-00250	Congestion on the roads too busy
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Lynsey anderson	Response-01067	I am writing to object to both proposed building sites in Wwst Hallam. Firstly the site behind High lane West, putting houses here is dangerous. Access either directly from High Lane or from Park Hall Lane would cause traffic chaos. Park Hall Lane leads to a blind bend and is mostly single track. This is an accident waiting to happen. The filed also floods into the gardens and out onto the road. Houses surely can not be built on a field that floods. I can not comprehend what the field would cost to compulsory purchase as the owner does not want to sell. My house backs onto the field that has been proposed behind High lane West and I did not buy here to be in the middle of building site or housing estate, I bought this house to live near the countryside. I was in attendance at the council meeting in Long Eaton and I found it laughable the reasons that were being given for both sites, apparently £230,000 + houses were going to solve a homeless crisis we have In Erewash. Most of the houses being £400,000 or above just does not make any sense that it would solve anything to do with the homeless issue. This argument was clearly just being used to tug at the heart strings. The only reason the council is so desperate to build houses is you are under threat of having your planning department removed and London making the decisions. This is no reason too destroy green belt, nature and take over our village. With regards to the site off Beech lane there are multiple highway issues here, wherever you would put the access roads again it is an accident waiting to happen and it would cause traffic chaos during rush hr. Both sites have been turned down previously. So what has changed now. The danger to the children at Scargill is also not acceptable, school drop off is already dangerous adding 100+ cars to the scenario is just incomprehensible. The houses would add this many cars as the transport links are minimal and unreliable. Again this would destroy green belt and the environmental issues are numerous. How would the shops cope of Beech lane, the car park already overflows and with no plans for another school, doctors, dentist then where are these new residents supposed to go. Everything adds up to the fact that no one in West Hallam wants this and we do not appreciate the council trying to rush this through and not coming forward correctly sooner with the proposal. If you were at the meeting in Long Eaton I am sure you could tell from the noise and boo?s coming from all attendee?s that no one wants any of these sites built on. I would hope that mine and all the other objections would be listened to and the council would make the right decision however I am pretty sure that the decision has already been made and no matter what any of us say or think it will not be heard. Please listen and realise you are potentially destroying a community, green belt and causing environmental issues at a time we should be doing the opposite.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Marie cox	Response-00105	High lane is an accident waiting to happen particularly at morning and evening rush hour With only 2 ways on and off the estate added to the cars in high lane plus 60 plus potential cars situated on the new development it is potentially lethal
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Mark	Response-00166	Access points onto a main road? Or onto park hall lane and then a bust crossroads? What a joke
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Mark Baker	Response-00108	The lane access is already hazardous greater use will only increase this risk.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Matt Haddon	Response-00098	This location is adjacent to an already very busy road and junction, which would become significantly worse if further housing were to be added in the proposed location, particularly so close to this already difficult junction to navigate due to limited visibility of approaching traffic. The proposed site would significantly increase the volume of traffic around the village which is already very congested at times
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Melanie Lawson	Response-00848	The traffic on High Lane West is already an issue and the position of the plot is in a very awkward position being on the brow of a hill. The roads linking these areas in Mapperley, Stanley Common and Stanley are not designed for increased traffic. The position of the development is unsuitable due to closeness to the junction. There will be issues with traffic due to the position of the plot. High Lane West is busy enough without more traffic.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Mia Foulkes	Response-01072	Disruption in the village whilst building will be huge - it?s busy enough already!
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Molly	Response-01071	Parking and traffic are already issues in this area.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Natalie Payne	Response-01520	Getting on to high lane is already difficult without introducing more traffic to the area
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Nichola Dodd	Response-00197	Traffic congestion is already bad getting in and out of the village. This will increase the traffic
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Nick Craddock	Response-00144	Will add more traffic to the area. So chances of congestion
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Nicola Elkington-Horridge	Response-00082	Too much traffic already in this area and the money spent on development should be spent on traffic calming and making good of the residential parking areas westhallam already has which are an eyesore.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Nigel Wright	Response-00101	Further development will increase traffic congestion and air pollution.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Patrick Barber	Response-00279	The development will put further pressure on the current congested local roads system.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Paula Piggott	Response-01044	You can't keep destroying the countryside destroying habitats, killing wildlife and it all not have a knock on effect. You are destroying the air we breathe. This is a small village. There is a school and many bungalows with pensioners. It is a accident waiting to happen. You will be compromising the safety of children. Also dog walkers, horse riders and lots of wildlife. Seriously someone will get hurt or worse killed! It is a small village without the capacity for more houses. The roads are not built for so many extra residents. You will totally destroy the area and you will totally destroy the clean air killing lots of wildlife and their habitats in the process. Keep building over land will cause flooding and lead to drainage problems as natural soakaway will be destroyed.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Pauline Lawson	Response-00314	High Lane is busy enough without more traffic. Vehicles leaving the site to join High Lane will gave great difficulty



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Pauline Wood	Response-01099	Entrance/exit would be on a busy road
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	P Newton	Response-00773	The current traffic levels on High Lane continue to increase yearly, with this proposed site additional traffic onto High Lane will lead to potential safety issues at the site entrance to High Lane.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Rachael Winfield	Response-01537	Already congestion throughout the day. Very difficult to drive past / through west Hallam especially at school times
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	R F Smith	Response-00685	The A609 High Lane West is an extremely busy road.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Rhonda Holt	Response-00236	There is already highly congested roads in the rush hours in West Hallam. The infrastructure is at capacity.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Richard Brewell	Response-00193	The road that it will come out onto is a small lane with a poor visibility junction, along with a busy A road running perpendicular. This A road is already busy in rush hour periods and this will exacerbate the problem.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Richard elks	Response-01422	Traffic is constant. It's a busy road, 40mph rarely adhered to, it's concerning that adding both sites in west hallam means more traffic.
			REDACTED	Response-00178	REDACTED
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Sarah	Response-00075	Roads are already difficult for people to cross
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Sarah James	Response-01086	Current road not suitable for increased traffic. Junction with High Lane treacherous.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Simon Reeve	Response-01059	The roads simply aren't built for the traffic we already have without adding more homes with more cars; I grew up in West Hallam (High Lane East) in the 80s and there were approximately 1 car for every 3 homes, now there's 6 for every 3. The junctions at Millhouse Garage and the Bottle Kiln have poor visibility and simply aren't suitable for supporting more homes
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Sophy Cunningham	Response-00211	High Lane West is already very busy and this will add to the already high traffic flow
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Stuart Dobson	Response-01114	The junction is already too busy and hard to see from that direction the increase in cars would make the issue worse
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Thomas Edward Tyler	Response-01079	Traffic on High Lane West is notoriously busy especially as vehicles approaching from Stanley Common have already entered a 40 mph limit before the crossroads.This means traffic emerging from Station Road heading towards Ilkeston have a tricky job getting out,and need to accelerate to avoid vehicles coming around the bend.There has been a speed indicator device fitted further along near the 'blue fly' entrance.We live opposite to Millhouse Garage and some traffic can be heard accelerating hard at times towards Ilkeston,it sounds almost like a speed test to see how fast they can reach before slowing down at the indicator.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Tina Jay	Response-01802	When these sites have been approached previously, Highways have raised problems at both the junctions of Millhouse and Mapperley Crossroads, as well as those at Beech Lane, Station Road, and the T junction at Cat and Fiddle Lane. It is therefore difficult to understand how these sites could now be considered suitable, when traffic problems have only increased and brought more difficulties. These additional housing developments, and with the high number of houses involved is not suitable for a village location, and would cause a further unacceptable influx of traffic/parking which the village would not be able to cope with.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Varley	Response-00290	The long bend causes people to drive at speed. Locals park their cars on the bend causing near misses. There is always car horns going off due to the long bend.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Traffic Congestion	Victoria noble	Response-00107	Already a lot of heavy traffic
1.10	North of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Charles Brooks	Response-00933	West Hallam is a reasonably affluent community. All properties are privately owned. I would not be against some new housing in West Hallam to appeal to our young people who want to stay in the village and buy a first property but not the location proposed. Totally inappropriate. West Hallam does not need any more large properties in the £300k plus range.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Claire Dean	Response-00068	The character and appearance of the houses on high lane pose great quality and it is a well known road for its up market value homes. People have worked hard to live on a road like this and to build new homes, several to affordable housing would not only reduce the value of these homes people have worked hard to create but the new housing would also have a detrimental effect on the positive reputation high lane holds!
1.10	North of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Claire Hunter	Response-00709	We moved to this affluent area for the peace and beautiful surroundings. We didn't move to the area to be surrounded by affordable housing that potentially could bring residents that could have a negative impact in the area
1.10	North of West Hallam	Type of Housing	David Whitehead	Response-01051	This is not social housing and only for making money for the private developers.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Helen Patenall	Response-00872	Type of housing is irrelevant. Whichever 'type' is proposed is not required and would lead to a drain on already strained local services.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Jayne Trueman	Response-00427	There used to be already a wide range of housing types in the area. Including empty new build properties on station road.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Kerry Middleton	Response-00265	We are not in need of an further housing within this already overpopulated area.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Type of Housing	laura slater	Response-01540	West Hallam is a lovely quiet, close nit community with people that have been here their whole lives or have moved here to avoid such busy neighbourhoods and the centre of town life. The children around here are all able to play out in the community with everyone knowing everyone. It is a safe environment. This will no longer be the case if we have hundreds of new people being placed here
1.10	North of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Lee Hunter	Response-00176	We moved out of an area with affordable housing and anti social behaviour, how is this going to be policed?
1.10	North of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Lewis Tyler	Response-01104	There is no need for affordable housing in this location. People have worked hard and purchased property for the country side views
1.10	North of West Hallam	Type of Housing	M. Morten	Response-00399	The Development should contain a mix of housing, both affordable and smaller open market dwellings so that young people can get onto the housing ladder.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Matt Haddon	Response-00098	A new high volume estate in the proposed location is not in keeping with the current area and would be detrimental to the current rural environment
1.10	North of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Melanie Lawson	Response-00848	I am unsure why there is a need for 40 % affordable housing ?

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.10	North of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Mr and Mrs Wood	Response-01825	And my last point is in regards to the algorithm, if indeed one even exists and I am being too kind that determine the percentage of affordable housing which I have heard could be as high as 4 in every 10 households; this an unprecedented high proportion compared to other nearby developments and it is a question, even though it's an uncomfortable one to ask that needs to be answered.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Nick Craddock	Response-00144	A lot of the housing is not affordable for first time buyers. Also there are so many housing estates being built, who is actually buying these houses? Investors!
1.10	North of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Nicola Elkington-Horridge	Response-00082	We don't want anymore cheap houses ruining the village and then being left empty because in reality people do not agree with the development and the developers are of poor quality as are the houses they have already been built and ruined other areas of the village.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Paula Piggott	Response-01044	You can't keep destroying the countryside destroying habitats, killing wildlife and it all not have a knock on effect. You are destroying the air we breathe. We need flowers, we need bees these things the world can't exist without. The wildlife will seriously be impacted. You will destroy the habitats of many animals needed for the world to survive. This is a small village. With lots of precious animals, insects, flowers, trees etc you will kill these insects and animals when you destroy their habitats thus destroying the air we breathe. There is a school and many bungalows with pensioners. It is a accident waiting to happen. Also dog walkers, horse riders and lots of wildlife. Seriously someone will get hurt or worse killed! It is a small village without the capacity for more houses. The roads are not built for so many extra residents. You will totally destroy the area and you will totally destroy the clean air killing lots of wildlife and their habitats in the process. Keep building over land will cause flooding and lead to drainage problems as natural soakaway will be destroyed.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Pauline Wood	Response-01099	We need affordable homes but how many will be housing association
1.10	North of West Hallam	Type of Housing	P Newton	Response-00773	More bungalows are needed in the village to help current house owners downsize to then provide larger housing for families, we don't need more houses in the village, just more bungalows.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Sarah James	Response-01086	Housing should be meeting the needs of local young people. I suspect these won't.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Simon Reeve	Response-01059	The types of housing isn't touch of a concern, that said all housing developed anywhere in the UK should be legislated to have solar, heat pump etc to ensure self sufficiency as the grid is at breaking point. As are the sewers and refuse collection services that often aren't considered. There needs to be more affordable housing £120k - £280k but not more social housing; more needs to be done for working people on lower wages as they are the group missed out when housing strategy is planned and yet they're working hard and paying taxes
1.10	North of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Thomas Edward Tyler	Response-01079	Our concerns here relate to if the proposed development results in a high proportion of properties which are quickly degraded by residents who simply don't care about how they conduct themselves or maintain their surroundings. If you insist on building on the Green Belt, then the properties must surely reflect this? You have to pay a premium to live in a nice area, West Hallam along with Stanley and Stanley Common have some lovely areas of natural beauty, please don't take these away.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Tracey Knighton	Response-01228	Social housing is required.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Type of Housing	Varley	Response-00290	Social housing = homing individuals who are known to abuse, neglect their property, local surroundings, the public because the property is given to them at a discounted rate or for free. You will turn a prestigious area of living in to homing those who have no pride or respect. There is a lot of beautiful homes on the road. Affordable housing will look visually out of place. There is plenty of brown sites around Ilkeston where affordable housing will be better suited with better local amenities. If you can't afford to live in your own property, surely you struggle to pay bills, pay for a car. North West Hallam is at least 30 mins walk to the nearest shop, doctors and on a very poor bus route.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Alesha Johnson	Response-01122	The area north of West Hallam includes valuable greenfield land that supports a variety of wildlife, including birds, small mammals, and important plant species. Development here would result in the irreversible loss of natural habitats and corridors essential for biodiversity. With increasing awareness of ecological decline and climate challenges, preserving this natural environment should be a planning priority.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Alison Bull	Response-00238	We need to provide more support to our wildlife and taking away an area such as this will be to theirs and our detriment
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Alistair	Response-01139	Building on field, it's a farm land area, don't need horrendous new builds in the area
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Andy Williams	Response-00184	The areas of green belt around this area supports the breeding area for local wildlife including uncommon butterflies (eg Brimstone), Buzzards, Red Kites, Barn Owls and Jays
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Anita Lawrence	Response-00660	Development would have a negative effect on the biodiversity of the proposed and surrounding areas during and after build. Badgers are protected under the 1992 Protection of Badgers Act. There are a number of badger setts on land behind High Lane West/Park Hall Lane, there are regular incidents involving death of badgers near this junction. Development of their habitat increases risk to badgers including road traffic accidents, as they are pushed out of established areas. The latest road death of a badger was reported to Mid Derbyshire Badger Group today (21/04/2025).
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Asha Haynes	Response-00059	The area has significant trees which should be left.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Bruce Broughton	Response-01533	There is notable badger and other wildlife activity in this area. The proposals do not appear to address this, so a thorough investigation should be conducted before any development potential is considered to avoid harm or disruption to protected species.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Carty Denham	Response-00291	This is one of our green spaces. I have noticed a huge amount of wildlife. Badger set, barn owl, foxes, birds of prey

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Caroline Tew	Response-01021	This area is a natural wildlife habitat for butterflies and wild flowers. I walk my dog here and walking in this peaceful environment is good for my mental health. The natural habitat with foxes, badgers and rabbits, plus the rich variety of birds should be conserved and protected for future generations. The area changes with the seasons, it is beautiful in summer with the wildlife meadow. Too much natural habitat is being lost to development when many previous industrial landscapes like Stanton Ironworks could be utilized for housing.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Charles Brooks	Response-00933	As the proposed lane id effectively green belt any building will destroy the current wildlife and the varied biodiversity. When you go for a walk along Park Hall Lane towards Shipley Park the sights and sounds are glorious. I moved to West Hallam to be in the country and the countryside experience starts as soon as you walk onto Park Hall Lane. More often than not you can walk along Park Hall lane, through Mapperley Village and back to West Hallam without seeing or hearing a moving vehicle. In todays pressurised world, this has to be good for human wellbeing.
			Chloe Parkin	Response-00153	Similar to the green spaces comment, destruction of green spaces is not good for local wildlife.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Chris Reid	Response-00137	This is near fields that have wildlife
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Christine Barnes	Response-00639	Home to badgers as can be seen by the entrances to badger setts on Park Hall Lane.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Claire Dean	Response-00068	The area in question has a substantial amount of wildlife, we have often witnessed badgers, foxes, bats not to mention the horses that occupy the field at present. I hope you can appreciate that wildlife is a vital component of this diversity, playing essential roles in maintaining ecological balance. Building on this area would cause a significant biodiversity loss, threatening wildlife populations and ecosystems.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Claire Hunter	Response-00709	Being a resident on high lane west next to this field we see the amount of wildlife there is. Owls, many species of birds, bats, rabbits etc. it's beautiful surroundings by a which will be spoilt by the building of these houses and many animal habitats being destroyed.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Cory page	Response-01425	I enjoy watching the badgers at night, foxes can be found here. Birds nesting in the trees.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Daniel Clark	Response-01091	We live in a village for the views and wildlife and more houses should not be approved to this beautiful area
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Danielle Tyler	Response-01121	Loss of habitat for lots of wildlife in the area
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	David Whitehead	Response-01051	The site is home to a badger sett, and mature hedgerows with a wide range of species supported. Bats also roost in the trees on the site of the proposed development.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	E bayley	Response-00080	Area of natural growth and animals
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Francesca Dean	Response-00220	Badgers, bats, sparrowhawks, rabbits & horses
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Gary Hamson	Response-00055	The field is under water for three months of the year and very possibly a site for newts
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Hannah	Response-00252	The area of beauty, there are brand new houses standing empty at bottom of station road been empty for 2 years plus! If you walk into Mapperley it is always full of wildlife walkers
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Helen Blackwell	Response-00457	This is a field used for horses. You can see where animals have made tracks. Building on greenfield sites will always have a negative impact on wildlife. It is only yesterday we found a dead owl near a building being extended on High Lane West. What other life will be lost?
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Helen Patenall	Response-00872	The proposed area for development is teeming with wildlife, it is currently a field covered in grass with horses grazing. Birds, insects and other wildlife will be lost by developing the area. I walk on a very regular basis past the proposed site and the area is constantly frequented by birds and where would the horses have to be moved to?
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Helen Stanley	Response-01558	This is part of the greenbelt and should not be built on. Loss of habitat in trees and hedgerows
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jade Harland-Toomer	Response-00218	Lots of animals live in this land
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	James Morris	Response-01061	Destroys the wildlife in that area
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jane Garner	Response-01076	I walk in that area - I have seen Hares, birds and other wildlife on the field.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jayne Trueman	Response-00427	The proposed site is a habitat for a wide range of wildlife. Including bats, red kites, barn owls and hawks, frogs and newts. Those fields support these and creatures and the ones required in the food chain.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jessica Starling	Response-00259	Around West Hallam is a habitat for many wild species, with Derbyshire Wildlife Trust land in close proximity to the area.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Joanne Vickerton	Response-00251	There is danger to wildlife
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jonie Centro	Response-00729	building houses - reduces natural space
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Julie Harbon	Response-00026	Reduced air quality is detrimental in a rural area used for farming, camping and people out enjoying the area (it's a popular walking/running/horse riding route) Biodiversity is blooming around Mapperley with it backing on to the reservoir and Shipley Park and this would also be affected by air quality.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Kath Crolla	Response-00070	Every effort should be made to care for the wildlife there.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Kathryn McCartney	Response-01042	Bit by bit the surrounding pasture land is being eroded putting pressure on local wildlife, flora and fauna, development will destroy hedgerows and disrupt local wildlife pushing it into an ever decreasing environment with little chance of any wildlife highways and connectivity.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	kelly centro	Response-00203	This is a site with lots of wildlife and is yet another piece of green land to disappear
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Kerry Middleton	Response-00265	This would be detrimental to the wonderful wildlife within the vicinity.
			Kristen Hamilton	Response-00208	This will affect local wildlife
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Laura Slater	Response-01540	I am a nature photographer and I see so much wildlife around Park Hall Lane and also the walk through the fields. I have seen many badgers, rabbits and a lot of birds of prey. This area is so green and the wildlife is just stunning. This new build will obviously kill a lot of wildlife and destroy their habitat
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Lee Hunter	Response-00176	We have mice, bats, rabbits, owls, foxes and even ducks all visiting the field next to our family home

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Lewis Tyler	Response-01104	The land is green belt. Houses will be an eye sore
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Lyndsey Taylor	Response-00250	Losing wildlife in that area
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Marie cox	Response-00105	There is an active badger set on the site as well as the wildlife What will happen to the badgers I thought they were protected
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mark	Response-00166	hedges trees and meadow destroyed = no wildlife Owls rabbits hares etc all gone. Can you live with that? do you want to ruin the world
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Matt Haddon	Response-00098	The proposed site is currently used for horses, and there is significant wildlife that is often seen in the field such as rabbits, birds, butterflies, bees, and also birds of prey can often be seen sitting on the fences at the proposed site. This would be decimated by building on the proposed new site.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Melanie Johnson	Response-01134	I have lived here for 45 years these areas are essential for wildlife kid exploring dog walking the road is always congested and the area needs protection for social well-being
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Melanie Lawson	Response-00848	The area is a natural area and should be left like this. There are badgers in the land and it is my understanding that they are protected
			Mia Foulkes	Response-01072	We live close by and back on to the green belt land and the birds/wildlife are amazing! I worry this will disrupt them.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Molly	Response-01071	Loss of fields and natural habitat for wildlife.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Natalie Jones	Response-00249	Too much wildlife will be destroyed and displaced
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Natalie Payne	Response-01520	The building of new houses will surely affect the wildlife in the area . We are blessed to have a diverse amount of wildlife that habits this area
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Nick Craddock	Response-00144	Will take away wild habitats for flora and fauna. Wildlife will threatened as well.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Nicola Elkington-Horridge	Response-00082	This is a beautiful dog walking and mush needed green space, it's full of birds bees and insects and just be left alone. The council could try planting wild flowers here to encourage wildlife instead!
			Nigel Wright	Response-00101	The field is home to rabbits, used by Woodpeckers, and migratory birds.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Patrick Barber	Response-00279	The proposed site has a badger set in its vicinity and is used by badgers, plus a range of other protected species including buzzards, hares and stouts. The development will remove these species habitat. The proposed development site has a number of TPO's on it and a protected hedge would have to be destroyed to allow the entrance to the proposed development.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Paula Piggott	Response-01044	You can't keep destroying the countryside destroying habitats, killing wildlife and it all not have a knock on effect. You are destroying the air we breathe. We need flowers, we need bees these things the world can't exist without. The wildlife will seriously be impacted. You will destroy the habitats of many animals needed for the world to survive. This is a small village. With lots of precious animals, insects, flowers, trees etc you will kill these insects and animals when you destroy their habitats thus destroying the air we breathe. There is a school and many bungalows with pensioners. It is an accident waiting to happen. Also dog walkers, horse riders and lots of wildlife. Seriously someone will get hurt or worse killed! It is a small village without the capacity for more houses. The roads are not built for so many extra residents. You will totally destroy the area and you will totally destroy the clean air killing lots of wildlife and their habitats in the process. Keep building over land will cause flooding and lead to drainage problems as natural soakaway will be destroyed.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Pauline Lawson	Response-00314	Any loss of land to housing will adversely harm the wildlife. Hares rabbit and numerous birds can be found in this field. Insects pollinators will be affected which will give a knock on effect to any crops grown whether commercially or just in our garden's.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Pauline Wood	Response-01099	I thought we were all supposed to be conserving nature
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Richard Elks	Response-01422	Both badgers and foxes are frequently seen on this proposed site.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	REDACTED	Response-00178	REDACTED
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Simon Reeve	Response-01059	The fields between High Lane, West Hallam and Shipley/Heanor Road, Ilkeston support a diverse population of wildlife with open fields, woodlands, marsh land, lakes and streams/rivers. Removing any part of this environment for housing should be banned on this basis alone, there be no home for nature and "not cutting the grass verges" (to save money) won't make a difference.
			Sophy Cunningham	Response-00211	We need to maintain the green areas we have around the village to protect the diverse wildlife we have in the area.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Teresa Faulkner-Day	Response-00240	We all pay a lot of money in council tax and rent/the price of property to live in the countryside. The rural walks are fantastic for locals mental health. There is a wealth of nature/habitat for wildlife that will be completely destroyed and lost forever if the area is to be concreted over. Not to mention the risk of flooding.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Thomas Edward Tyler	Response-01079	The area to the rear of our property currently supports any wildlife and biodiversity that can and should be allowed to flourish on what is after all designated as Green Belt. There are also horses on this and adjoining areas which would without doubt be displaced should the development proceed.
1.10	North of West Hallam	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Victoria Noble	Response-00107	West Hallam is a haven of wildlife
1.11	North of Borrowash	Air Quality	Anita Gorman	Response-01245	Pollution of all the extra cars
1.11	North of Borrowash	Air Quality	Ann Daykin	Response-01443	The increase in the number of cars will affect the air quality around this area.. This will cause more pollution
1.11	North of Borrowash	Air Quality	Ashley Stafford	Response-01135	More vehicles is always going to lower the air quality.
1.11	North of Borrowash	Air Quality	David Tyler	Response-00836	The proposed site is very close to the A52. Air and noise pollution must be an issue
1.11	North of Borrowash	Air Quality	Helen Shaw	Response-00521	The houses are going to be very close to the A52 so air quality will be poor!
1.11	North of Borrowash	Air Quality	Kirsty Murray	Response-01004	Houses this close to this road will be breathing horrible air
1.11	North of Borrowash	Air Quality	Laura Mellott-Batty	Response-00517	Increased car use due to unnecessary housing will impact air quality
1.11	North of Borrowash	Air Quality	Mr Paul Rigby	Response-00880	With all the extra traffic from this site and the other site at the other end of the village the carbon emissions will be much increased and a danger to the environment and those who suffer with asthma
			Mrs Sheila Hardington	Response-01233	The Air Quality for people in the proposed new houses will be poor with being so close to the busy A52.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.11	North of Borrowash	Air Quality	Mr Timothy Shepherd	Response-01336	Air quality so close to the A52 will not be good for the new residents.
1.11	North of Borrowash	Air Quality	PETER HINKLEY	Response-00776	Borrowash has the A52 Corridor running parallel to the A6005, the rat runs in all directions it seems to me. We need the greenbelt more than ever.
1.11	North of Borrowash	Air Quality	Phil self	Response-00758	These houses will be next to the A52 where noise and pollution will be a major factor
1.11	North of Borrowash	Air Quality	Susan Johnstone	Response-00174	Building on this land will affect the air quality of the residents of the neighbouring houses. 1. From contaminates in the land itself. 2. From the dust that the building work will create. 3. From the increased emissions from the increased traffic.
1.11	North of Borrowash	Air Quality	Tanya caldbeck	Response-00918	More traffic and household fumes
1.11	North of Borrowash	Bus Services	Ashley Stafford	Response-01135	Again, capacity will be stretch. More buses will be needed, again creating more traffic
1.11	North of Borrowash	Bus Services	Mr Paul Rigby	Response-00880	All these extra houses from both proposed sites in the village will put pressure on our limited bus service
1.11	North of Borrowash	Bus Services	Mr Timothy Shepherd	Response-01336	These houses will be a long walk away from local bus services.
1.11	North of Borrowash	Bus Services	Sarah Cresswell	Response-01208	The i4 which stops at the bottom of Cole Lane has a 20 mins service to Derby & Nottingham. The local 9a service between Borrowash and Derby stops on Priorway Avenue close to the footpath running through the proposed site.
1.11	North of Borrowash	Flooding / Drainage	Ann Daykin	Response-01443	The development would put extra pressure on the drainage of this area. At the moment the Ock brook does flood areas of Borrowash and this development will just add even more pressure to a system that's already struggling.
1.11	North of Borrowash	Flooding / Drainage	Chris Archer	Response-01141	This area of Borrowash has historically had issues with flooding and water drain off, by removing this green land it will only contribute to worsen the issue
1.11	North of Borrowash	Flooding / Drainage	David Tyler	Response-00836	This land provides drainage for the A52, as does the adjoining lands
1.11	North of Borrowash	Flooding / Drainage	Denis Woodcock	Response-00930	Flooding will increase, Borrowash has problems now it will not cope with the extra capacity,
1.11	North of Borrowash	Flooding / Drainage	Geoff Whittaker	Response-01806	There appears to be no mention of surface water attenuation for these sites. The will contribute to the flow going into the Derwent which already floods several times a year. They will add to the flow initially in the two brooks. The Ockbrook already is close to causing flooding to properties lower down its cause and has flooded housing on Kimberley Drive once the past years. the other brook also appears in a poor state of repair and lacks maintenance.
1.11	North of Borrowash	Flooding / Drainage	Helen Shaw	Response-00521	The A52 gets a lot of surface water from the nearby fields especially on the other side going towards Nottingham. Many cars get caught out and aqua plane with many a nasty accident (landing in the boundary hedges). So if houses are built the water will have to go somewhere and that somewhere will be the road surface which will result in more accidents as motorists don't slow down in bad conditions.
1.11	North of Borrowash	Flooding / Drainage	Ian Frearson	Response-00719	Any development of this nature should have a restricted drainage run off based on a maximum impermeability factor of 0.5% of the development area to take into account dramatic change in uses and the capacity of downstream sites. it is considered that this would be very difficult to achieve so render the development proposal unviable. Discharges from this site would put additional pressure on the already stretched land bordering the current main river site of the Ock Brook. Current flooding events from the Ock already threaten existing residential homes in the area.
1.11	North of Borrowash	Flooding / Drainage	Kirsty murray	Response-01004	Where do you think all the water will go when this country is just houses and concrete, stop building and allow natural drainage
1.11	North of Borrowash	Flooding / Drainage	Laura Mellott-Batty	Response-00517	Houses will impact drainage currently completed by field
1.11	North of Borrowash	Flooding / Drainage	Maria Fowkes	Response-00455	I'm deeply concerned about flooding in the village. In recent years we have seen flooding in areas never seen before. There needs to be areas of green to allow drainage of elrain water. Concreting over this area could lead to further flooding on the roads and housing.
1.11	North of Borrowash	Flooding / Drainage	PETER HINKLEY	Response-00776	This area is liable to flooding and I have seen plenty of water running on to the A6005
1.11	North of Borrowash	Flooding / Drainage	Phil self	Response-00758	The brook nearly flooded a few years ago when the torrential rains came and building more houses will not help the situation when this happens again
1.11	North of Borrowash	Flooding / Drainage	Sarah Davies	Response-01136	Flooding is a big problem in the area, damage to properties every year due to bad drainage, poor upkeep of drains and sewer system.
1.11	North of Borrowash	Flooding / Drainage	Sheralyn Pattison	Response-01250	There are already flooding and drainage issues in the lower parts of the village, this will only increase
1.11	North of Borrowash	Flooding / Drainage	Tanya caldbeck	Response-00918	Estates already flooding due to drainage issues
1.11	North of Borrowash	Green Belt	Anita Gorman	Response-01245	All green belt will be decimated and wildlife on the decline
1.11	North of Borrowash	Green Belt	Ann Daykin	Response-01443	Borrowash and Ockbrook have always had areas of green around the village which has provided the residents with areas of green belt and has helped with the mental wellbeing of the residents. The pressure of more housing will add extra stress to the locals who live on the current housing estate, which will be closest to the development. This development will be detrimental to the mental health and wellbeing of the current residents who are a low socioeconomic group.
1.11	North of Borrowash	Green Belt	Ashley Stafford	Response-01135	We must protect the green belt. Far too often this land is being given up for housing.
1.11	North of Borrowash	Green Belt	Helen Shaw	Response-00521	Green belt should never be built on when there are plenty of brown field sites which could be used instead. Once it's gone it's gone forever!
1.11	North of Borrowash	Green Belt	Ian Frearson	Response-00719	This proposal would naturally affect the local and surrounding Green Belt and potentially affect any Red Book species present

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.11	North of Borrowash	Green Belt	John Malcolm Kerr	Response-00254	I am Hon Sec of Erewash Valley Model Engineering Society. On behalf of the Society I am registering our opposition to the re-designation of our site, immediately to the west of the Ockbrook, as "safeguarded" land, liable for use as building land in the future. Our facilities have been developed over decades of membership participation and to have that hard work and dedication destroyed would be heartbreaking to many of our members. To have to re-locate, if any suitable land was available and not already designated for development, and start again from scratch would be an enormous task. Our membership profile is mature in age and the physical work on re-erecting our existing on-site facilities would be beyond our limited capabilities. What is the point of evicting existing occupants (and this also applies to the tenants of the allotments next to our site) and building over already developed and fully utilised land when other sites with only grazing animals are available? If any of the land between the Ockbrook and Victoria Avenue was only grassland or brownfield then you might have a better argument for re-designation but the current proposal doesn't take into consideration the already highly developed nature of this area. Are you fully aware of the nature of the facilities already extant on this site? If you need any further information about our activities and facilities we would welcome you to visit the site so you would get a full appreciation of the Society and its membership profile.
1.11	North of Borrowash	Green Belt	Kirsty murray	Response-01004	We can't keep building on green spaces it is not sustainable
1.11	North of Borrowash	Green Belt	Laura Mellott-Batty	Response-00517	Building on green belt land- unnecessary
1.11	North of Borrowash	Green Belt	Lesley Eccles	Response-00812	Should not be built on green belt
1.11	North of Borrowash	Green Belt	Lynda Gamble	Response-00909	When Green Belt land is gone then that's it forever. There are so many empty houses and disused buildings around the local areas that it would make far more sense to renovate those first. Recycling and reusing what is currently available extends to everything, not just household waste!
1.11	North of Borrowash	Green Belt	Marcus Smith	Response-00310	Green belt already been build on adjacent by redefining farmland grey belt
1.11	North of Borrowash	Green Belt	Margaret Irene Wheatley	Response-00913	It is worrying that these developments will have an impact on the Green Belt which is important on safe guarding communities.
1.11	North of Borrowash	Green Belt	Mr Timothy Shepherd	Response-01336	Green Belt land should be protected and preserve. Brown Belt land should always be used in preference wherever it is available.
1.11	North of Borrowash	Green Belt	Peter John Ball	Response-00704	The site is an important separation between Borrowash and Ockbrook. The western end of the site is currently allotment gardens which are in short supply in the Parish of Ockbrook and Borrowash. The Parish Council has always a waiting list for allotments in the village and while this land is owned by the church the gardens provide an important addition to the availability of allotment land in the Parish.
1.11	North of Borrowash	Green Belt	Robert Mee	Response-01788	My main reason for objecting to these developments is that I do not believe that the criteria set out in the NPPF has been met justifying any encroachment into the Green Belt at this time. The Core Strategy and this Amendment are developed in order to meet the housing targets allocated to the council by central government. I do not believe that the number of houses required by government constitutes, in itself, the 'exceptional circumstances' which are required under the Framework. This is particularly so in view of there being no published objective basis for the numbers allocated to each authority. The term 'exceptional circumstances' does include 'instances where an authority cannot meet its identified need for homes'. The waiting list for social housing in the general area might suggest that this is the case, but I do not accept that these plans will go far to address this issue. The vast majority of the planned housing allocations are not even for affordable housing, let alone social housing. Additionally, I do not remember seeing evidence that Erewash has specifically quantified local (i.e. Erewash) housing needs. I also do not believe that much, if any, of the Green Belt selected for development would fit the definition of 'Grey Belt'. As a concept, I can support the idea of Grey Belt as originally reported, i.e. pieces of land within the Green Belt which have previously been developed. Indeed, I can think of a few locally, though they are all fairly small. I find the arguments that I have heard over distances between the edge of Derby and the edge of other towns, and how these distances will still be maintained, extremely spurious. The Green Belt in its entirety exists to prevent Nottingham and Derby from merging. While building on any of these sites does not immediately make the two cities any closer to each other, it does reduce the green space between the two cities, which is precisely what the Green Belt was established to prevent. The Green Belt is a regional initiative, covering two counties and several local authorities. With Erewash having such a high proportion of its land earmarked as Green Belt it is incumbent on the region as a whole to find a solution to the housing shortage, rather than to expect our authority to have to sacrifice its green spaces.
1.11	North of Borrowash	Green Belt	Susan Johnstone	Response-00174	Every piece of green land is important for our wildlife and biodiversity, not to mention our mental health. Build houses on brown land and protect the beautiful green spaces for the wildlife that enriches our lives.
1.11	North of Borrowash	Green Belt	Tanya caldbeck	Response-00918	Should not build on greenbelt and change policy to suit yourselves
1.11	North of Borrowash	Healthcare Facilities	Anita Gorman	Response-01245	Can not see a doctor easily now. Even with the promise of extra surgeries where will the GP's come from
1.11	North of Borrowash	Healthcare Facilities	Ann Daykin	Response-01443	Borrowash has two doctor surgeries and one dentist. All these facilities are oversubscribed and could not support the extra residents that this development would bring.
1.11	North of Borrowash	Healthcare Facilities	Ashley Stafford	Response-01135	I personally have to visit a Drs outside of our parish to get an appointment already. I also have to go to a private dentist on the other side of Derby because of the same reason.
1.11	North of Borrowash	Healthcare Facilities	Catherine Fox Charlton	Response-00658	Borrowash has difficulty servicing medical appointments for current residents and the one pharmacy has very little stock available.
1.11	North of Borrowash	Healthcare Facilities	Denis Woodcock	Response-00930	Our healthcare facilities are poor now additional capacity is the last thing we need.
1.11	North of Borrowash	Healthcare Facilities	Helen Shaw	Response-00521	Building more houses without the infrastructure such as doctors and dentists is madness!
1.11	North of Borrowash	Healthcare Facilities	Ian Frearson	Response-00719	This proposal would put increased pressure on the already stretched facilities available.
1.11	North of Borrowash	Healthcare Facilities	Joanne briggs	Response-01251	It's almost impossible to get a doctor's appointment now without having another 120 plus people!
1.11	North of Borrowash	Healthcare Facilities	Joy Cordwell	Response-01292	Both surgeries are oversubscribed and exhausted resources. We cannot cater for more houses! It is already near impossible to get a doctor appointment

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Kirsty murray	Response-01004	It's already impossible to get an appointment at the doctors already
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Laura Mellott-Batty	Response-00517	Healthcare facilities already under massive strain, impossible to get GP appointment as it is. Where is the proposal for increasing support services
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Lesley Eccles	Response-00812	Doctors full to capacity Already severe problems getting appointments This will certainly add to the problems
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Margaret Irene Wheatley	Response-00913	Both of the Doctors' Surgeries appear to not have any spare capacity at the moment, based on the difficulty in getting an appointment
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Mr Paul Rigby	Response-00880	Our GP? s are already overloaded and difficult to get appointments. Extra patients will not help
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Mrs Sheila Hardington	Response-01233	Extra patients for what seems to already be an overloaded system.
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Mr Timothy Shepherd	Response-01336	Local doctors and dentists are already under strain and would be unable to cope with additional patients.
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Mr W Barton	Response-00892	The proposal would put a significant strain on our existing Health care facilities which are already over stretched.
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Pamela Bloor	Response-00777	It is already difficult to get appointments at the local doctors surgeries , the influx of more households would exuberate this
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	PETER HINKLEY	Response-00776	Existing GP Services will come under additional strain I assume - I do not have any numbers.
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Peter Howell	Response-00830	no new doctors surgery
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Phil self	Response-00758	Doctors and dentist will be over run as in many other areas ruining it for future generations
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Sarah Davies	Response-01136	I understand demand for the NHS and services are high everywhere but it?s almost impossible to gain an appointment at the local surgeries. This would be unimaginable if we then had hundreds more new patients. The local pharmacy will also be impacted yes, at present there?s normally a 20/30 minute wait for a prescription, often the stock isn?t available due to demand so a wait of a day or two is often expected. No room in the dentist for NHS patients, this has been the case for years.
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Sheralyn Pattison	Response-01250	It is already a nightmare getting appointments at both surgeries - any increase in houses will put even more pressure on to services
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Susan Johnstone	Response-00174	We already struggle to get Doctors appointments in Borrowwash, I have had to wait 2 weeks for my appointment, the surgery?s can?t cope with an influx of new patients. The NHS dentist in the village retires in June and they don?t have a replacement yet, they are at full capacity for NHS patients.
			Tanya caldbeck	Response-00918	No GP place - under pressure
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Landscape	Ashley Stafford	Response-01135	When housing is built it undoubtedly has an impact on the landscape. We need to keep large green spaces.
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Landscape	Mr Timothy Shepherd	Response-01336	The open landscape should be preserved wherever possible for the health of all residents.
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Landscape	Sarah Davies	Response-01136	It will change the make up of the village, it will no longer be a village, it will combine spondon with Borrowwash
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Landscape	Susan Johnstone	Response-00174	This isn?t a muddy brown field, it?s a beautiful green, full of life field that enriches the lives of local residents.
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Ashley Stafford	Response-01135	Too many house in one small area
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Denis Woodcock	Response-00930	Borrowwash has a good amount of green spaces, when these are gone they?re gone forever. Our open spaces should be protected for everyone to benefit. Borrowwash will loose one of its main assets and become another urban sprawl.
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Kirsty murray	Response-01004	Too many
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Mark Burrow	Response-00656	Too many houses to a nice quiet village. Strongly disagree with this project.
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Mr Paul Rigby	Response-00880	A lot of houses proposed for a small area
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Mr Timothy Shepherd	Response-01336	The capacity and capability of the local schools, doctors and dentists should be used as a limit with regard to building additional housing. Too many new houses will be detrimental to all residents.
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Phil self	Response-00758	Why cram so many houses in to a relatively small area, makes no sense
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Susan Johnstone	Response-00174	60 new houses is too many and it won?t stop there as the rest of the field is safe guarded for further development, it will end up with hundreds of houses, Borrowwash is a village that?s being turned into a town but without the infrastructure.
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Other	David Tyler	Response-00836	The council should be looking at all the empty properties across Erewash borough and bring them back into occupancy. Possibly look at council/housing association properties with 2 or more bedrooms with a single person living there and offer an alternative 1 bedroom property to free up a larger property. Offer some kind of incentive, lower rent or something.
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Other	Denis Woodcock	Response-00930	Over the years there has been too much infilling and it seems to be a policy to keep on doing this. People need space, cramming houses in any space will always be counterproductive. Have you not learned from previous mistakes. The character of our village destroyed.
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Other	Gary Mortimer	Response-01147	The quality of life for inhabitants of this development will be very poor as the houses are immediately adjacent to the A52 dual carriageway
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Other	Iain Pendry	Response-01185	I am in favour of these proposals. Borrowwash and Ockbrook desperately need additional housing stock to enable young people and young families to be able to afford their first homes. I hope that the council find some way to; a. Ensure that a substantial number of houses are deemed affordable, smaller homes in order to address this need, and that b. Some kind of provision is made that housing is preferentially offered to local people.
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Other	Margaret Irene Wheatley	Response-00913	This area is already going to be affected by the current National Grid Upgrade without having the effects of development to contend with.
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Other	Peter John Ball	Response-00704	The western end of the site is currently allotment gardens which are in short supply in the Parish of Ockbrook and Borrowwash. The Parish Council has always a waiting list for allotments in the village and while this land is owned by the church the gardens provide an important addition to the availability of allotment land in the Parish.
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Other	Philip Archer	Response-01391	Whilst I?m not in favour of building in the green belt, if it is accepted that housing needs to be provided somewhere then this seems logical infilling.
		Road Safety	Anita Gorman	Response-01245	Speed is 40 miles per hour, incline and bend to the road is not good access

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.11	North of Borrowash	Road Safety	Ann Daykin	Response-01443	The proposed development will affect the roads around the site. Those roads are important routes, especially the A52, Cole Lane and Nottingham Road, Borrowash. The concern is that the increased traffic will cause safety issues through the increase in the number of cars pulling onto/off these major routes through Borrowash.
1.11	North of Borrowash	Road Safety	Ashley Stafford	Response-01135	The increased amount of vehicles undoubtedly raises the local risk of serious accidents. Especially when entering the A52 or heading towards Elvaston castle via station road. Station road is highly congested at times already and I have witnessed multiple RTCs in the area with the current capacity.
1.11	North of Borrowash	Road Safety	David Tyler	Response-00836	Is the access off Cole lane ? If so it will be very close to the A52 Junction
1.11	North of Borrowash	Road Safety	Geoff Whittaker	Response-01806	There is talk about the need for suitable and safe routes for pedestrians and cyclists, but no account is taken about the amount of work that will be needed to meet this requirement or the significant costs this will incur. This could involve work by Derby City Council on its network.
1.11	North of Borrowash	Road Safety	Helen Shaw	Response-00521	The actual junction off the A52 is a nightmare. Even though you indicate to say you're pulling off cars behind you don't slow down which in turn if there are cars wanting to turn right into the new houses (when built) could mean accidents as you're having to maintain your fast speed to get off the A52 so no one runs into the back of you. If there is a vehicle waiting it's going to be very dangerous. Likewise joining the A52 from Cole Lane is also dangerous and the more cars the more people will pull out when not safe to do so resulting in more accidents. It is an accident black spot! The entrance is also too close to the footbridge and the A52.
1.11	North of Borrowash	Road Safety	Ian Frearson	Response-00719	previous comments on the safety of the unacceptable proposal should be noted and repeated here.
1.11	North of Borrowash	Road Safety	Joy Cordwell	Response-01292	Cole Lane already has its share of boy racers, which the police do nothing about. No more traffic!
1.11	North of Borrowash	Road Safety	Kirsty murray	Response-01004	This junction with the A52, will become very dangerous, you have to leave the A52 at some speed due to the very short run off at the exit, having a junction to a housing estate so close will cause problems
1.11	North of Borrowash	Road Safety	Laura Mellott-Batty	Response-00517	Increased traffic on the road will impact road safety
1.11	North of Borrowash	Road Safety	Margaret Irene Wheatley	Response-00913	I am concerned about the close proximity of the vehicular access so close to the A52. Access onto the A52 at present is extremely difficult with vehicles having to rely on vehicles travelling along the A52 moving into the outside lane; such cooperation is often lacking during busy periods.
1.11	North of Borrowash	Road Safety	Maria Fowkes	Response-00455	There has been several accidents and many more near misses in this area due to the slip road not being adequate to build up speed. There's also a lot of congestion around work and school travel times
1.11	North of Borrowash	Road Safety	Mr Paul Rigby	Response-00880	Extra traffic from this site and the one at the other end of the village gives an increased risk of accidents and danger to people crossing the road
1.11	North of Borrowash	Road Safety	Mr Timothy Shepherd	Response-01336	The A52 junction is already hazardous, additional traffic here will only increase the accident risk. The addition of another junction close to the A52 will exacerbate the problem further. Consideration should also be given to the number of small children living close to the A52.
1.11	North of Borrowash	Road Safety	Mr W Barton	Response-00892	The junction onto the A52 at Cole Lane has very limited slipways which causes inadequate time to accelerate into the fast moving traffic. The proposal of 60 houses would increase the traffic using this junction adding to the danger of collisions. In the past a number of pedestrians have been killed. For this reason the pedestrian bridge was built. This junction needs to be closed or considerably improved before allowing any more development.
1.11	North of Borrowash	Road Safety	PETER HINKLEY	Response-00776	An already busy road between Risley and Borrowash and from Spondon and A52 bypass, increased traffic will increase risk to road safety
1.11	North of Borrowash	Road Safety	Sarah Cresswell	Response-01208	The proposed site is adjacent to the junction with the A52 westbound and within a very short distance of the main exit for Borrowash and Ockbrook. In addition to these two junctions, there is also a vehicle entrance to an allotment site, just a few metres before the main exit point. In recent years there have been a high number of road traffic accidents around both these junctions and the two on the northbound carriageway. An extension to the 50mph speed restriction between Derby and Spondon, to cover all four junctions for Borrowash and Ockbrook would achieve the following: 1. reduce the number of accidents at these pinch points 2. make it safer and easier for vehicles accessing the proposed site from the A52 eastbound 3. reduce due noise pollution for residents.
1.11	North of Borrowash	Road Safety	Susan Johnstone	Response-00174	The access to this site is dangerously close to the A52 junction. This is a notoriously dangerous junction that has seen numerous accidents over the years, including cars crashing into the barrier by the foot bridge. This cannot be deemed safe for approximately 120 cars turning in and out of a new access so close to that junction.
		School Capacity	Anita Gorman	Response-01245	Traffic to schools and be horrendous. School capacity
1.11	North of Borrowash	School Capacity	Ashley Stafford	Response-01135	The local schools are already working capacity if not already above capacity
1.11	North of Borrowash	School Capacity	Ben Foster	Response-00837	Under subscribed at Ashbrook
1.11	North of Borrowash	School Capacity	Catherine Fox Charlton	Response-00658	I am concerned about the spaces available within schools and nursery places.
1.11	North of Borrowash	School Capacity	Ian Frearson	Response-00719	This proposal will put more pressure on the already overcapacity schools available.
1.11	North of Borrowash	School Capacity	Joy Cordwell	Response-01292	There are no places at the local school
1.11	North of Borrowash	School Capacity	Laura Mellott-Batty	Response-00517	Both local schools at capacity and which secondary school will these feed into as also at capacity
1.11	North of Borrowash	School Capacity	Lesley Eccles	Response-00812	Schools already quite full Any more children may have to travel out of village
1.11	North of Borrowash	School Capacity	Molly Pettitt	Response-00721	Schools are already struggling
1.11	North of Borrowash	School Capacity	Mr Paul Rigby	Response-00880	We only have one school where are all these extra children supposed to go
1.11	North of Borrowash	School Capacity	Mr Timothy Shepherd	Response-01336	Additional funding will be required for the building of new classrooms and staff for the new children.
1.11	North of Borrowash	School Capacity	PETER HINKLEY	Response-00776	Sandicare and Spondon schools in addition to the local primary school do not have capacity for ever more students from increased housing.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.11	North of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Peter Howell	Response-00830	no new school in the programme.
1.11	North of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Sarah Cresswell	Response-01208	Ashbrook Nursery, Infant & Junior Schools have capacity according to recent data and both can be accessed safely via the footpath linking the proposed site to Priorway Avenue. Redhill School can be reached via the accessible footbridge crossing the A52 adjacent to the site.
1.11	North of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Sarah Davies	Response-01136	The local schools are already at capacity, a new primary school would be required to facilitate the extra potential new residents.
1.11	North of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Tanya caldbeck	Response-00918	No school capacity
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Anita Gorman	Response-01245	Roads will be congested with the amount of traffic through the village of Borrowwash
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Ann Daykin	Response-01443	The proposed site will have to have access to Cole Lane which is a busy route, especially in the mornings where cars pull onto the A52. The prospect of more cars trying to pull onto Cole Lane in the mornings/evenings will cause a lot of traffic issues and potential problems for existing car users. Also the cars will have to cross the pavement and that could affect the pedestrians especially children that walk to school in Ockbrook..
			Ashley Cartlidge	Response-01414	There is already times when congestion hinders movement around the area.
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Ashley Stafford	Response-01135	It's hard enough entering the A52 during rush hour, another few hundred vehicles will make this even harder.
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	David Tyler	Response-00836	How is going to be safe to access the site so close to the A52 junction
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Denis Woodcock	Response-00930	Infilling will only compound the issues of parking. People are parking on pavements more and more. Extra traffic at peak times around Victoria road, Nottingham road and Station road will make life unbearable for residence.
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Geoff Whittaker	Response-01806	There is talk about the need for work to adjacent junctions but this is not detailed and what the costs will be. There is talk about a new junction on the A6005 but no costs are given. It would be reckless to not consider the overall costs within the proposals.
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Helen Shaw	Response-00521	There is already an influx of cars cutting up Cole Lane meaning queues on to the A52. It is also a dangerous junction - getting on and getting off. There has been many accidents at this junction.
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Iain Pendry	Response-01185	Don't believe this will be a significant issue
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Ian Frearson	Response-00719	This proposal would generate an unacceptable volume of traffic from and to the adjacent Arterial route A52 (T) as well as the unacceptable and unsafe below current standard for the proposed access into the site that would itself contravene current site development requirements. The numbers of dwellings of around 60 will generate some 100 vehicles from new residents making the access and egress on and off the A52 an unacceptable risk.
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Joy Cordwell	Response-01292	With one entry/exit, Cole Lane (already very busy) will be unrecognisable. This beautiful and historic lane cannot withstand more traffic
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Kirsty murray	Response-01004	The junction there joining the A52 will become very congested.
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Laura Mellott-Batty	Response-00517	Heavy traffic use already on this road. This will add to it unnecessarily
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Lesley Eccles	Response-00812	Won't be able to get out of site directly so will impact in increase of traffic in borrowwash
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Marcus Smith	Response-00310	Spondon already in gridlock and new proposed developments elsewhere to this will make it worse
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Mark Burrow	Response-00656	Will add too much congestion to those small village.
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Mr Paul Rigby	Response-00880	Borrowwash is a busy traffic area already and with the proposed building of 280 houses at the other end of the village the traffic will be unbearable
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Mrs Sheila Hardington	Response-01233	There will be queuing traffic on Cole Lane for entry onto the A52, particularly during the rush hour.
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Mr Timothy Shepherd	Response-01336	The Cole Lane/ A52 junction is already hazardous. Additional traffic here will increase the accident risk significantly.
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	PETER HINKLEY	Response-00776	Increased traffic flows right in the heart of Borrowwash at crossroads of Station Road, A6005 and Victoria Ave and pelican controlled traffic lights and ensuing traffic congestion. That's right now and not if additional housing to the North side of Borrowwash not a 1/2 mile from this busy junction.
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Sarah Davies	Response-01136	Parking is already a problem in the village, there are not enough spaces in the main carpark for the local shops that surrounding streets are then used as in overflow which then impacts local residents who have limited parking on the road. The public are already using creative parking to find spaces putting pedestrians in danger.
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Sheralyn Pattison	Response-01250	There is already a lot of traffic on Cole Lane and off the A52. It is a hazardous junction already - an increase in traffic will cause an accident
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	sophy peacock	Response-00677	Borrowwash can't handle more traffic
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Susan Johnstone	Response-00174	60 houses means approximately another 120 cars using roads that already aren't fit for purpose, full of potholes, plus, the heavy plant traffic that will be coming in and out of the village will wreck the roads even more.
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Tanya caldbeck	Response-00918	Too much traffic around the area already.
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Type of Housing	Ashley Stafford	Response-01135	Borrowwash is lucky enough to being my traditional style housing with with generous gardens. The new builds are built on such a way that triple the amount of housing is built on the same sized land. The housing should be in keeping with the area.
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Type of Housing	Iain Pendry	Response-01185	The area is in desperate need of affordable housing and hence this proposal must require the developer to make provision for substantial numbers of affordable houses / starter homes
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Type of Housing	Ian Frearson	Response-00719	This should not need consideration since the entire proposal should not be considered further.
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Type of Housing	Joy Cordwell	Response-01292	New homes will ruin the unique character of Cole Lane
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Type of Housing	Kirsty murray	Response-01004	I do t think more social housing is needed, if anything we need larger homes for families to grow into the village, moving out of the terraced houses into 3 and 4 bed homes, freeing up terraces for younger people
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mr Timothy Shepherd	Response-01336	Small affordable houses are required. Building larger houses will not solve the housing problem.
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Anita Gorman	Response-01245	Where will our wildlife go , all our green space will be decimated

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Ann Daykin	Response-01443	The proposed development is to be built on fields surrounded by hedges, with the Ockbrook flowing on the Western side. The area is varied and supports wildlife, the hedges are extremely important for biodiversity.
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Ashley Cartlidge	Response-01414	Our native wildlife is under threat and are being squeezed in terms of habitat, once it's gone it will not be able to bring it back.
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Ashley Stafford	Response-01135	Remove trees, grass, hedges it will push our wildlife away. Borrowwash is lucky to have the diversity of wildlife it has, especially the native song birds.
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Gary Mortimer	Response-01147	The area is full of wildlife which would be negatively impacted by this development
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Helen Shaw	Response-00521	Erewash are losing too much green spaces which has a knock on effect to the wildlife. My children and my now grandchildren loved/love to look for the horses in the field when we walk over the bridge. It will be a shame to build houses on the field.
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Iain Pendry	Response-01185	Given this area is directly adjacent to the A52 only concern would be management of noise and air pollution for those living in the site
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Ian Frearson	Response-00719	a diminution of the available space for use for biodiversity will be reduced by the whole development area and as such will threaten the viability of red book species.
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Kirsty murray	Response-01004	Losing any greenspace to housing is of detriment to wildlife.
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Laura Mellott-Batty	Response-00517	Unnecessary destruction of wildlife
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Lesley Eccles	Response-00812	Will impact on this
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Lynda Gamble	Response-00909	Where will the wildlife go when everywhere is completely built up? How will future generations ever learn about nature and biodiversity?
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Margaret Irene Wheatley	Response-00913	This should be protected at all costs. Any losses should be kept to a minimum. Presumably Biodiversity Net Gain applies to these proposed developments and should be implemented in our areas. Points should not be bought to mitigate these responsibilities.
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Susan Johnstone	Response-00174	We are all being told to protect our wildlife and bird species. This is a beautiful green field, full of wildlife, foxes, squirrels, hedgehogs, not to mention the plethora of wild birds, Buzzards, Kestrels, Sparrowhawks, Pheasants, Bullfinches, Jays, Green Woodpeckers, I could go on, this is a bird watchers paradise and a haven for pollinators when the buttercups are out. This is a field full of wildlife !! Please leave it that way.
1.11	North of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Tanya caldbeck	Response-00918	Destroying greenbelt land and nature
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	Adele Pinkney	Response-01456	The number of vehicles in Borrowwash centre already has a detrimental effect on air quality, especially as traffic backs up Victoria Avenue waiting to turn onto Derby/Nottingham Road. Additional traffic coming in to and through the village at peak times from a new, large housing development will add to these emissions and cause further decrease in air quality.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	Alice Fitzpatrick	Response-00543	The pre-mentioned traffic congestion is ultimately going to cause a serious reduction of the already poor air quality. It will be like living in a city which, if this development proceeds is exactly what we shall be. This is supposed to be a rural area but it is becoming increasingly urban!
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	Ann Daykin	Response-01453	The sheer volume of new cars on the roads of Borrowwash and Ockbrook, following on from the proposed development being established, would have a detrimental affect on the air quality of the area.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	Ashley Cartlidge	Response-01417	More traffic as a result of so many homes must impact air quality.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	Ashley Dunn	Response-01560	Additional cars along Victoria Avenue will create bigger air quality issues. I already regard air quality on Victoria Avenue to be unacceptable, especially for children attending Ashbrook Infants School. Additional traffic from this site would endanger children's young lungs.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	Barry Shaw	Response-01482	Air quality is generally poor, this will not be improved
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	Bella Kelsey	Response-00739	Air quality in our area is already high risk due to the A52 - more traffic and industrial work will make this even worse
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	Britton	Response-00877	We have lived on Derby Road near the proposed site for 17 years, the traffic has increased drastically since we moved here and the proposed site will only increase the traffic and impact air quality
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	Carmen Buckley	Response-00737	With the airports and busy A52 and M1 being so close the air quality is poor. This area acts as a barrier between Borrowwash and Spondon.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	Carol Shaw	Response-00797	Increased traffic from the new development will likely lead to higher emissions, negatively impacting air quality in the area. The additional vehicles on the A6005 Derby Road will contribute to air pollution, which is contrary to the goals of the NPPF to promote sustainable development and reduce air pollution. Impact on Ashbrook School: The extra road traffic forced past Ashbrook school on Victoria Avenue will exacerbate air pollution levels, posing a significant health risk to school children. Children are particularly vulnerable to air pollution as their lungs are still developing, and they are more likely to be exposed to higher levels of pollutants due to their proximity to traffic. Increased traffic can lead to higher concentrations of particulate matter (PM2.5 and PM10) and nitrogen dioxide (NO2), which are known to cause respiratory issues and other health problems.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	Dale Harlow	Response-00887	Less farm land and fields, more cars and traffic causing much more air pollution
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	Dan Pilgrim	Response-00932	Protect natural areas, avoiding pollution
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	David Modrovic	Response-00803	More traffic means more pollution
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	David Steare	Response-01300	1 I suspect that around 280 commuters will have a detrimental effect on the air quality of the surrounding area including neighbouring houses and the farm during commuting periods. 2 I suspect that this detrimental air quality will be exacerbated by the development near to the A52 dual carriageway and its heavy traffic at commuter times.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	Dr Sarah Mee	Response-01320	The main concerns on air quality relate to the construction period. During piling and with haulage vehicles entering and leaving the proposed housing allocation site daily there will be an unacceptable volume of air particle debris and traffic fumes for the existing residents of Derby Road which must be contained and monitored so this does not cause damage to the health of existing residents or impact the quality of their living standards such as being able to use their gardens safely. Clean air is a fundamental human right. The Clean Air Act debated on 19 March 2024 aims to establish a legal right for citizens to breathe clean air and abide by WHO clean air guidelines. Air pollution is a national health emergency in the UK and targets within the Environment Act for fine particulate matter should be complied with during the construction of any housing or industrial development at this site West of Borrowwash. It is without doubt that the current air quality around the current Greenbelt designated land will be negatively impacted during the construction phase at this proposed housing allocation site for the existing village residents and potentially following construction, even when taking into account the currently enhanced building regulations and energy efficiency technologies for the houses, the traffic flow and related fumes will be hugely increased.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	Emma Gregory	Response-01454	See traffic congestion
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	Eve barker	Response-00443	A main road already runs through the village, air pollution is a real concern
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	Gillian Fitzpatrick	Response-00482	The pre-mentioned traffic congestion is ultimately going to cause a serious reduction of the already poor air quality. It will be like living in a city which, if this development proceeds is exactly what we shall be.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	Gillian Hitchcock	Response-00446	Need we keep repeating that the increase I. Traffic will greatly affect the air quality
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	Helena Lucas	Response-00644	There is lots of evidence that 280 new build houses will significantly increase air pollution, during the construction phase and ongoing due to increased energy consumption from residents. Construction activities will generate dust, fumes, and emissions from vehicles, while the increased number of residents leads to more traffic, and consequently, higher levels of pollutants from vehicle exhaust, as well as increased demand for energy, potentially leading to more emissions from power plants. This will put increased pressure on healthcare services, but more worryingly, affect those living nearby who are affected by respiratory illnesses. I personally know several residence who live on adjacent streets and roads. I have worked at the nearby GP surgery and can tell you it is already overwhelmed with patients, without unnecessarily increasing demand as a direct impact of the new builds.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	Ian Frearson	Response-01267	The additional construction and subsequent developed site will generate far more pollution to the area than is currently generated by the agricultural site thereby affecting adversely the existing wildlife.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	James Dean	Response-00553	More traffic, less tress, less open space... a far worse air quality. This will no double have negative effect on the community and people's health.
			Jane Rothon	Response-00042	Air quality is poor here now and will be even worse especially whilst houses are being built.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	Jane Shepherd	Response-01333	More traffic will lead to poorer air quality
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	Jennifer Sutton	Response-00518	The development will worsen local air quality, already impacted by vehicles on Derby Road. Brake dust, tyre particles, and NOx emissions especially affect children's lungs. These pollutants are not mitigated by one park or tree buffer. Residents on the school run or daily commute will pass Ashbrook School, further exposing children to airborne toxins. The huge increase in traffic this development will bring shall permanently impact the air pollution of the village; car engines, brake dust and noise will massively increase past our village schools.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	John & Anna Mead	Response-00772	Because more traffic, housing will affect the air quality
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	Julie Margaret Smith	Response-01090	Increased traffic can only decrease the air quality of those walking along increasingly busy roads and for those whose properties line Derby Road and Victoria Avenue, as well as pedestrians using the facilities in the village centre.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	Ken Hardy	Response-00928	Development of this scale would inevitably result in recorded increases in all types of pollution. Efforts to mitigate this would reduce the levels omitted by buildings, occupants and the introduction of vehicular trips to a previously undeveloped site. However, construction and the occupancy of on-site buildings would see a rise in pollution omissions.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	Kevin Highton	Response-00506	This will be terrible during and aftr the proposed building works
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	Kirsty Murray	Response-01003	Of course this will be detrimental, we are losing green space and adding houses and cars will further damage air quality
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	Laura Dewsnap	Response-00936	The air quality in Borrowwash will be negatively impacted by the removal of vegetation, the construction of buildings and an increase in motor vehicles which will emit air pollution. During construction of buildings, large construction vehicles will be frequently present emitting pollution and following the builds, the houses themselves will negatively impact on the air quality as soon as they are inhabited. In addition to this, the construction of buildings and removal of vegetation will increase the temperature of the area by creating an urban heat island. It is known that building materials hold their heat for longer than vegetation a consequence of this being an increase in the average temperature of the area.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	Lauren Fardoe	Response-00039	The dust/ pollution from the building site whilst being built
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	Lesley Eccles	Response-00814	Will impact on air quality as more emissions on cars

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	Lewis Sutton	Response-00415	Increased traffic will exacerbate air pollution, which contradicts the government's air quality targets. The area is semi-rural, currently benefitting from clean air, and development will increase NOx and particulate emissions especially troubling given the proximity to homes and schools. The huge increase in traffic this development will bring shall permanently impact the air pollution of the village; car engines, brake dust and noise will massively increase past our village schools. Impact on Children Lung Development: Exposure to NO? can impair lung growth and function in children, particularly in polluted urban areas like London, Birmingham, and Manchester. Asthma: Higher NOx levels are linked to increased asthma incidence and attacks in children. It can also worsen existing respiratory conditions. School Performance: Poor air quality, including NO? exposure, is associated with reduced cognitive performance and school absenteeism. Infant Health: Prenatal and early-life exposure to NOx pollution is linked to low birth weight, premature birth, and developmental issues.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	Lindsay Hodson	Response-01434	More traffic means more pollution. Obviously this should be taken into consideration.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	Lucas Hodson	Response-01435	More traffic will mean more pollution which will cause even more damage to the wildlife than the building on green land.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	Maisie Hartow	Response-00963	More houses = more people = more traffic = more vehicle emissions. Contributing to the existing problem of the high air pollution in the area caused by heavy traffic on the A52 / M1.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	Mandy Dickens	Response-00590	Due to extra traffic which will be bumper to bumper the air pollution will increase and there are Nurseries and schools in which the young children will be affected
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	Mark Fearn	Response-00507	The amount of cars and building works will cause a significant impact to regular air quality for local residents
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	Mary-Jo McDermott	Response-01437	Roads in Borrowwash are already exceptionally congested and busy. Air quality is already poor. Building on green fields will eliminate a vital buffer that helps absorb pollutants from surrounding roads. Increased vehicle emissions and loss of plant cover will further degrade local air quality, affecting respiratory health in vulnerable populations and causing increased levels of noise and disruption.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	Maxwell Sutton	Response-01093	Max aged 5 already finds Derby road nasty, and believes 1000 more cars will worsen the environment
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	Mrs Kay Rigby	Response-00876	With all the extra cars they will be any increase in carbon emissions especially when they are waiting in the traffic jams that will happen in peak times
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	Mrs M McCroft	Response-00532	Pollution from all these extra cars would be damaging to our health I have COPD and my husband has gas and lung cancer.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	Mr Timothy Shepherd	Response-01334	Increased traffic in traffic jams will have a detrimental effect on air quality in the Nottingham Road and Victoria Avenue.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	Nicholas Parr	Response-01253	The pre-mentioned traffic congestion is ultimately going to cause a serious reduction of the already poor air quality. We are one of the most inland and industrial counties and need to maximise any opportunity to improve our air quality ? this development would have the opposite effect.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	Nick Coates	Response-00393	Already high flow of traffic no more needed
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	Nicola Ashton	Response-00081	With all the traffic now through the village you only need to look at our front windows to see the amount of pollution that is visible, it's not pleasant to have your windows open in the summer.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	P. Hart	Response-00623	More traffic will increase pollution of air and environment in general eg residue from tyres.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	Paul Barker	Response-00800	Air quality will suffer extra slow moving traffic
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	Peter HINKLEY	Response-00775	Increased car usage, we're not all electric yet, will increase poor air quality levels
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	Phil Self	Response-00759	Far too many cars coming through the area
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	Raoul Pinkney	Response-01457	Increased vehicles will cause a further reduction in air quality, especially in the village centre where congestion already causes fumes to build up
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	Simon Shaw	Response-01152	Poor air quality currently, imagine living between the A52 and Derby road, a whirlpool of bad air, especially by the school
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	Sophy Peacock	Response-00678	Poor air quality whilst the build is on going but also the added pollution from that many extra homes and the extra traffic it will cause
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	Stephen Peat	Response-01793	The land is a link to the opposite side of the A52 to move animals once a year between Spondon and Ockbrook to land within Meynell Farm. This is also explained in the next chapter of this letter, in section A, 'New developments, face high levels of air and noise pollution from the A52?', including dangers to and from animals passing through the area. (1) The land west of Borrowwash is close to a very busy A52, and since the planned 280-housing development would be subjected to high levels of air and noise pollution from high volumes of passing vehicles travelling to and from Derby. (2) Around 200 metres from the A52 would be affected by noise and air pollution because the A52 is very noisy with heavy lorries passing through the area. After noise and air pollution, this area could put children at risk of being close to the A52, and the rights of way to transfer animals from the opposite side of the A52 to Meynell Farm, who have sheep and other livestock within their Farm. This means hundreds of sheep would pass through the planned 280 housing estate, posing a risk to animals and householders who live on the 280-home estate. In law, the farmer can walk their animals through this site and across the A52 to Meynell Farm. This law is over 100+ years old, and is still the law today. The farmer can order the closure of the A52 twice or three times a year to move animals to different sides of the A52. The building of houses could create a risk in the movement of animals to and from the A52, including noise of construction, noise and traffic from the new neighbourhood.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	Steven Hoolan	Response-00912	Air quality will be significantly impacted with the additional traffic these homes will bring
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Air Quality	Suzanne Prior	Response-00907	The increase in population from the new housing, combined with more traffic which will be idling due to congestion at the Victoria Avenue will increase pollution for those living on Derby Road Borrowwash
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Bus Services	Alice Fitzpatrick	Response-00543	The bus services would be seriously challenged especially at school times. more buses would mean more traffic (objection raised under Traffic)
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Bus Services	Angela Chapman	Response-01331	Poor bus service, damaged roads, neither will get better, only worse, making safety issues worse.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Bus Services	Anthony Clarke	Response-00559	We have no bus services in Borrowwash, the two flyovers were ended years ago, just those that pass through available

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Bus Services	Carol Shaw	Response-00797	While the development includes provisions for pedestrian links to surrounding facilities and bus services, the increased population may strain existing public transport services. The current infrastructure may not be sufficient to accommodate the additional demand, leading to overcrowded buses and reduced service quality.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Bus Services	David Modrovic	Response-00803	Bus service already poor, more people adding to this wouldn't help
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Bus Services	Dr Sarah Mee	Response-01320	Public transport provision for the new residents of a development at this site would impact the volume of traffic on an already busy road and additional buses would need to be provided for the route to and from Derby and Nottingham and allocations to from schools. At peak times the service is already at capacity and the impact of additional traffic on congestion, pollution and road safety must be factored in to decision making
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Bus Services	Gillian Fitzpatrick	Response-00482	At peak times there will be a need for more buses and therefore more traffic which has previously been objected to.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Bus Services	Gillian Hitchcock	Response-00446	Bus service is rubbish now, being more people to the area and make it worse, that's a great idea not!
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Bus Services	Helena Lucas	Response-00644	The bus services to Derby and Nottingham will become more overcrowded, especially during peak times.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Bus Services	Ian Frearson	Response-01267	The proposals would put more pressure on the existing public transport services and yet does not lend itself to the provision of a 7.3m carriageway highway within the development proposal.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Bus Services	Jane Shepherd	Response-01333	Will there be a new bus route? Will the roads planned allow buses to manoeuvre easily?
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Bus Services	Jennifer Sutton	Response-00518	Public transport is inadequate, with poor links to Nottingham and limited rail access.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Bus Services	John & Anna Mead	Response-00772	Obviously these will get more crowded and busier
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Bus Services	Julie Margaret Smith	Response-01090	Bus services would need to be increased at peak times to accommodate an increased population.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Bus Services	Laura Dewsnap	Response-00936	Borrowwash does have bus services but one of these has been replaced by a small minibus which isn't accessible for wheelchairs. The services are not reliable and an increase in population would mean there is a further strain on these services.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Bus Services	Lewis Sutton	Response-00415	There is limited bus service provision along the A6005. The development risks becoming car-dependent, especially for commuting, school runs, and accessing amenities? further increasing emissions, traffic, and isolation for those without private transport. Public transport is inadequate, with poor links to Nottingham and limited rail access.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Bus Services	Lindsay Hodson	Response-01434	Bus services are adequate but can be very busy at certain times. Bus services need to be extended to accommodate more people. Borrowwash connects people from Derby to Nottingham. More traffic will slow this service down.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Bus Services	Lucas Hodson	Response-01435	The i4 and indigo bus service which run through Borrowwash are key bus lines as they connect Nottingham and Derby so by building in Borrowwash you will be significantly slowing down the two bus services which will have may knock on effects like people possibly being late to work.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Bus Services	Mark Birkinshaw	Response-00046	With dedicated school buses to West Park School at capacity already, the potential increase on current scaled down public transport will jeopardise availability for other users.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Bus Services	Mark Fearn	Response-00507	Bus services in Borrowwash are already in high demand and do not cater to the local population as it is meaning it would not be able to sustain such influx of regular passengers.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Bus Services	Mrs Kay Rigby	Response-00876	We have a fairly good bus service which is used a lot the extra residents in Borrowwash will mean full buses and longer waiting times
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Bus Services	Mrs M McCroft	Response-00532	Bus service would not be able to cope with all these extra people
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Bus Services	Nicholas Parr	Response-01253	Bus services would need to be increased at peak times to accommodate an increased population leading to further traffic congestion and reduced air quality.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Bus Services	Paul Barker	Response-00800	Bus service. Direct to Derby would be needed
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Bus Services	Virginia Locke	Response-00580	We have no buses in Borrowwash
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Alex Lowe	Response-00707	The land currently acts as a flood plain which stops a large amount of water flooding local houses. I would have major concerns if this was turned into a building site
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Alice Fitzpatrick	Response-00543	I am seriously concerned about drainage. We already experience flooding (Derby Road in particular) and more concrete means less drainage. What about sewage? Climate change has increased rainfall which has raised the water table. My garden flooded badly last year for the first time (I've lived here 30 years) - it was literally standing in water with no place for it to go. This also impacted on the road drains - Victoria Avenue can look like a canal at times.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Amy Brown	Response-00514	On said ground, during heavy downpour, this area does tend to get very boggy and flood. How will this be managed? Draycott, Borrowwash & surrounding areas all have the same type of issues. This is not managed as it is let alone adding however many houses on top. How does this affect local homes/businesses?
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Angela Chapman	Response-01331	There are issues with flooding along the Derby Road already during prolonged or heavy rain fall, how can they be sure that the works will not exacerbate the issue, making the homes already there unlivable.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Ann Daykin	Response-01453	More development will just add pressure to an already weak drainage system.. Borrowwash has the Ock brook running through the village and it flows into the Dereent. This area floods yearly and is getting worse. I have lived in the village for 57 years and can see a decline in this area. It's getting worse and that's because the system can't cope now.. and building this development will only add to the pressure on local systems.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Anne Anderson	Response-00980	That land has always flooded and still floods. I have a friend who backs onto that field and during heavy rain his garden is literally under water. It was so bad last winter that he had to get sand bags to prevent the water entering the air bricks.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Barry Shaw	Response-01482	The roads already flood often. This will make things worse.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Breanne Rodda	Response-00708	The green area is always flooded when it is heavy rain, I suspect likely protecting a lot of houses in the area from more severe flooding

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Carol Shaw	Response-00797	The proximity of the development to the Ock Brook watercourse raises concerns about flooding and drainage. While the site is in Flood Zone 1, appropriate landscaping and drainage measures must be implemented to prevent adverse impacts on natural drainage patterns as Derby road floods from these fields currently, and often.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Catherine Casartelli	Response-01428	Derby Road near the proposed access already suffers from flood water running through onto Derby Road during excessively heavy rainfall. Covering fields with roads and houses can only add to this rain run off.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Chris Archer	Response-01142	Borrowwash has a historical issue with rain water and flooding due to the run off from the A52 and fields to Spondon. By removing such natural drainage locations such as fields this will exacerbate this issue
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Craig Hydes	Response-00782	The bulk earthworks in the surrounding areas are built up of significant quantities of clay. Drainage is poor for existing property owners on Field Close and Victoria Avenue. Flooding is a problem and we personally suffer every year.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Dale Harlow	Response-00887	Losing fields which are used as natural flood banks and soak aways will cause more surface water, larger puddles and cause long term flooding issues
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	David House	Response-01489	The area to the south of the proposed site is susceptible to flooding. We live at 60 Derby rd, Borrowwash. Our garden and garage have been flooded in recent years. We are concerned that the development will exacerbate this.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	David Modrovic	Response-00803	Where would any rain water go? Currently the land absorbs it, building would increase flooding!
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	David Smith	Response-01115	Living close to the area in recent years our garden has remained flooded almost throughout the winter months. I am not sure but there may be some parts of this land which is likely to flood. Many of the houses in Field close have required new flooring which is an indicator that the area is low lying.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	David Tyler	Response-00835	This land is close to a brook that occasionally floods derby road, if the land is built on , there will be less natural soakaway and the possibility of regular flooding of derby road
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Deborah young	Response-01306	Since they built the house next to field it has flooded more . If they build on the land were will the water go . ?
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Dianne Simmons	Response-00401	I live on Field Close and our garden floods even with the lightest of rain, another 200 plus houses will surely make this worse.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Dr Sarah Mee	Response-01320	There is a field drainage ditch and an underground spring behind the existing properties on Derby Road. The ditch fills rapidly after rain and existing flood defences are frequently overwhelmed causing Derby Road to become a running stream which has closed Derby Road in the last few years at times. The Flood Prevention Officer at Matlock has been involved in site assessment and Erewash Council have been made aware of this flood water and potential risk of flooding on several occasions by several residents of Derby Road. At times the flood water prevents exit from driveways on Derby Road which has been a major safety concern for access to emergency vehicles to properties and exit of residents in an emergency or even just to take the bins down to the road . Recent enquiry by a resident found drains and sewers to be at capacity already along Derby Road for existing houses so additional housing is a major concern on the flooding risk.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Ellen Young	Response-01357	Since the creation of Covent Garden Close and a house/building on some land off Derby Road, the field to the south of Covent Garden Close now floods in places it didn't in the past. The field to the north east of this has always been waterlogged on rainy days. There was a little stream that ran along the border of some of the fields. This has since become clogged and no longer flows like it used to. 20+ years ago, the farmer dug a ditch around the perimeter of at at least one of the fields on the plan. This prevented the field from becoming water logged and from run off entering gardens. This ditch hasn't been maintained for many years but it could prevent crops from being waterlogged, which is a current problem with growing crops. Building on fields that becomes waterlogged is going to increase the chances of existing gardens and the new houses of flooding as the water has nowhere to go. Drainage can only take so much water away before it's overwhelmed. Maybe it's time we should start looking at the correlation of the increase in flooding with the amount fields being built on and stop blaming the situation solely on global warming. We're lucky in Borrowwash, we rarely flood but when we do it tends to be in places near a source of water, e.g. brooks, or at the bottom of hills. I fear that building on land that becomes waterlogged in heavy rain is going to cause flooding in places we don't normally see it.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Emma Gregory	Response-01454	This land is a flood plain and regularly floods.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Geoff Whittaker	Response-01805	There appears to be no mention of surface water attenuation for these sites . The will contribute to the flow going into the Derwent which already floods several times a year. They will add to the flow initially in the two brooks. The Ockbrook already is close to causing flooding to properties lower down its cause and has flooded housing on Kimberley Drive once the past years. the other brook also appears in a poor state of repair and lacks maintenance.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Gillian Fitzpatrick	Response-00482	I am seriously concerned about drainage. We already experience flooding (Derby Road in particular) and more concrete means less drainage. What about sewage? Climate change has increased rainfall which has raised the water table. My garden flooded last year for the first time since I have lived here (42 years!).
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Gillian Hitchcock	Response-00446	Whilst currently a fields we don't suffer from flooding but take that away and it'll increase, if my property were to be as a result of this build I wouldnt be amused
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Hayley Dexter	Response-00519	As we are seeing year on year, with more land disappearing for houses there is no where for rain and flood water to go as there is less and less natural drainage. The houses that back on to the land already have an issue with flooding and in heavy rain the water floods there gardens and drives and runs of into the main road causing hazards and issues to the properties already there
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Helena Lucas	Response-00644	Borrowwash and the surrounding main roads are already subject to significant flooding and flash floods. Adding 280 new build houses over this greenbelt area, a significant feature in helping to manage heavy rainfall, will significantly and worryingly compound this issue further. As the field itself is prone to retaining a lot of water through periods of wet weather, the water run off to the remaining field will beside the new build will cause dangerous flooding to the ground and stream flowing to the edge of the field.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Helen Pearce	Response-01550	Borrowwash has seen an increase in flooding over the recent years. Our house on Victoria Avenue has usually been unaffected due to the natural drainage that the fields and nearby brooks provide. The new plans will destroy this provision for all of the houses on Victoria Avenue, increasing our flood risk which our Victorian pipework is not equipped to deal with.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Ian Frearson	Response-01267	The proposal would generate additional pressure on and already busy sewerage system as follows. Firstly an increase in the flood potential from surface water generation discharged into the boundary brook between Derby and Erewash. This proposal has the potential to see an additional discharge of surface water approaching 1,000 litres / sec influencing the crossing of the Derby Road at a low point already a potential for flooding and forward to the railway and on to the adjacent development before its discharge into the River Derwent. The proposal would affect the provision of Foul sewerage provision onto an already overloaded system
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	James Dean	Response-00553	Naturally... building on all this natural drainage will be detrimental to the local area that has already experiences issues during wet weather with flooding. Again... house values will reduce ruining the area for all involved.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Jane Rothern	Response-00042	Our village already gets flooded quite badly at times. We don't know how building on this land will affect this but can only imagine it will get worse. Derby Road has been flooded quite a lot over the last few years became sure this will get worse
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Jane Shepherd	Response-01333	Careful planning needed, the land near Elvaston already floods. If land is less green where will rainwater go?
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Jennifer Sutton	Response-00518	The local water table and pluvial floodplain must be assessed. The area is poorly drained, and the introduction of impermeable surfaces will worsen flood risks, this is true for housing and road infrastructure. Derby Road already floods during heavy rainfall due to poor drainage and runoff. The proposal will cover fields in impermeable surfaces, making this worse. The plan mentions Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) in general ? but fails to specify how they'll prevent flooding or what the downstream consequences may be. This conflicts with NPPF para 167 on flood risk.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Judith Anderson	Response-00934	Flooding likely to happen
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Julie Margaret Smith	Response-01090	In this area, we are already under threat of flooding every winter; gardens, housing and roads (especially Derby Road) as well as land close to watercourses. Our garden (off Victoria Avenue) is still saturated from winter 23/24 flooding. A reduction in natural absorption of run-off will exacerbate the problems. Land drains can be poorly installed or easily disturbed. Housing will only increase flooding problems - where will the excess water go? How will it affect land miles away?
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Ken Hardy	Response-00928	I would like to register my concerns about the high risk of flooding if the proposed plans are submitted reference to the housing development on green belt land at the back of Derby Road Borrowwash. Behind our property (64 Derby road) is an area of about an acre which for the past two years has become more and more like marsh land. when we originally move in this used to be farmed and the ditch at the bottom of our garden (which is higher than the house) always used to be dry, however now it always contains a high level of water and when it rains it fills rapidly. The farmer tried to drain the area into the ditch by digging channels in the field but without success making the ditch fill even higher and quicker, he has also tried to dig out the ditch making it extremely deep. The farmer no longer farms this land as a few years ago he actually sunk the combine harvester and had to get several machines to pull it out! The problem as I see it is the water has nowhere to go and I believe there is a spring which constantly runs to add to the problem. When it rains heavily water runs down our garden into land drains we had to have put in, it is also noticeable that several of the houses on the street have a flow of water running down the drives into Derby road itself which now becomes like a flowing river after just a short downfall as the drains cannot cope. The water seems to appear from under the driveways for some strange reason. Most concerning is how our Neighbour actually tries to control the level of the ditch to try to protect the houses either side. He has installed a manual system which is like an adjustable lock gate which he can adjust to try and control the level of the water in the ditch, this runs into a small man-made stream which feeds into the drain at the front of his house, the only problem when it rains the flow is too great and it overflows and runs down the side of our house against our wall which is a bit worrying. As a possible solution I spoke to someone who knows about water tables and he suggested that a balance pond needs to be installed in the area of the field but still believes this would not solve the problem fully as the ditches which used to be in place around the field have since been filled. The water has to go somewhere and water being water it finds it's own way to the lowest point, which happens to be the houses along Derby road. We have since checked the ditch itself and there unbelievably is no run off for the water either end other than our neighbors "invention". Over the past few years this has become an increasing concern as the farmer has since abandoned the idea of trying to do something about it, and now we have the threat of this proposed green belt development, which for a number of reasons seems wrong, however my concern now is how it will effect our house and the potential risk of flooding. You or any of your colleagues who would deal with this matter are more than welcome to come and view the area of concern and I know my neighbour would be more than happy to show off his flood defense. I am as you have probably gathered one of many of the villages against this proposed development but feel this is a genuine concern regardless of what decisions are made. Many Thanks Ken Hardy 64 Derby Road Borrowwash
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Kevin Highton	Response-00506	There is a small underground waterway on this land
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Kirsty Murray	Response-01003	The whole country is flooding more as we buil more, which prevents natural drainage
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Laura Dewsnap	Response-00936	Whilst the site is not a flood plain, the act of building on this land will significantly increase the risk and likelihood of flooding in the area. Building in this area will replace permeable surfaces such as soil and vegetation with impermeable surfaces like concrete and tarmac. This will increase flood risk by altering natural drainage patterns and reducing the land's ability to absorb rainfall, leading to increased surface runoff and potentially overwhelming drainage systems.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Lesley Eccles	Response-00814	Have been problems with flooding due to brook in Borrowwash but not in this area

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Lesley Young	Response-00902	Houses are already suffering from flooding in this anrea and our weather is getting worse where rainfall is concerned. Housing destroys any protection against this and Wii result in water in houses and on the road which will cause damage and contribute to extra traffic issues on the Derby Road.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Lewis Sutton	Response-00415	The local water table and pluvial floodplain must be assessed. The area is poorly drained, and the introduction of impermeable surfaces will worsen flood risks, this is true for housing and road infrastructure. The site is prone to road flooding during heavy rainfall due to poor drainage infrastructure along the A6005. Developing the land would increase impermeable surfaces, worsening flood risks locally and downstream. This contradicts climate resilience and sustainable drainage requirements.
			Lindsay Hodson	Response-01434	Borrowwash and Ockbrook suffer with flooding the fields are needed for drainage. Housing in green belt will impact houses elsewhere.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Maisie Hartow	Response-00963	We had to move house because a new building estate caused flooding in our previous neighbourhood in Trowell. Building large new housing estates reduce the land's ability to absorb rainwater and then increases the surface runoff. The field they plan to build on will no longer be able to absorb any rain and the surface water will be forced in to the surrounding homes instead.
			Mandy Dickens	Response-00590	This land is constantly flooded as the property , previously called Queens Hall could testify.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Mark Fearn	Response-00507	Derby Road is known for flooding when we have increased rainfall and the adding of houses will not only increase this likelihood and level of flooding but the damage it will do to the new development and existing buildings and infrastructure.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Mary-Jo McDermott	Response-01437	These fields act as a natural drainage basin. Paving over them will exacerbate flood risks in surrounding areas, especially with climate change increasing rainfall variability. Existing drainage infrastructure cannot cope as it is.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Mrs Kay Rigby	Response-00876	This area is a natural drainage area for Borrowwash when we have heavy rainfall. If it is concreted over there will be no where for the water to go and could cause flooding around the area
			Mrs M McCroft	Response-00532	This has been flood area for the last 11 yrs
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Mrs Sheila Hardington	Response-01232	More houses means more strain on the system.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Nicholas Parr	Response-01253	I have noticed far more flooding locally since I started trading in Borrowwash in 2012 eg. Derby Road. More concrete means less drainage. What about sewage?
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Nicola Ashton	Response-00081	The proposed site always floods in the winter and residents have been dealing with this for years
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Paul Barker	Response-00800	Flooding already occurred regularly on to derby road.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Peter HINKLEY	Response-00775	This area is liable to flooding and I have seen plenty of water running on to the A6005, not sure what the recent SevernTrent work has done to prevent this. Probably naught as was possibly just large diameter pipes 'passing through a field, albeit underground, rather than a drainage solution. Borrowwash and 'Floods' are never a good thing for Borrowwash
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	P Fisher	Response-01175	I am concerned that a development of this size could lead not only to a flood risk in the area, but also problems with drainage and sewage.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Phil Self	Response-00759	I pass that area on my way to work cycling and water pours off of that field when raining hard
			Ray Kirk	Response-01378	Anyone with any sense knows the new drainage systems running into old systems can't work.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Sarah Davies	Response-01137	Flooding is a big problem in the area, damage to properties every year due to bad drainage, poor upkeep of drains and sewer system.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Sarah McAuslan	Response-01248	Our villages already flood during flash rain which we are seeing more of. With increased concrete builds the water will have nowhere to go. Our current village homeowners must be protected from flooding and not just considering expansion to solve one problem but make another
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Steph Archer	Response-01140	If houses are built on this area then it will push the water to the original houses causing damp and other flooding issues.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Stephen Peat	Response-01793	The Site is a flood Risk Zone (1) The map below shows that a river runs through the site that travels from Locko Park, through Spondon Wood development, Wood Road, to Dale Road Park, which connects 4 water courses and two underground streams that travel through the Dale Road Park area down the fields across the A52 into the plan site for 280+ houses. (2) When you examine the map above, you can see how close the River Derwent is to the planned development, meaning during a period of hefty rainfall, the River Derwent is likely to flood and affect housing on both sides of the road. (3) Within the development, several streams enter the development site and could overflow and affect new properties built on the site. (4) The second concern is that the extra water flow into the streams within the Spondon would travel towards the new site, increasing the risk of flooding in the land west of Borrowwash. (5) In the last few years, many insurance companies have paid millions of pounds to repair properties caused by flooding. These companies have decided not to insure properties that face the risk of flooding or damage by water. The Environmental Agency is working on new flood patterns to cover climate change weather patterns, meaning preventing the development of new houses close to areas of water, streams, and rivers. For example, the six large 6 insurance companies want to decide on housing and commercial development, including independent flood and environmental surveys, to ensure new developments do not face flood risk resulting from climate change. (6) I have spoken to the Environmental Agency at Derby City Council last November 2024 with Derby Climate Action and senior staff at Derby City Council. All parties at the meeting, including Derby City Council, Derby Climate Action, and the East Midlands Environment Agency, are rewriting the flood risks of the East Midlands, Derby, and Derbyshire. The updated data with the latest climate modelling will be available to Councils and developers from the end of 2027. The present data used by housing developers is expired, and should not be used in the submission and decision-making for the location of new developments. In section B, I listed that this land could be a flood risk from the effects of the River Derwent being a couple of metres away on the opposite side of the road, and the land has several streams passing through the site that could overflow into new houses during heavy storms or periods of heavy rain. This would be an insurance nightmare for areas at risk of flooding by preventing householders from purchasing flood or housing insurance, knowing the River Derwent has flooded several times in the last three years. The risk of flooding would worsen from the effects of climate change listed in Section B of this letter.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Steven Hoolan	Response-00912	This field floods with every heavy downpour. As a homeowner backing onto this site I know this for a fact as my garden floods from the run off and water can be seen running off the field onto Derby Road. The drains cannot cope with the amount of water. Pumping tons of concrete into the ground is only going to exaggerate this issue
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Sue Higginbottom	Response-01143	Borrowwash is known for flooding and the area you ?intend? to build on is flooded regularly!
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Suzanne Prior	Response-00907	Will measures be implemented to prevent the existing flooding of that area becoming worse because of building on a natural soak away surface?
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	Tanya caldbeck	Response-00917	Fields already flood
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Flooding / Drainage	T McKinnon	Response-01368	We occasionally have flooding on Derby Road, this is likely to hit us more often with the planned development west of Borrowwash, which would hit a main route into the city.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Adele Pinkney	Response-01456	This narrow stretch of green belt land is immensely important in its role of preventing the urban sprawl of Derby City as it is all that separates the city boundary from the villages of Erewash. Its development would open the door to the merging of Derby and Nottingham in to one urban conurbation As green belt this land forms part of an essential wildlife corridor. It's destruction would cause loss of habitat and biodiversity, hugely disrupting the local ecosystem This is agricultural land which has been, and can again be farmed. The proposed park area is not an alternative to greenbelt land. It would not maintain the rural, village character of Borrowwash, nor would a managed park with public access provide a comparable habitat to the current open green belt land. Once developed, green belt land has gone forever. Short sighted aims cannot be allowed to destroy our essential ?green lungs?. To build on such precious areas when previously developed land, brownfield sites and empty properties are available is immoral.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Alice Fitzpatrick	Response-00543	The Green areas and farmland need to be protected whatever designation they are given. We need wildlife. We need pollinators. We need a clear demarcation between the city and the borough and ANY development on this land would mean Borrowwash feeling part of the sprawling Metropolis of Derby city! One field, whether it is designated as parkland or whatever is NOT ENOUGH to divide Borrowwash from Spondon! The council should only be using Brown sites for more housing in the borough! There must be plenty of vacant properties in the towns that could be converted to housing - especially affordable housing!
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Alison Vine	Response-01813	It is also a concern that eventually all of this land will be built on and there will then be no distinction between Borrowwash and Spondon. Borrowwash should remain under Erewash and not become part of Derby city, which has been mentioned.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Amy Brown	Response-00514	It seems you have chosen the area that disrupts the most people also - where the 'park' section is allocated would of been less disruption to others due to only being opposite a football ground. Why is this the case? If you really thought about the people surrounding these areas, you could have minimised this. You are practically wanting to build around my whole home, up to my back date and down the side of my home amongst many others.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Angela Chapman	Response-01331	This area was designated green belt, by the monarchy long before any of us were born, this was done for a reason, to help prevent the spread of disease. If allowed, it will not matter how many doctors or health centres pop up, disease will spread rapidly, mother nature always wins in the end, why stack the cards in her favour. Aside from this, the identity of the village will be lost in the sprall of Derby City.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Ann Daykin	Response-01453	The green belt in Borrowwash needs to be protected for future generations and their wellbeing. This development brings the boundaries between urban and green belt into conflict and leaves precious little green space between Borrowwash and Spondon . It needs to be stopped before it encroaches this precious area..
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Anne Anderson	Response-00980	Green belt is green belt and once it has gone it cannot be retrieved.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Anthony Clarke	Response-00559	Further reducing the gap between Spondon and Borrowwash.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Ashley Dunn	Response-01560	The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states in paragraph 138 that: "The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence." Furthermore, the NPPF sets out five purposes of the Green Belt in paragraph 138, including: ? to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; ? to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; ? to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The proposed allocation directly contradicts these aims. The land west of Borrowwash plays a critical role in maintaining the physical and visual separation between Derby City and the settlements within Erewash. The area in question is one of the narrowest sections of Green Belt between Derby and the wider Erewash Borough. Development here would not only compromise the openness of the Green Belt but would also materially contribute to the coalescence of Borrowwash with the urban edge of Derby, undermining the purpose of the Green Belt in a fundamental and irreversible way. The proposed allocation also risks setting a precedent for future erosion of the Green Belt in this strategically sensitive area, threatening the long-term integrity of the boundary between city and borough.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Barry Shaw	Response-01482	Erosion of the greenbelt is national policy protected against. Removing the greenbelt is absolutely abhorrent.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Bella Kelsey	Response-00739	The green belt needs expanding not building on
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Britton	Response-00877	Green belt should be protected due to habitat loss - there are surely other sites in and around the area that could be developed without impacting precious green belt
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Carmen Buckley	Response-00737	I object to the proposed planning at the bottom of my garden. There are many solutions to the housing crisis that don't involve building on the Green Belt land.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Carol Shaw	Response-00797	The development west of Borrowwash involves the destruction of green belt land, which is protected under the NPPF. The green belt serves to prevent urban sprawl and maintain the openness of the countryside. Developing this land contradicts the NPPF's aim to protect green belt areas except in exceptional circumstances. Renaming Green Belt to Grey Belt: The renaming of green belt to grey belt is an attack on the protections the green belt is supposed to provide. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. The NPPF states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified. Renaming and reclassifying these areas undermines the purpose of the Green Belt and threatens the long-term sustainability and environmental health of the region.
			Dale Harlow	Response-00887	Losing natural green belt
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Dan Pilgrim	Response-00932	Protect green belt areas
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	David House	Response-01489	The proposed development consumes green belt when we think there are more suitable sites in the borough. The development represents a further step towards a continuous built up area, encroaching into Derby.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	David Modrovic	Response-00803	Green belt needs to be retained for farming! No farmers no food!
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	David Smith	Response-01115	It should always be protected particularly when it is already a narrow strip of land. A footpath is not a defensible barrier and so would not be an obstacle to further developments.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	David Steare	Response-01300	The biodiversity of the land and the wilderness appearance should be considered as outstanding natural beauty situated so close to Derby.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	David Tyler	Response-00835	This working agricultural land not baron land
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Deborah young	Response-01306	Why has green belt been changed . Once this beautiful green piece of land is built on it can never be green again . I find that so sad .
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Denise Ball	Response-01291	The site is in a very sensitive part of the Green Belt, being part of a small area separating Erewash villages from the developed areas of Derby City. The few fields between Borrowwash and Spondon protect and retain the individual character of Borrowwash. This piece of the Green Belt is long established and people living in Borrowwash greatly appreciate the openness of the agricultural fields to the west of their village. I ask that Erewash Borough Council protect the Green Belt with respect to this site. The Green Belt around Borrowwash is clearly defined and none of this application site should be developed for housing, small industry and other built structures. A public right of way exists alongside the site. This means that the site will be very visible from public points as well as from the large number of houses neighbouring the site. The development will be a very visible intrusion into the openness of the Green Belt. There are undeveloped sites in Borrowwash that have planning permission. This goes against any idea that there is a shortage of housing in Borrowwash. I am aware that Erewash Borough has been allocating brownfield sites for development and hope that it will continue this policy. I reject strongly, the argument that short-term issues of land supply, if they exist, could be solved by breaking the long-term policy of the Green Belt. Erewash Borough should not allocate housing development to land between Spondon and Borrowwash.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Denise Illsley	Response-00056	It is vital that we maintain our green belt. Once lost it will never return. Borrowwash will become a concrete jungle with no where for nature to flourish.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Dr Sarah Mee	Response-01320	Release of Greenbelt land for housing allocation at this site is a complete reversal of the original decision making process which recognised the designated land as fulfilling the purposes of Greenbelt and is without new evidence to underpin revisiting the original decision. There is no new evidence or data submitted within the consultation documents entitled Greenbelt Review Jan 2025 - only a subjective opinion that vistas from the site are semi-urban. The same vistas were present at time of Greenbelt designation so this has not changed and floodlights at the sportsground are used rarely at night and when partially lit, the footpath within the Greenbelt has enhanced safety. It is my counter view from the Greenbelt review report that walking on the footpath at this site provides a real sense of space and countryside with the fields on either side allowing for existing residents and visitors to enjoy a countryside view and feel and exercise themselves and their dogs in fresh air and an open space. There are adequate non- Greenbelt spaces for housing allocation in Erewash. Eroding Greenbelt at this site will fundamentally destroy the village feel to Borrowwash and this open space which prevents the village merging with the Derby City boundary and thus current not feeling like part of the town. We note that the footpath is to be retained however walking on a footpath bordered by a housing estate on one side and a busy parkland area on the other is far from the current experience of space and countryside so my view is that loss of Greenbelt here fundamentally impinges the countryside. Having a new major road in and out of the housing allocation site will also destroy any remaining benefit of the footpath for residents.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Elizabeth	Response-01215	Joins Borrowwash to the City
			Ellen Young	Response-01357	Once Green belt is gone, it's gone. We can never get it back.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Emma Gregory	Response-01454	I object to the proposed development being built on Green Belt land within Erewash. There are plenty of brownfield sites in Erewash without building on our precious Green Belt in Borrowwash. I object to this development being built on the last open green space between Derby, Spondon and Borrowwash travelling along the A6005. I object because this is inappropriate development which by definition is harmful to the Green Belt. Last piece of Green Belt lost would lead to urban spread. The village wants to keep its village status and not be joined to Derby
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Eve barker	Response-00443	This land has always been protected greenbelt. As a 40+ year resident, it's essential it stays protected. Borrowwash is a village, not a town. We need these fields for wildlife, protect us from merging into neighbouring villages
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Fiona Richards	Response-00020	Need a fire breaker between Borrowwash and Spondon

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Gillian Fitzpatrick	Response-00482	The Green areas and farmland need to be protected whatever designation they are given. We need wildlife. We need pollinators. We need a clear demarcation between the city and the borough and ANY development on this land would mean Borrowwash feeling part of the sprawling Metropolis of Derby city! The council should only be using Brown sites for more housing in the borough! There must be plenty of vacant properties in the towns that could be converted to housing - especially affordable housing!
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Gillian Hitchcock	Response-00446	Keep green belt for farming!
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Hayley Dexter	Response-00519	Should not be building on green belt land. It should be and is supposed to be protected for a reason!
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Helena Lucas	Response-00644	This area is a precious greenbelt marking a divide between the next village of Spondon and Derby. To disrupt this area would be immoral and deeply upset residence within the village of Borrowwash. It is also a concern that other greenbelt areas would be built upon once this estate has been rolled out.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Ian Frearson	Response-01267	This site is an important provision of green belt and buffer between the City of Derby and Erewash and as such should be retained and maintained either as agricultural land or managed open space in order to increase the quality and area of land available to wildlife.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Jacky Kinirey	Response-01209	Greenbelt is called that for a reason not to be built on. We need this stretch of land .
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	James Dean	Response-00553	This should be protected at all costs and should be criminal to even consider building on it. Out countryside, open space and green belt is what makes the area so special and what separates us from spondon and the city. Borrowwash feels more rural and building on all this beautiful land will ruin that and ruin the are... depreciating house value and damaging the local quality of life. Making everyone's lives more miserable.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Jane Rothern	Response-00042	Should not be built on. We need to keep our green spaces. Would be a much better idea to plant trees in the land to help the environment.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Jane Shepherd	Response-01333	Need to protect this. Need to ensure biodiversity. Why are Derby and Derbyshire not looking at using brown belt sites? Old factories, disused shops etc rather than digging up green spaces
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Jayne Bennett	Response-01519	This area separates us from Spondon and Ockbrook and is one of the reasons that I purchased my house as I like living in a village and the views of open space. It is already a narrow piece of land which would become an even more narrow area should the development be allowed to go ahead. I believe that sufficient land has been identified for the provision of current housing in more suitable areas.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Jennifer Sutton	Response-00518	The proposal fundamentally contradicts the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the clearly stated five purposes of Green Belt. This site is Green Belt, which the NPPF protects ?to prevent urban sprawl and safeguard the countryside.? Labour nationally pledged to protect the Green Belt ? reclassifying it as ?safeguarded? land is a sleight of hand and a political betrayal. True sustainable planning starts with brownfield reuse, not expansion into protected land. he Borough should prioritise brownfield redevelopment ? like Stanton Ironworks ? before sacrificing green space. These sites are harder to develop, but more sustainable and in line with both the Core Strategy (2025) and the NPPF?s brownfield-first policy (Para 119).
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Julie Margaret Smith	Response-01090	There should be no housing in the Green Belt. It would compromise the distance between the Borough/County boundary and the city of Derby. We do not want to be absorbed by the city; this proposal, if granted, would set a precedent and soon there would be no Green Belt at all. It is also vital that we protect the Green Belt for ecological reasons, including the protection of wildlife and agriculture.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	kelvin cross	Response-01187	What is the point of having a green belt, which was created with considered due care, to take into consideration/restrict inappropriate future develeopment if all you are going to do is ignore it anyway ? Where is the information collated as part of impact assesments, on the use of already existing brownfield sites ?
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Ken Hardy	Response-00928	This is greenbelt land which was farmed but has clearly been left to make it look suitable for development, there are other area's where houses could be built to help towards the housing targets for example : the old Borrowws site, the Wilmot Arms site and the garage site in the center of the village.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Kevin Highton	Response-00506	Never build on green belt
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Kevin Palmer	Response-01894	The land west of Borrowwash is farmland in the Green Belt, and therefore development should not be allowed unless there are special circumstances. It has traditionally been left as long as I can remember (72 years) as an open gap between Spondon and Borrowwash to prevent urban sprawl of the two villages and indeed Derby City and Erewash. Previous attempts to develop there have been resisted by local people and turned down by planners. Even with an element of parkland it will still mean that the green boundary between the two communities will be narrowed.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Kirsty Millward	Response-01327	Loss of vital green belt land with long established hedgerows. You should explore unused brownfield sites before destroying our ecosystem.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Kirsty Murray	Response-01003	No one appears to care about the green belt anymore
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Laura Dewsnap	Response-00936	The fundamental aim of green belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. By reallocating the proposed site from green belt land to an area available for development, (grey belt) Borrowwash will have no separation from Spondon and Derby. The site is in a very sensitive part of the Green Belt, being part of a small area separating Erewash villages from the developed areas of Derby City. The few fields between Borrowwash and Spondon protect and retain the individual character of Borrowwash. By taking much of the agricultural land between Borrowwash and Spondon, the remaining land could become unviable leading to further pressure for development. This piece of the Green Belt is long established and people living in Borrowwash greatly appreciate the openness of the agricultural fields to the west of their village.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Lauren Fardoe	Response-00039	Will the remaining green belt be available for housing in time

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Lesley Eccles	Response-00814	Presumably this is currently green belt so we will have less now
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Lesley Young	Response-00902	Green belt was established for good reasons so why are they now being ignored. There needs to be a break between borrowwash and Spondon.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Lewis Sutton	Response-00415	The proposal fundamentally contradicts the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the clearly stated five purposes of Green Belt. Under the NPPF, Green Belt land is to be protected from inappropriate development unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. The proposed allocation for 280 homes on 14 hectares at West of Borrowwash contradicts multiple key aims of Green Belt policy and raises significant concerns. The development site is currently designated as Green Belt, which serves critical functions: preventing urban sprawl, safeguarding the countryside from encroachment, and preserving the setting and character of nearby settlements. Releasing this land for development undermines the permanence and purpose of the Green Belt, especially when alternative brownfield sites or lower-quality land have not been exhausted.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Lindsay Hodson	Response-01434	Completely reject the plans to build on any green belt land. Breaston has derelict warehouses etc. Why not knock them down and build there. Do not ruin the environment unnecessarily.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Lynda Gamble	Response-00910	As more and more land is taken for house building it won't be long before the concept of green belt land means absolutely nothing at all. Wouldn't it be awful if all towns and villages just became one giant sprawling housing estate with no apparent boundaries or green spaces to distinguish one area from the next? That is the way things appear to be turning out around here with these new housing developments planned.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Mandy Dickens	Response-00590	This is prized greenbelt land between Erewash and Derby and as such should not be built on
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Margaret Irene Wheatley	Response-00915	The Greenbelt needs to be preserved to protect the Villages identity.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Mark Fearn	Response-00507	The building of houses on vital green belt area will be detrimental to local wildlife and ecosystems which already struggle with the growing building projects in nearby areas.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Mary-Jo McDermott	Response-01437	This land is designated Green Belt for good reason. It provides a buffer against urban sprawl, but more importantly, it offers sanctuary to wildlife, including raptors that rely on these open fields for both feeding and breeding. Building on green belt land sets a dangerous precedent, eroding protections designed to preserve nature. Once developed, this habitat cannot be recovered. It would lead to irreversible harm to the environment, the wildlife, and the identity of the area.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Matt Harvey	Response-01312	This is our only green belt between Borrowwash and Spondon. Every effort should be made to build elsewhere first and protect this green belt.
	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Maxwell Sutton	Response-01093	Max aged 5 loves the greenery and fields of Borrowwash, without this we may as well live in the city.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Middleton	Response-00893	I thought it was green belt, either way its a lovely walking area
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Mike Casartelli	Response-01211	Brown belt before green belt. Before long we will lose all of our green spaces.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Mrs Kay Rigby	Response-00876	This has always been green belt and should be protected from this housing estate
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Mrs M McCroft	Response-00532	This area is supposed to be green belt?
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Mr Timothy Shepherd	Response-01334	Green Belt land needs to be protected. No green Belt land should be sacrificed while there are still alternative sites that are not being redeveloped. More city sites should be developed where shops have closed and are empty in recent years.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Neil Raistrick	Response-01365	The land to the west of Borrowwash is considered as part of Green Belt; the Erewash Green Belt Review (page 79) is being very disingenuous by suggesting the current housing along between Derby / Nottingham Road should define the westerly boundary of Borrowwash, this is a single row of housing along a road as the mority of the housing that defines this boundary are on Victoria Road.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Nicholas Parr	Response-01253	This piece of land was declared Green Belt with a classification of 3a so is ideal for livestock and crops and therefore should never be offered for housing. Any building on this land would lead to CONURBATION with the village being extended too closely to Derby City boundary. Previous planning applications have been unanimously rejected on the above grounds plus, a full survey of the land was conducted and found that the village simply does not have the infrastructure to support the development. This was before the sites that were the Burrows/William Barron's house, Wilmot Arms, Harrington Avenue etc were granted permission to build! The council should only be using Brown sites for more housing in the borough with an emphasis on affordable housing! There must be many vacant properties in the towns that could be converted to housing without impacting on the Green Belt.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Nick Coates	Response-00393	Need to protect green belt land
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Nicola Ashton	Response-00081	This has been classified as green belt and was agreed by council last time this was proposed. We need to preserve our green belt as a fantastic source of habitat for our local wildlife, if we lose these animals we will never be able to get them back. The green belt is so important for people health and well-being, if we build on it where is our food going to grown , trees take in so much Co2 out of our atmosphere and provide homes for wildlife they are amazing
	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	P. Hart	Response-00623	Loss of this green wedge will be most felt by people living on the edge of the area.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Paul and Dawn Davison	Response-01804	The divide between Spondon and Borrowwash would be closer to becoming just one area.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Paul Barker	Response-00800	All this proposed site should be classed as green belt as this has been used for growing crops up until this year.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.12	West of Borrowash	Green Belt	Peter John Ball	Response-00703	The area is an important part of the Greenbelt separating the City of Derby from villages in Erewash. It is the only piece of agricultural land between the village of Borrowash and the centre of Derby City. On previous appeals against development of this land, planning inspectors have refused development as it would destroy the open nature of the area between Borrowash and Spondon. The proposed park will not give that openness that is so vital to the character of the land. There are other areas of land in the Derby and Nottingham Greenbelt in Erewash that would not have the same impact as building on the land west of Victoria Avenue. While the development will spoil the views of the residents on Victoria Avenue, that is not the main reason for my objection. The development of this land will remove the last agricultural separation of Borrowash from Spondon. The land is graded as 3a, which is above average for UK agricultural land and should be kept for agriculture and not be developed.
	West of Borrowash	Green Belt	P Fisher	Response-01175	We need to protect our green spaces, before there are none left.
1.12	West of Borrowash	Green Belt	Philip Archer	Response-01392	I'm concerned about building on the green belt however this is not prime agricultural land as it is very wet with poor drainage so in principle I am happy with this site. However it should be noted to maintain the boundary on the western side as per the recommendations
1.12	West of Borrowash	Green Belt	Phil Self	Response-00759	That is a large walking area for people and for wildlife to thrive
1.12	West of Borrowash	Green Belt	Raoul Pinkney	Response-01457	The proposed housing development and park would take up the entire green belt separating Derby City from Borrowash village. Without this green belt Borrowash would become part of the Derby urban sprawl and lose its identity as a village. The Green Belt is also vital for biodiversity and wildlife. It is agricultural grade land which could be used for food production, as it has done in the past.
1.12	West of Borrowash	Green Belt	Ray Kirk	Response-01378	It appears the term Green Belt means nothing nowadays, it looks like its all about money and housing anyone.!!!
1.12	West of Borrowash	Green Belt	Rebecca Peach	Response-00404	The reason we moved here was for our health benefits and building on more and more green belts is disgraceful to the local area.
	West of Borrowash	Green Belt	Richard hodgkinson	Response-00530	We object strongly to the buildings on green belt and the disappearance of Borrowash as an individual village
1.12	West of Borrowash	Green Belt	Robert Mee	Response-01504	My main reason for objecting to these developments is that I do not believe that the criteria set out in the NPPF has been met justifying any encroachment into the Green Belt at this time. The Core Strategy and this Amendment are developed in order to meet the housing targets allocated to the council by central government. I do not believe that the number of houses required by government constitutes, in itself, the ?exceptional circumstances? which are required under the Framework. This is particularly so in view of there being no published objective basis for the numbers allocated to each authority. The term ?exceptional circumstances? does include ?instances where an authority cannot meet its identified need for homes?. The waiting list for social housing in the general area might suggest that this is the case, but I do not accept that these plans will go far to address this issue ? the vast majority of the planned housing allocations are not even for affordable housing, let alone social housing. Additionally, I do not remember seeing evidence that Erewash has specifically quantified local (i.e. Erewash) housing needs. I also do not believe that much, if any, of the Green Belt selected for development would fit the definition of ?Grey Belt?. As a concept, I can support the idea of Grey Belt as originally reported, i.e. pieces of land within the Green Belt which have previously been developed ? indeed, I can think of a few locally, though they are all fairly small. I find the arguments that I have heard over distances between the edge of Derby and the edge of other towns, and how these distances will still be maintained, extremely spurious. The Green Belt in its entirety exists to prevent Nottingham and Derby from merging ? while building on any of these sites does not immediately make the two cities any closer to each other, it does reduce the green space between the two cities, which is precisely what the Green Belt was established to prevent. The Green Belt is a regional initiative, covering two counties and several local authorities. With Erewash having such a high proportion of its land earmarked as Green Belt it is incumbent on the region as a whole to find a solution to the housing shortage, rather than to expect our authority to have to sacrifice its green spaces.
1.12	West of Borrowash	Green Belt	Sarah Cresswell	Response-01206	The proposed allocation completely contradicts the Green Belt Policy within The National Planning Policy Framework - "The fundamental aim of Green Belt Policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence." The land west of Borrowash plays a critical role in maintaining the physical and visual separation between Derby City and the settlements within Erewash. The area in question is one of the narrowest sections of Green Belt between Derby and the wider Erewash Borough. The proposed development would not only compromise the openness of the Green Belt but would also materially contribute to the coalescence of Borrowash with the urban edge of Derby, undermining the purpose of the Green Belt in a fundamental and irreversible way.
1.12	West of Borrowash	Green Belt	Sarah McAuslan	Response-01248	Our green belt is precious and it's provides the future for our children to enjoy. By having villages become towns we remove all the amazing reason green belt was created in the first place. We need it for wildlife and fresh air . We cannot destroy our villages . Greenbelt rules must remain
1.12	West of Borrowash	Green Belt	Simon Shaw	Response-01152	Green belt building is against the NPPF. It's much easier (cheaper) to build on green belt land, but we should not be doing it, especially if we respect our land and our children. It's very shameful what ahs been proposed.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Stephen Peat	Response-01793	According to the Daily Express article, Erewash Core Strategy and the Amendment Strategy could see the merger of Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire into a major City. The development in Erewash could see Derby and Nottingham become the largest cities in the UK outside London and Birmingham. The Daily Express listed the area between Derby and Nottingham, including land at the location, which would lead to the merger of the two cities, forming one new conurbation. In the plan, over 280 houses could be built on green belt land, leaving no greenbelt between Spondon and Borrowwash, which would affect wildlife in the area, and with reduced Greenbelt Land available. The loss of land would affect the greenbelt's lung capacity to reduce air pollution and climate change. This includes reducing agricultural land for food production, and given the effects of climate change on future farm yields, has been reduced across the UK and Europe. When the government announced the grey belt for new developments of houses, it was land that had been built on, including disused homes that had not been occupied for 20+ years, farm buildings, and old industrial land reclaimed by nature. The land west of Borrowwash has been farmed for 250 years in a crop rotation with year 1 wheat crops, year 2 Barley, year 3 animal feed or beans, and a fallow year to help improve the soil for cropping in the following year. When you look at the history of the land at Borrowwash Library, this land would not be classed as a grey belt area because, according to the history of Spondon, Ockbrook and Borrowwash, the land has been farmed to grow crops for the food industry from bread making to producing straw to feed horses and animals within the East Midlands. In conclusion, when you look at the pros and cons of this plan development, I think this location is unsuitable because it will merge Derby and Nottingham into a new conurbation covering the East Midlands. The greenbelt has been classed as a grey belt, but when you examine the site, there has been no grey belt terminology because the site has been farmland for hundreds of years. In the introduction of my first part of the letter, highlight that this location is not a grey belt but a greenbelt zone. For example, when engineers examine the land area, they would notice that this area has been farmed for over 250 years. There is no evidence of a building constructed on the site or housing of animals or farm equipment. This means this land is a greenbelt and not a grey belt in the land identification of the land listed in the introduction and Section A
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Steve Brown	Response-01153	WHY?
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Steven Hoolan	Response-00912	This is the last remaining area of Greenbelt between Spondon and Borrowwash. It is criminal to build on greenbelt. It is designated greenbelt for a reason
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Sue Higginbottom	Response-01143	Leave our green belt alone! You are ruining our community our Children's welfare and countless other things!
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Suzanne Prior	Response-00907	The green belt land to the west of the area is an important corridor for the environment. The impact of new housing with all the construction vehicles and noise is going to have a significant impact on the wildlife in this area.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Tanya caldbeck	Response-00917	Should not be built on greenbelt land
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	T McKinnon	Response-01368	Corridor for wildlife is being narrowed. Borrowwash in danger of being absorbed into Derby whilst Ockbrook with its wider gap between village and city gets a park! Seems very unfair, Why not reverse this design, convert the field west of Borrowwash into a park, and use some of the much larger open space west of Ockbrook for development.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Green Belt	Wayne Henderson	Response-01207	The designated green belt land in and around the villages of Borrowwash, Risely, Draycott, and Breaston serves the communities that live in those settlements in many ways. The land naturally plays host to thriving wildlife and biodiversity which often spills over into the gardens and green spaces in those settlements. This in turn gives the inhabitants benefits of positive mental health and wellbeing. It's a well known fact that natural spaces and places play a huge role in people's quality of life. The green belt and green wedges help to promote individual identity between each settlement and yet helps to weave a common thread and interest in the environment that we live in. Local initiatives such as village in bloom? bring people from different villages together forming a common goal of wanting to improve the place where we live?. There is no doubt that there is a need for housing nationwide, but it should not take the place of green belt and wedges. Careful due consideration needs to be applied to ensure that urban sprawl does not take precedence over nature and its precious wildlife. Due process needs to also be applied when identifying fertile farm land to prevent it easily falling into the lap of developers just because the landowner wants to cash in?. The Core Strategy Policy? in my opinion needs to observe the need for housing development in conjunction with those communities and their quality of life it wishes to impose on. As inhabitants of Erewash we place our trust in those making very important decisions that will affect our quality of life and wellbeing, and not just bow to that that Central government dictates.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Adele Pinkney	Response-01456	Our local GP surgeries are already stretched beyond capacity. I believe they objected to similar development plans ten or so years ago on such grounds, and accessing appointments for current patients has become much more difficult since then. The local dentist has not had any NHS spaces for several years, only taking new patients on for private treatment.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Alex Lowe	Response-00707	We already struggle to get appointments at the Borrowwash park medical site and it's 2 minutes walk from our house. Capacity will not keep up
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Alice Fitzpatrick	Response-00543	The practice I use is at capacity. I can usually get an appointment eventually but any further load and this will not be the case. The other practice however this is not the case. Everyone I speak with who is registered complains that they cannot get through on the phone let alone get an appointment! This practice is causing more stress than it is easing! Ironical that the landowner for this proposed site is or was connected with this practice. As you can see above we have very limited healthcare facilities now and certainly cannot accommodate any further strain.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Amy Brown	Response-00514	The 2 local doctor surgeries are bursting at the seams and many residents are finding it super difficult to even get through to a GP let alone see one. We are a village made up of many elderly residents alongside Ockbrook and some of these are not getting access to the care they need. People are moving surgeries purely due to the impact already being had on our surgeries and this isn't acceptable. To bring in a whole new neighbourhood of people to an area where these surgeries will take a further beating is madness. Whilst homing people is super important and one I advocate for, I don't believe taking away from current residents is a fair option. We also have a small dental surgery alongside an eye surgery which again would not cope with the impact of a wider community. Borrowwash is not in a position to be extended with the facilities we have available.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Ann Daykin	Response-01453	Borrowwash has two surgeries and one dentist. Both surgeries are oversubscribed and find patients complain that it's difficult to get an appointment. The dentist practice is also struggling with patient numbers.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Anne Anderson	Response-00980	It is virtually impossible to even get through to The Park Medical Practice on the telephone never mind get an appointment. I see the Surgery have applied to extend into the house next door but are not going to increase their staff so what is the point.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Anthony Clarke	Response-00559	What a joke an additional 280 houses , average 2.5 people per house. Both doctors surgeries already at full capacity, can't get an appointment as it is now
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Ashley Dunn	Response-01560	The ability to get a doctor's appointment in Borrowwash via Park Medical Practice or Overdale is already incredibly difficult and frustrating for everyone. More houses would exacerbate this unacceptably.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Barry Shaw	Response-01482	It is currently hard to impossible to see NHS services, this will be exacerbated.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Breanne Rodda	Response-00708	I can never get an appointment at Park Medical Practice Borrowwash as it stands. I routinely can't get an appointment or get sent to Chaddesden . This would just make the problem worse
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Britton	Response-00877	Trying to get a doctors appointment is already extremely difficult, the surgery phone lines are frequently full to capacity and people queue daily to wait for opening- the proposed site will only add to the pressures and lack of appointments
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Carol Shaw	Response-00797	The strategy does not specify enhancements to local healthcare facilities to accommodate the increased population. The influx of new residents will put pressure on existing struggling healthcare services, leading to longer wait times and reduced access to care
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Catherine Casartelli	Response-01428	The doctors are already overstretched with the current village population. There is only 1 NHS dentist and they are full to capacity.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Catherine Fox Charlton	Response-00659	Difficult to get medical appointments for current population and the chemist has difficulty servicing pharmaceuticals
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Chris Archer	Response-01142	The two doctor surgeries and dentist surgery are already over subscribed and appointments are impossible to get at the minute with the population as it is without increasing this issue with a larger population
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Christine Cole	Response-01254	There are already reports of the local health care system creaking under the capacity to cope? What additional costs does this put on that system?
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Craig Hydes	Response-00782	The local NHS dentist is full to capacity, and I have been on the waiting list for several years.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Dale Harlow	Response-00887	The doctors has applied for an extension but is under staffed regardless
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Daniel Lang	Response-00322	The local GP practices are already massively oversubscribed. It is virtually impossible to get an appointment. There will be a desperate need to bring in another surgery or expand the current one
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	David House	Response-01489	The local GP practices are unlikely to cope with the increase in numbers of people.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	David Modrovic	Response-00803	Doctors facilities are already pushed to the brink!
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Deborah young	Response-01306	We can't get in the doctors now . What would it be like with another 500 + people . Dentist is full .
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Denise Ball	Response-01291	Borrowwash is well served with services including doctor's surgeries, chemists, a dentist, library, junior and infant schools and a shopping area supplying most daily needs. The size of the proposed development would put pressure on these services. The Practitioners Surgery on Derby Road is already reported to be at full capacity and is being extended to cope with existing demand for health care. There would need to be further expansion of services to cope with a population increase from the houses in this development.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Denise Illsley	Response-00056	We have two medical practices in Borrowwash and it is becoming increasingly difficult to get appointments to see a GP or nurse. It's near impossible to get a blood test. Not everyone has transport to enable them to travel to get a test. The situation has just got worse and this will make it even more difficult.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Dianne Simmons	Response-00401	The Dr's Surgery on Victoria Avenue and Derby Road already struggle to provide appointments, with over 200 new homes it will be impossible to get an appointment and with an aging population in Borrowwash and Ockbrook this is very concerning
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Dr Sarah Mee	Response-01320	Emergency secondary access to the proposed allocation site must be robustly designed otherwise access to emergency services will remain a major concern for the people living in the proposed development of 280 houses. Access to healthcare facilities is already extremely restricted for existing residents due to staffing issues and size of the GP practices serving Borrowwash and the nearest A and E and other secondary care facilities. Increasing the housing allocation safely must be accompanied by increasing the access to healthcare facilities and be proven to not just add further strain on existing resources.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Elizabeth	Response-01215	Dr's are already over prescribed
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Ellen Young	Response-01357	We have 2 GP surgeries. These struggle to process the current population of Borrowwash without an extra influx of people. As a patient at Overdale Medical Practice, I recently struggled to get an appointment as they were fully booked. Likewise, people often voice their frustration with not being able to book appointments at both Medical Practices on the community Facebook group. The dentist often stops accepting NHS patients as they're full. If residents of the affordable housing require dental appointments then they'll likely need NHS appointments due to the high cost of appointments.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Emma Gregory	Response-01454	Great difficulty in getting appointments now. With 268 new houses, to say 4 people to a new house, that is approximately 1064 people needing to be registered to a new GP practice. Even though Park Medical Practice in Borrowwash has an extended building, they will still have to get more staff when as we know it is not easy to recruit.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Eve barker	Response-00443	I've rang 5 times this week to get a doctors appointment and each time, no appointments available. Too many people, too few spaces
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Francesca Hope	Response-00528	Our 2 GP surgeries are already full to capacity and obtaining an appointment is a struggle without additional residents to include also
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Gillian Fitzpatrick	Response-00482	Our doctor's practices are full and one of the practices already has a very poor reputation for answering the phone and providing appointments.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Gillian Hitchcock	Response-00446	Wow health care is a massive problem locally, lack of appointments, so unless a new facility is being built it?s going to be awful
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Hayley Dexter	Response-00519	The doctors are already struggling and patients can't get appointments!! This will impact this hugely in a negative way
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Helena Lucas	Response-00644	I have worked at the local GP Practice on Nottingham Road in Borrowwash, It is always fully booked with appointments. One way to facilitate increased numbers of patients would be to increase the number of appointments buy reducing appointment times and/or increasing the number of appointments per GP or other Healthcare Professionals. This leads to burnout and staff leaving the role. I understand that the surgery is extending to the neighbouring property, however increasing and retaining staff numbers would remain a challenge. This will put Borrowwash Residence at risk, as access to the GP surgeries will become more difficult. Furthermore, this puts pressure on other healthcare services affecting patient outcomes.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Helen Pearce	Response-01550	The doctors and dentists are already oversubscribed. No new provision is being made for the influx of new homeowners.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Henrietta heron	Response-01354	Getting a doctors appointment is already very difficult add into this another 200 houses with multiple occupants it will add extra pressure
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Iain Pendry	Response-01188	Healthcare provision in Borrowwash is already very significant stretched, with it being almost impossible to get a Dr or Dental appointment at the local practices. Whilst I support the additional houses in the villages, very serious consideration needs to be given to how the additional population will not further degrade these already stretched health services. I would expect to see statements from these local health providers laying out how they will meet these challenges, and what support is to be provided to them to enable them to do so.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Ian Bloor	Response-00778	It is already difficult to get appointments at the local doctors surgeries , an influx of so many new households would make this extremely difficult
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Ian Frearson	Response-01267	The proposal would require the provision of an additional health facility for Doctors and Dentist practices without which the existing provision would be overwhelmed
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Ian Wood	Response-00987	Additional housing will inevitably have a detrimental effect on the current inhabitants being able to access doctors and other healthcare provision.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Jacky Kinirey	Response-01209	Our NHS is over stretched at the moment we need more local services for example doctors, dentists, facilities for the elderly to go to,so they do not feel isolated or alone. Building more houses without planning long term for an ageing population is shortsighted and irresponsible.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Jaime Grant	Response-00512	As with schools, how has the impact of these homes been considered? What solutions have been provided?
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	James Dean	Response-00553	This will certainly have dire consequences to our local health care. Our local GP practices are set up to deal with a relatively small town and are already stretched with long wait times... more houses will be a mistake and impact the community in a negative way. Not to mention the fact it is already impossible to sign up to an NHS dentist anywhere locally.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Jane Rothern	Response-00042	Our doctors are already stretched and this will get even worse with another 500+ residents in the village.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Jane Shepherd	Response-01333	I have huge problems whenever I need a doctor's appointment. This will only be exaggerated by more families settling in the area. As for NHS dentists, will these also be made available. As with education the NHS budgets are already stretched, how will these cope? It's a nightmare trying to get a doctors appointment at this moment in time. Will extra doctors be part of the plan? Also NHS dentists? ?
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Jayne Bennett	Response-01519	Doctors and dentists are at full capacity and people living in the village may have the inconvenience of having to go elsewhere.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Jennifer Sutton	Response-00518	Healthcare services are already overburdened. Borrowwash currently lacks an NHS dentist and faces excessive GP waiting times. There are no proposals in the policy to add or fund health services. The strategy relies on Section 106 contributions ? but with multiple strategic developments across the borough, this stretches resources thinner, not wider. It directly contravenes Strategic Policy 1.1 (Point 8) of ensuring sufficient healthcare contributions.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Joanne	Response-01252	Have you tried getting a doctors appointment in Borrowwash???
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Jodie Brown	Response-01213	The local GP surgeries are already oversubscribed, getting an appointment is near on impossible
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	John & Anna Mead	Response-00772	It is difficult to get to see your gp at the moment without more people coming
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Judith Anderson	Response-00934	Our present doctor surgeries are already over subscribed, this will worsen with increased number of inhabitants.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Julie Margaret Smith	Response-01090	Healthcare provision is underfunded everywhere and the NHS is in crisis. Additional housing of this amount will put increasing pressure on local services, leading to worse provision for all.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	kelvin cross	Response-01187	Where is the viewable impact assessment that has been carried out(?) in relation to the effect of another 1000'ish people on the already stretched local medical services ?
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Kerrie Illsley	Response-01340	Borrowwash is at capacity for healthcare facilities.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Kirsty Millward	Response-01327	Both doctors surgeries in Borrowwash are already at full capacity and are incredibly difficult to get appointments at. I have had several instances where I have been unable to get my 10 month old to see a gp for several days, causing me resort to seeing help at emergency care. Adding more people to the village will add further demand for our two gp services that are already overburdened and struggling to support the local community. The dental practice in the village is also full and not accepting any nhs patients. Adding more residents to the village will only make access to a dentist more difficult for the existing residents. You will need to accommodate the new patients or build the houses elsewhere.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Kirsty Murray	Response-01003	It is already almost impossible to get a doctors appointment , unless you know weeks in advance you are going to be ill, so ofcourse more families will have a negative impact.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Laura Dewsnap	Response-00936	There is currently one dentist in Borrowwash and they are currently not accepting new NHS patients. There are 2 GP surgeries in Borrowwash but unfortunately, it is very difficult to get an appointment at either. There are long call waiting times to speak to reception and it is difficult to get a place in the call queue in the first place. I understand that one of the surgeries is currently planning an extension to make the building larger but unfortunately, the building they already have is not filled to capacity as there are not enough GPs employed there to serve the client database they have. An extension to the building will not generate more appointments, it will just generate more space. There are not sufficient healthcare facilities in Borrowwash to serve the existing population. An increase in the population will put further strain on the services currently offered.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Lauren Fardoe	Response-00039	With 280 houses where do the council propose they register for doctors ?
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Lesley Eccles	Response-00814	Will impact on both doctors surgeries and will make it even harder to get an appointment
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Lesley Young	Response-00902	We are really struggling to get any appointments at the Park Medical faculty and they are clearly unable to take any more people. Overdale is the same.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Lewis Sutton	Response-00415	Local GP surgeries and healthcare facilities are already under pressure. An influx of residents from 280 new homes (plus future expansion) would stretch resources further, potentially reducing care quality and accessibility for existing residents. Currently I have personally been unable to get a doctors appointment for days. Even with a slight expansion to meet current needs this number of extra people will destroy any capacity.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Lindsay Hodson	Response-01434	Both Borrowwash doctors are very busy. I have moved from one to the other to try and get better service but it did not help. More doctors would be absolutely necessary.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Lucas Hodson	Response-01435	The only 2 local doctors are in borrowwash so by bringing more people into the area there will be more pressure on the doctors than there already is.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Mandy Dickens	Response-00590	It is already nigh on impossible to get a Doctors appointment in this area. The additional people coming to this area would make the situation impossible
			Margaret Irene Wheatley	Response-00915	Both Doctors are struggling with the needs of the Village as it stands.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Mark Birkinshaw	Response-00046	With availability of appointments almost impossible to secure at The Park Medical Centre how will this be addressed to ensure that all residents have the correct levels of access to medical care required and if this facility is at or close to capacity then where will 280-1000 more residents be supported?
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Mark Fearn	Response-00507	Local medical practices (doctors and dentists) are already nearing or are at (in the case of the local dentists) at full NHS capacity meaning not only can it not provide a service to new residents but it will diminish what little current ones get.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Mark Green	Response-00940	Assuming that the majority of these homes (and the ones at the rear of Hawthorne Avenue,) will have at least 2 people living in them, will mean that additional GP healthcare facilities will be needed as the current services are already struggling with an ever increasing demand. On the current plan, no such facilities have been accounted for.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Mary-Jo McDermott	Response-01437	GP surgeries and dental practices in the area are already stretched, with long waiting times. This development would add further pressure, compromising access to essential health services.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Matt Harvey	Response-01312	I can't get in now never mind building another 100+ houses! No chance.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Middleton	Response-00893	Already cannot get to see a doctor
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Mike Casartelli	Response-01211	The medical and dental practices in the village are already under incredible strain, which is impacting the quality of service being offered. A development this size will only worsen the situation.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Mr N D NICHOLLS	Response-01192	It is virtually impossible to get a doctors appointment now
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Mrs.A.Pickard	Response-00802	Health care is stretched as it is, further development of housing to the extent being voiced surely requires further services being included for new practices to be built.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Mrs Kay Rigby	Response-00876	All our GP's are full with trouble getting an appointment now so how can they cope with all the extra patients they will have to take on
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Mrs M McCroft	Response-00532	Doctors can't cope with what they have at the moment without hundreds of more people
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Mrs Sheila Hardington	Response-01232	GP Practices in Borrowwash are difficult enough to access for appointments without extra potential patients.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Mr Timothy Shepherd	Response-01334	The local doctors practices are already under strain. It is already difficult to obtain doctors or nurse appointments. The local practices could not cope with so many more patients.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Nathan Thomson	Response-01328	Already hard to get medial appointments due to the numbers registered, adding more houses would require the need for more providers
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Nicholas Parr	Response-01253	Healthcare provision is a challenge nationwide. Additional housing of this amount will put increasing pressure on local services, leading to worse provision for all.
			Nick Coates	Response-00393	Limited health care around the area

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Nicola Ashton	Response-00081	You can't get an appointment at our local doctors, dentist now as they are so overwhelmed with the amount of residents registered now
			P. Hart	Response-00623	It is difficult to get appointments already.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Paul Barker	Response-00800	Doctor appointments are already difficult to arrange without more people trying to access the service
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Peter HINKLEY	Response-00775	Existing GP Services will come under additional strain I assume - I do not have any numbers.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Peter Howell	Response-00829	no new doctors surgery current at bursting point
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	P Fisher	Response-01175	It is hard enough to get a GP appointment as it is, without adding several hundred more patients to practice lists.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Phil Adcock	Response-01488	These services are already stretched to our detriment.
			Phil Self	Response-00759	More unnecessary queues and problems for doctors and dentists, just ruin it for everyone why not !
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Raoul Pinkney	Response-01457	The GPs surgeries in Borrowwash are already struggling to provide an accessible service to the current population. The demand from a large increase in homes in the area would be too much for the surgeries to absorb. The one dentist in the village has not taken on new NHS patients for some years
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Ray Kirk	Response-01378	Unless another doctors surgery is going to be built you could be looking at another 1000+ people putting pressure on an already pressured system.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Richard hodgkinson	Response-00530	Healthcare in the village is good at the moment but additional housing will threaten this
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Sarah Davies	Response-01137	I understand demand for the NHS and services are high everywhere but it's almost impossible to gain an appointment at the local surgeries. This would be unimaginable if we then had hundreds more new patients. The local pharmacy will also be impacted yes, at present there's normally a 20/30 minute wait for a prescription, often the stock isn't available due to demand so a wait of a day or two is often expected. No room in the dentist for NHS patients, this has been the case for years.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Sarah McAuslan	Response-01248	We struggle already to book appointments at our local surgery and parking at the surgery is minimal . It can take over 200 calls to make an appointment. We can't add more staff to the surgery as there is no capacity for individuals to visit via parking
			Simon Shaw	Response-01152	I can't get an appointment now....
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	sophy peacock	Response-00678	Limited access to local health due to over population anyway, this will make it worse
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Steph Archer	Response-01140	It is already incredibly difficult to get a GP appointment at our local surgery's. I often have to travel out of borrowwash for a doctors appointment which is not the surgery's fault, they are over subscribed.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Stephen Peat	Response-01793	(1) In the approval of the Spondon Wood Development, there have been hundreds of complaints against the Spondon Wood application regarding the lack of health, GP and Dental services within and around the Spondon and Borrowwash areas. (2) In our neighbourhood, all medical services in the Spondon and Borrowwash area are oversubscribed, with new patients unable to register with a GP when moving to a new house, compared to older established neighbourhoods. (3) Borrowwash and Spondon have no dental services to cope with the present population, and Erewash planning will need to set up plans with the developer and NHS Derbyshire to construct a new dental and GP practice to cope with the housing squeeze within the Borrowwash and Ockbrook area. An estimated cost to build a new GP and Dental Practice would be over £4 m to cope with the housing developments planned under the amended Erewash Amendment Core Strategy. (4) When you examine the full costs in all sections, the total cost could exceed £30 million to cover Schools, GP, Dental Services, flood prevention and protection, including changes to the highway to reduce traffic congestion and air pollution affecting Spondon and Borrowwash.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Steve Brown	Response-01153	Any provisions for this in proposal already difficult to get appointments.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Steven Hoolan	Response-00912	Currently impossible to get a doctors appointment in Borrowwash. No dentist taking on new NHS patients
			Sue Higginbottom	Response-01143	God help us! Getting a gp appointment is near impossible as it is! How is it going to be if you build more houses!
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Suzanne Prior	Response-00907	As a resident of Borrowwash it is difficult to get a doctor's appointment, you could be waiting a month for a telephone appointment. The dentist has no capacity for NHS patients. The chemist is overwhelmed to the point where it can take a week to get medication once you have handed over your prescription. An increase in population is going to make these services unavailable for the majority.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Tanya caldbeck	Response-00917	No GP places services under pressure
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Healthcare Facilities	Virginia Locke	Response-00580	I can't get an appointment as it is
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Landscape	Alex Lowe	Response-00707	This will significantly reduce the one small part of non-residential land that a significant number of houses already look out on to. In turn reducing the value of the houses and surrounding area
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Landscape	Alice Fitzpatrick	Response-00543	The question of landscape is irrelevant - there should be no housing and the landscape should remain as it is!
			Barry Shaw	Response-01482	People live here because the way it looks and feels, once it becomes basically Mackworth estate people will leave.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Landscape	Bella Kelsey	Response-00739	The area is a lovely little village - new builds always ruin an area
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Landscape	Breanne Rodda	Response-00708	The area of land is one of the last bits of nice greenery that a lot of houses can look out on to. It will massively impact our enjoyment and house prices if built over - especially as it will likely be a building site for a long time
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Landscape	Carmen Buckley	Response-00737	This area acts as a much needed barrier between Spondon and Borrowwash. I bought my house because of the Green Belt land to the back meant I could be closer to nature and enjoy the west setting sun. Hedgerows are in decline and these fields serve as the perfect habitat for migrating birds and winter visitors inc redwings and field fares.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Landscape	Carol Shaw	Response-00797	The development will alter the landscape character of the area, transforming open green spaces into residential areas. This change will negatively impact the visual appeal and natural beauty of the countryside surrounding Borrowwash.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.12	West of Borrowwash	landscape	Craig Hydes	Response-00782	The change of landscape will significantly impact Borrowwash, west. The new house builds will no doubt promote social housing or provide accommodation for legal immigrants. This will lower the quality of people in the area as Derby City has quickly deteriorated over a few short years. The house prices will be heavily impacted driving long time residents away which would leave a bad taste in people's mouth.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	landscape	Dan Pilgrim	Response-00932	Protect green belt areas, avoiding so call eye sores such as affordable housing
1.12	West of Borrowwash	landscape	David Modrovic	Response-00803	I like the view from my house! I don't want to look at more houses!
1.12	West of Borrowwash	landscape	Dr Sarah Mee	Response-01320	Comments related to landscape value of the site relate to the original Greenbelt designation and lack of new evidence to reverse the decision on preserving this site for countryside use of current residents and future generations and concerns about forever altering the village status of Borrowwash.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	landscape	Francesca Hope	Response-00528	We currently have the most beautiful view from our house which will be spoilt to be filled with a building site for years and eventually housing
1.12	West of Borrowwash	landscape	Gillian Fitzpatrick	Response-00482	The question of landscape is irrelevant - there should be no housing and the landscape should remain as it is!
1.12	West of Borrowwash	landscape	Gillian Hitchcock	Response-00446	The landscape is beautiful as fields! I do t wish to look at a concrete jungle
1.12	West of Borrowwash	landscape	Hayley Dexter	Response-00519	Building on this land will make Borrowwash blend into the next village. It will no longer be a village and more like a small town it will replace the natural land that has been there for hundreds of years that is needed
1.12	West of Borrowwash	landscape	Helena Lucas	Response-00644	The new development will cause the disruption of natural habitats, including wildlife corridors, leading to fragmented ecosystems and significantly reduced biodiversity. The construction activities will disturb the soil, leading to erosion and pollution of water sources. Increased Runoff and Flooding The new surfaces such as roads and rooftops increase the amount of rainwater runoff, potentially leading to flooding in certain areas. Nottingham Road and the A52 are already impacted by dangerous flash flooding which will worsen and cause increased risk of collisions, injuries, death and damage to property and roads. The new buildings will alter the visual landscape, impact the privacy of residence living on Victoria Road particularly, and surrounding area. It will affect increased noise levels and light pollution, disrupting wildlife and residence quality of Life further.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	landscape	James Dean	Response-00553	This should be protected at all costs and should be criminal to even consider building on it. Out countryside, open space and green belt is what makes the area so special and what separates us from spondon and the city. Borrowwash feels more rural and building on all this beautiful land will ruin that and ruin the are... depreciating house value and damaging the local quality of life. Making everyone's lives more miserable.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	landscape	Jennifer Sutton	Response-00518	Borrowwash is chosen for its tranquil, rural character. This proposal urbanises pleasant countryside, contradicting the Core Strategy's vision for sustainable, character-respecting growth. Landscapes take centuries to mature ? this would be erased for profit-motivated, uniform housing, typically lacking in architectural value, greenery, or sustainability.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	landscape	Julie Margaret Smith	Response-01090	We need to preserve the narrow, agricultural landscape and footpaths between city and county. Nobody wants their open views to be blighted by more tarmac and monotonous grey buildings, or to lose the freedoms of footpaths in open countryside. The narrow Green Belt is precious and its integrity needs to be preserved.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	landscape	Ken Hardy	Response-00928	Strategic development at this site would undoubtedly alter to a substantial degree the landscape character evident in this part of the Borough, currently an interconnecting network of agricultural fields separating the settlements of Borrowwash and Spondon. Development of the site would have a notable impact on visual amenity to the current appearance consisting of enclosed agricultural fields. The development would have the potential to make a negative impact visually, the thoughtful and creative landscaping of green spaces, creation of new habitat and positive design of new buildings can help create a positive layout. Some properties which back on to the site date back as far as the early-c20th including mine, good master planning and design would be required to minimise the impact of development on the surrounding built environment.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	landscape	Kevin Highton	Response-00506	Enjoy the view at all times, this will be ruined by housing, including the proposed new road
1.12	West of Borrowwash	landscape	Kirsty Murray	Response-01003	If this area has to be built on, it should be of benefit to the village an attraction, not some mini slum
1.12	West of Borrowwash	landscape	Laura Dewsnap	Response-00936	The site is very large compared to the existing settlement. It covers an area the size of the Priorway Estate on the east side of the village. It is also the size of the development to the south of Derby Road bounded by Station Road. It would be a significant increase in the size of Borrowwash village and thus significantly change the landscape. Many of the houses that border this land would have their outlook negatively impacted and many mature hedgerows would be lost.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	landscape	Lesley Young	Response-00902	The fields offer a beautiful quiet lanscape to enjoy and this would disappear. There were plans at one stage to make this area a wild flower area. This would be far more beautiful than housing.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	landscape	Lewis Sutton	Response-00415	Many residents have deliberately chosen to live near open countryside and green space. Development would significantly alter views and character, removing visual access to open fields and reducing the area's tranquillity and rural appeal. This degrades both landscape quality and residential amenity.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	landscape	Maisie Harlow	Response-00963	Borrowwash and Spondon currently have their own identities. Building in-between them will join them up and therefore they will lose their own identities, character and sense of place.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	landscape	Margaret Irene Wheatley	Response-00915	It would be nice to see landscaping in the public areas but it needs to be maintained so that it can be enjoyed for many years to come.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	landscape	Mary-Jo McDermott	Response-01437	The proposed development would permanently scar the rural landscape. These open fields offer natural beauty, historical character, and are an essential part of the area's identity. The loss would be deeply felt by current and future generations. The negative impact of such a development for Victoria Avenue residents cannot be understated - 50% of us have a garden that backs on to these fields. I speak for many when I say this would be disastrous for our collective health and well-being as a community.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Landscape	Mike Casartelli	Response-01211	A development this size cannot have anything but a negative impact on the landscape and will damage the 'village feel' of Borrowwash.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Landscape	Mrs Kay Rigby	Response-00876	We have a lovely view from the back of our house with the greenery and wildlife that would completely disappear with this development
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Landscape	Mrs M McCroft	Response-00532	Need some park land
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Landscape	Mr Timothy Shepherd	Response-01334	Open landscapes should be preserved wherever possible. These areas are important to the well-being of the residents.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Landscape	Nicholas Parr	Response-01253	The landscape should remain as it is now - unchanged!
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Landscape	Nicola Ashton	Response-00081	Borrowwash is a village we are looking at losing our identity and being swallowed up and being part of Derby city. As a resident for over 40 years this is a special village. We need to preserve our green belt and utilise the brown sites for building. Pride park built so many large warehouses and there's so many sitting empty wouldn't it have been better to build homes there when there is an Road infrastructure already in place
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Landscape	Peter John Ball	Response-00703	The open nature of the land to the West of Victoria Avenue is an important landscape adjacent to the village. It should be kept as open land for the enjoyment of the residents of Borrowwash (and Spondon). Housing and the creation of woodland would remove the open nature of the current land use. The Greenbelt area to the south of Derby Road in Borrowwash does not provide that essential open aspect.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Landscape	Sarah Davies	Response-01137	It will change the make up of the village, it will no longer be a village, it will combine spondon with Borrowwash
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Landscape	Steph Archer	Response-01140	We need more greenery not less!!
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Landscape	Steven Hoolan	Response-00912	The landscape will be significantly altered for the worst. There are nit many open spaces left in Borrowwash as it is
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Landscape	Suzanne Prior	Response-00907	The current proposal for the amount of housing and land given to this proposed site will almost merge Borrowwash into Spondon. It is beneficial to have a clear demarcation of boundaries and not merge Derbyshire into Derby city
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Landscape	Tanya caldbeck	Response-00917	Too many buildings around and no green space
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Alex Lowe	Response-00707	The number of houses planned to fit onto the small space of land would change the dynamic of the surrounding area
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Alice Fitzpatrick	Response-00543	No houses please.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Alison Vine	Response-01813	The amenities in the village are already very busy and may not be able to support further housing.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Amy Brown	Response-00514	280 homes!!! Sounds lovely to house that many people but again, the impact on a small village is only going to have poor consequences. The time it would take you to build which in turn affects me in my own home is just frightening to say the least. I have dogs, a young child and their lives too affected. And that is just one household - think of how many others you will affect by installing all of these homes putting strain on our village, our facilities, our green space which we are entitled to have! 280 homes, so let's say 3 people on average in each home - that's nearly 1000 more people. We just don't have the room or capabilities.
			Andrew Hozack	Response-01322	There is already a difficulty in getting a doctors or dentist appointment without adding more people to the waiting list.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Ann Daykin	Response-01453	The number of houses is just too much .The local infrastructure just can't cope with housing on this scale.. Borrowwash has always had a village identity.. the scale of the proposed housing developments will create issues for the local community and resentment towards the residents of the new proposed developments.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Barry Shaw	Response-01482	Far far too many. With a single entry and exit it's amusing it has even been proposed.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Britton	Response-00877	Borrowwash is a village, the number of houses proposed in and around Borrowwash will impact traffic, schools, doctors and other facilities
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Carol Shaw	Response-00797	The number of proposed houses represents a huge additional percentage of the size of the current village. Borrowwash is a small village, and adding 280 homes will significantly increase its size, potentially by a substantial percentage. This significant increase will change village life negatively and permanently. The influx of new residents will alter the close-knit community feel, increase demand on local services, and potentially lead to overdevelopment.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	David Modrovic	Response-00803	No houses wanted here! One is one too many
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Dr Sarah Mee	Response-01320	Although it is the trajectory of travel in modern property development to maximise land use and minimise privacy, 280 houses is a large allocation for the space and surrounding village infrastructure to accommodate safely in terms of emergency access, road safety, and healthcare service provision. Please also see my comments on the flood risk. I am very concerned about the flooding from the site which has been severe enough to close the A6005 after rainfall when the road and particularly that road area at the allocation site access which can become a stream.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Ellen Young	Response-01357	280 houses is a lot of to add to a small village. It's going to feel cramped having so many houses so close to our gardens.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Emma Gregory	Response-01454	Borrowwash is only a small village - 268 houses (approximately) is a lot for a small village. With natural wastage of older people, within the next 10 years there will be a large number of houses becoming available.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Eve barker	Response-00443	The sheer number of houses is insane and not needed or wanted. Already developed sites are available, wilmot site, Burrows yard
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Gary Mortimer	Response-01148	280 houses is extremely high. This would add over 500 cars on the road in the area.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Gillian Fitzpatrick	Response-00482	There should be no housing! That field/ green space needs to be preserved. The proposed remaining green area is insufficient to separate Borrowwash from Spondon in other words the city from the borough!
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Gillian Hitchcock	Response-00446	We don't need any
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Hayley Dexter	Response-00519	Far too many houses for a village that doesn't have enough amenities for the people who already live there

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Helena Lucas	Response-00644	280 house will take approximately 3 years to complete, taking into account possible additional complications such material shortages, weather and unforeseen complication. Taking into account other building projects within the village nearby, the disruption will be unbearable for residence living in and around the village. The scale of the project will bring in potentially 1000 new residence into the village, it will be far too overcrowded putting pressure on the already pressured local services.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Ian Hamilton	Response-01325	The size of of the proposed development is completely unrealistic and would overburden already inadequate infrastructure and services such as roads, dentists and doctors.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	James Dean	Response-00553	No kore houses... it is already over populated for the facilities and space available.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Jane Rotheron	Response-00042	Far too many houses are being proposed. Our village will lose its identity.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Jane Shepherd	Response-01333	A smaller number of houses that are affordable for young people (first time buyers). A proper home 2 or 3 bedrooms with adequate parking, solar panels, electric charging points. Any building should be future proof. Some housing us needed but we should be looking at making of good quality at a decent price rather than always thinking about maximum profit. Some social concern with help from government or councils is needed
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Jennifer Sutton	Response-00518	Scale Relative to Borrowwash Borrowwash currently has approximately 2,800?3,000 homes. An additional 280 homes is nearly a 10% increase in housing stock ? in a single development. This is not ?rounding off? ? it's a major urban-style expansion, out of keeping with the settlement?s scale, identity, and infrastructure capacity. Such a dramatic population increase will strain local services, alter the village?s character, and contribute to urban sprawl, directly conflicting with the NPPF's goal of sustainable, proportional growth. Density and Infrastructure Mismatch The proposed site is 14 hectares, which equates to 20 homes per hectare ? relatively high for an edge-of-village location and more suited to urban environments. This amount of housing would: Overwhelm the single access junction on the A6005. Generate significant new car journeys daily ? estimated well over 500 vehicle movements. Stretch local services like schools, GP surgeries, and public transport well beyond their intended capacity. No genuine assessment is provided of whether existing infrastructure ? roads, sewers, flood defences ? can support such a jump in usage. This development does not exist in a vacuum. Strategic Policies 1.11 and 1.12 combined propose 340+ homes in Borrowwash alone. Adding further pressure to roads, services, and countryside buffers. And safeguarded land to the north all but guarantees future expansion ? meaning 280 homes is just the beginning. It sets a precedent for the complete erosion of the western green belt boundary, inviting future developers to push for even more ? in contradiction to public pledges to protect these areas. This proposal conflicts with several key principles of sustainable planning: NPPF Paragraph 11(c): development must be "sustainable" and respond to local capacity. Strategic Policy 0 ? Settlement Hierarchy: notes that rural area growth should be modest and proportional. This is not. Core Strategy Spatial Portrait: describes Borrowwash as a key settlement with village character. That character would be lost under such a large-scale addition.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Joanne	Response-01252	Borrowwash is a small village, it will be ruined.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Jodie Brown	Response-01213	The amount of houses for size of land seems impractical
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	John & Anna Mead	Response-00772	As before, the area cannot cope with increase in numbers of oeople
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Julie Margaret Smith	Response-01090	280 houses and the population it will bring, with all its needs and environmental footfall is far too great for Borrowwash to support.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Kirsty Millward	Response-01327	The number of houses allocated to this area is very unbalanced compared to other areas in Erewash and moves us ever closes to merging with the edge of spondon. I can accept that a much smaller number of houses could be built, but not this many. The number of houses needs to be more evenly distributed accross Erewash including areas such as Stanley who appear to get preferential treatment over Borrowwash
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Kirsty Murray	Response-01003	Fewer larger houses with decent gardens and plenty of parking, and some open spaces or play areas would be better not lots of small crammed in houses
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Laura Dewsnap	Response-00936	No more houses are needed in Borrowwash, there are currently 77 houses listed for sale and 6 for rent within a 1 mile radius of the proposed site. Within a 3 mile radius of the site, there are currently 459 properties for sale and 102 properties for rent. There is no need for further properties to be built in Borrowwash.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Lewis Sutton	Response-00415	280 homes represent a disproportionate expansion of Borrowwash, risking overburdening local services, fundamentally altering the character of the settlement, and contradicting strategic planning principles of sustainable, proportionate growth.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Margaret Irene Wheatley	Response-00915	Will 40 per cent be affordable housing? Any developer will seek to reduce this number
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Mark Burrow	Response-00655	Far too many houses introduced into this village. Strongly disagree with the project.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Mary-Jo McDermott	Response-01437	The volume of houses proposed is excessive and out of scale with the existing community.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Mike Casartelli	Response-01211	This is a huge development which believe will negatively impact the ?village feel? of Borrowwash and essentially merge us with Spondon and Chaddesden.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Mrs Kay Rigby	Response-00876	This seems far too many houses for the area on land and for the village of Borrowwash
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Mrs M McCroft	Response-00532	A lot less than 280
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Mr Timothy Shepherd	Response-01334	Far too many houses for the road network, schools doctors and dentist services.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Nicholas Parr	Response-01253	There should be no housing for the reasons given in other categories!
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Nicola Ashton	Response-00081	We need to look at the brown field site?s first before destroying our natural landscape
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Paul and Dawn Davison	Response-01804	There is also the extra pressure on the local infrastructure. Doctors, Dentists and sewage management.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Paul Barker	Response-00800	To many for size of site
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Phil Self	Response-00759	Again. just cram as many unsightly houses in as possible with no thought to the residents all looking in each others windows and ruin a decent village.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Simon Shaw	Response-01152	A huge amount, current population is ~7,000, this number of housing will add ~1000 people, this is a crippling number

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Stephen Peat	Response-01793	(1) According to Erewash Council, they are writing to over 1800 homes that have been empty for more than two years, but another 1500 empty homes that have been empty for 6 months or a year will need tenants or be sold to new householders. (2) The management of Erewash Council could reach its housing targets within the Erewash Amended Core Strategy plans to include empty homes, which could provide accommodation in a shorter time than building new houses. Erewash Council and the main house builder should take over these empty homes by compulsory purchase of the property, then refurbish the property to be sold or rented. For example, when I was in the Hospital, a BBC programme called Homes under the Hammer showed empty homes could be refurbished and back on the market between 6 weeks and 3 months, compared to 1 year when building a new property. (3) Erewash could reach its target of houses faster if it purchased empty homes with house builders, more houses would become available to the population of Erewash, so more of the greenbelt could be used to farm and grow crops. (4) With the Reform Party taking Derbyshire County Council a few weeks ago, Reform could take Erewash and Derby City Council by electing Reform Councillors at the next election. Erewash Council will need to make a greater effort to protect the greenbelt and keep the separation between Derby and Erewash and Erewash and Nottingham.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Steven Hoolan	Response-00912	Too many houses for the site. Other much more suitable areas are available
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Number of Houses	Sue Higginbottom	Response-01143	0
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Other	Alice Fitzpatrick	Response-00543	(Application Reference: ERE/0914/0013 Location Land West of 23 to 195 Victoria Avenue & Land North of 12 to 72 Derby Road Borrowwash DE72 3HB) The above 2014 proposal went to full planning. I attended the above public meeting and the proposal was unanimously rejected ? not one member of the committee was in favour! This should stand indefinitely. I am sympathetic to the need for good housing however I have lived in this village all my life and I have witnessed the loss of many old houses, recreational sites and green areas ? I think Borrowwash has done enough. I am also curious to know why Ockbrook seems to have avoided being included in the revised plan?
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Other	Amy Brown	Response-00514	As mentioned, I live at 3 Covent Garden Close and the impact of building works to the left of my home to the back would be hugely catastrophic. I work from home which entails working with vulnerable customers and with the level of traffic, noise, disruption and chaos it would bring would be super detrimental to my work alongside others. We chose to live here based on the green belt at the rear and the lack thereof now days and it's a peaceful environment - you would be destroying this. Not only that, we are a cul de sac. You cannot have pedestrians/further traffic up and down this street to gain access - we would suffer hugely due to this. Look at the street at 9am & 3pm daily and you'll get a rough idea. Now imagine all those extra people you house trying to get to that school or the doctors down the road - it will simply not work. You are effectively disrupting a lot of lives for some houses that have a better chance of being accepted elsewhere with much less disruption. You are interrupting a village, our facilities, our lives, our mental health and our green space.
			Barry Shaw	Response-01482	No enough community consolation, even this is abstract and hidden.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Other	Craig Hydes	Response-00782	Accessibility on and off the A52 will be massively impacted. Historic dog walking routes will be ruined.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Other	Dan Pilgrim	Response-00932	1000's of houses are being built just down the road at Boulton Moor site, why destroy another green belt area for MORE houses. Better to develop existing project plots.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Other	David Modrovic	Response-00803	It seems an utterly stupid idea and probably just for the land owner to cash in rather than sell for agricultural, all empty houses or my old barracks should be repurposed rather than build more houses
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Other	David Tyler	Response-00835	More should be done to reduce the number of empty properties across the whole of erewash before building on farm land
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Other	Deborah young	Response-01306	WHEN THE GREEN LAND HAS GONE THERE'S NO BRINGING IT BACK . I know people need houses but there must be more none green areas to build on .
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Other	Dr Sarah Mee	Response-01320	Many existing residents of Derby Road and Victoria Avenue are older people who have expressed significant concern about the construction phase of any housing allocation development at the Greenbelt site on pollution, traffic congestion, road safety and noise and disruption to village life. My Mum is 80 and has lived in the village, raising a family and contributing in her paid working life to the village of Borrowwash for most of her adult existence. Mum has enjoyed the Greenbelt and countryside vistas with friends and family and visitors and dogs over the years and greatly appreciated the space and peaceful village feel this area of countryside affords . Due to physical ill health and mobility issues my Mum is virtually house bound now but enjoys the sanctuary of her well kept garden which would be directly adjacent to the road in and out of any planned development. The impact of a major construction project on the doorstep is a huge concern for my Mum and I am very concerned about the impact on her mental health and well being and ask that this is not overlooked by any human involved in decision making. The development will bring relentless noise and poor air quality at a time in my Mum's life where peace and clean air should be prioritised. I am very concerned that the current housing allocation review is already having an impact on her sleep and is causing her a great amount of worry about the future of the quality of her life in her own home and garden. There is a lot of fear that when construction gets underway existing residents of Derby Road will have no access to peaceful greenspaces in their gardens which could have devastating mental health consequences especially for those who are elderly and house bound by physical illness.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Other	Ellen Young	Response-01357	The planted fields haven't been maintained well. There doesn't seem to have been a rotation of crops. There hasn't been any signs of the fields being fertilised. Drainage hasn't been maintained. It feels as if the fields have been neglected on purpose so the owner has an argument for selling it for development. They'll probably get more money selling the land for development than agriculture. Residents understand the need for more housing but there are better places in Derbyshire to build than green belt in a small village. An adjustment to the proposal that may see less objections is putting the park/woodland on the land by the Victoria Avenue houses with access via Covent Garden Close and put the houses on the land off Derby Road, where the park is allocated. Regardless of whether they put an objection in, residents don't want 280 houses on their backdoor but they may not feel so strongly about it if there is a barrier between the new and existing houses. There is a bigger benefit to the community with this change as more locals can access the park as it's closer to the centre of the village but people on the development and residents on the south of the village can still access it.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Other	Emma Gregory	Response-01454	This development would severely and detrimentally impact on my privacy and quality of life, making use of my garden virtually impossible due to noise and air pollution. Air pollution is a real worry to me from the building work and also vehicle movement. Please build on brownfield sites in Erewash, not on Green Belt areas. Green belt areas serve a purpose.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Other	Fiona Richards	Response-00020	New houses next to the busy A52. Pedestrian safety, air pollution and aesthetics.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Other	Francesca Hope	Response-00528	Noise pollution. We currently live in a lovely quiet cul de sac and this will be spoilt if a housing estate is built with construction vehicles, building noise etc right next to our houses for years until completion
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Other	Gillian Fitzpatrick	Response-00482	(Application Reference: ERE/0914/0013 Location Land West of 23 to 195 Victoria Avenue & Land North of 12 to 72 Derby Road Borrowwash DE72 3HB) The above 2014 proposal for this development went to full planning. My daughter and I attended the public meeting and the proposal was unanimously rejected ? not one member of the committee was in favour! This should stand indefinitely! I am sympathetic to the need for good housing however I have lived in this village all my life and I have witnessed the loss of many old houses, recreational sites and green areas ? I think Borrowwash has done enough.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Other	Gillian Hitchcock	Response-00446	I really cannot see why we need housing to this scale nationwide, surely former barrack sites where houses still stand could be repurposed back for the general population! New hoses these days are not affordable on todays wages
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Other	Hayley Dexter	Response-00519	There is hardly any parking in Borrowwash and one pub. There aren't enough amenities to those that already live in Borrowwash and adding all these houses will add and impact this in a negative way! Borrowwash is no longer a village and is large enough without building all these houses on land that shouldn't be built on anyway
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Other	Helena Lucas	Response-00644	On a final note, myself and husband have been residents for 18 years on Princess Drive, we have raised pur family in peace, within this proud and hard working community. An influx of such a high number of new residents will alter the atmosphere of the village, cause years of distress, upset, ill health, damage to property and cars, and cause social issues affecting school admissions, and put pressure on local services. It would also be devastating to see an area of greenbelt land demolished forever where there are many properties or derelict buildings that could be renovated instead. With the cost of living and food bank issues, poor quality food and goods being brought into the country, or being poisoned with pesticides, this space should be used as a community hub to grow food, encourage bees and wildlife and be a place the community can gather to improve health, and wellbeing, and foster learning how to become self sufficient again like the preceding generations. This would significantly set Borrowwash apart. Not just be another village vanishing into the large scale building site that Derby is becoming.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Other	Helen Pearce	Response-01550	The houses on Victoria Avenue are over 200 years old, the views across the fields from our gardens have been unspoilt for centuries and these new plans will spoil the peacefulness and history of our small village street. We feel that the space allocated for parkland would be better suited to housing and leave the space behind Victoria Avenue as parklands. This would cause much less disruption to the residents, protect much of the wildlife living in the hedgerows etc and protect the privacy and peace of the residents of Victoria Avenue.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Other	Iain Pendry	Response-01188	The consultation makes no recommendations on the lack of cultural or sporting facilities in the village. It would be good to see that - in addition to this housing stock - thought is given to releasing more property for local services, pubs, exercise and sporting facilities. For example, Borrowwash is served by only one public house, at the opposite end of the village, whilst the Wilmot Arms is abandoned and an eyesore. The "Three Chefs" shop is boarded up and blocks the use of valuable retail or recreational use. These issues need to be addressed.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Other	James Dean	Response-00553	Just no... please no. Reconsider, we love our local area, love out countryside and love our open space. The town cannot deal with further housing for all the reasons I have mentioned... this will be a diabolical decision and cause damage for so many people's lives.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Other	Jennifer Sutton	Response-00518	The proposal threatens the rural and historic character of Borrowwash. There will be a loss of privacy and green views for existing residents, as well as a permanent loss of valuable of green space. There has been a lack of transparency and insufficient community engagement, this has already been thoroughly debated previously. Trying again every few years is simply not democratic. No updated assessments for ground conditions or ecological impacts. Planning should be based on current, complete evidence. The proposed development of 280 homes west of Borrowwash is inappropriate, unsustainable, and fundamentally harmful to the local community, environment, and infrastructure. It represents an excessive scale of growth for a village settlement, amounting to a nearly 10% increase in housing with no proportional investment in roads, healthcare, education, or drainage infrastructure. This plan will exacerbate existing traffic congestion on the A6005, introduce serious road safety risks at a poorly placed single access point, and worsen air pollution, particularly for children walking to local schools. The loss of this Green Belt land will result in the permanent destruction of wildlife habitats and biodiversity that cannot be replaced by token green spaces or tree planting. Meanwhile, local GP surgeries are already overstretched, there is no NHS dentist, and schools are near or at capacity. The development does not deliver genuinely affordable, sustainable, or community-enhancing housing? instead, it prioritises volume and profit over village character, environmental protection, and public wellbeing. It directly conflicts with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the Erewash Core Strategy, and national political promises to protect the Green Belt. This proposal should be rejected in full, and future growth should be directed to brownfield sites, with true consideration for infrastructure, biodiversity, and the needs of existing communities.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Other	Ken Hardy	Response-00928	Crime. As a result of this incidences of crime are very likely to increase and with it the fear of crime in the locality as would be expected with an expanded population. The opportunity to reduce incidences and fear of rural crime is outweighed by the effects of urbanising the land, particularly when considering the site is already in a largely urban environment.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Other	Lewis Sutton	Response-00415	The proposal threatens the rural and historic character of Borrowwash. There will be a loss of privacy and green views for existing residents, as well as a permanent loss of valuable of green space. There has been a lack of transparency and insufficient community engagement, this has already been thoroughly debated previously. Trying again every few years is simply not democratic. No updated assessments for ground conditions or ecological impacts. Planning should be based on current, complete evidence.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Other	Lucas Hodson	Response-01435	Borrowwash is a key village between Nottingham and Derby and by building in borrowwash you will be not only putting more pressure on key services but also harming the environment and overpopulating borrowwash. As a student who will be soon taking important exams I have to study while multiple children loudly play outside on the road due to lack of facilities and places to play so I reject the idea of building unless you also build more services to accommodate for the population increase.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Other	Margaret Irene Wheatley	Response-00915	A careful thought out plan can only be achieved if the planners make the appropriate representations. It must not be allowed to go through on the "nod" and needs to be fully scrutinised so that the developers are not allowed to dictate for profit.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Other	Mary-Jo McDermott	Response-01437	This green space is essential not only for the wellbeing of local residents, providing a buffer against noise, air pollution, and overdevelopment, but also for supporting environmental resilience. At a time when climate change demands urgent action, protecting natural land is critical. Green spaces like this help absorb CO?, support biodiversity, reduce flood risk, and mitigate urban heat effects. Their destruction undermines local and national environmental commitments. Brownfield sites, vacant industrial land, and derelict buildings, especially in the city centre, are far more appropriate for development and would meet housing needs without sacrificing precious remaining greenbelt. Once lost, these natural assets cannot be replaced. This is the wrong location, at the wrong time, for this kind of development.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Other	Maxwell Sutton	Response-01093	The Core Strategy Review does not provide sufficient evidence that all suitable brownfield sites and underutilised land have been fully examined and utilized before proposing alterations to Green Belt boundaries . This is a critical requirement under the NPPF . There is no clear demonstration that the density of development has been optimized in line with the policies in the NPPF . The strategic policies do not show significant efforts to increase minimum density standards in town and city centres or other locations well served by public transport The proposed alterations to Green Belt boundaries do not clearly promote sustainable patterns of development . The strategic policies should align with the development plan's strategy for sustainable development, which is not sufficiently evidenced in the Core Strategy Review The Core Strategy Review lacks evidence of thorough discussions with neighbouring authorities about whether they could accommodate some of the identified need for development 3. This is essential to demonstrate that all other reasonable options have been considered before altering Green Belt boundaries. Sustainable Development: The Core Strategy Review does not provide detailed plans for compensatory improvements to the remaining Green Belt land. This is necessary to mitigate the impact of removing land from the Green Belt and to enhance accessibility, biodiversity, and landscape quality.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Other	Mrs M McCroft	Response-00532	Planning on this area was thrown out as ludicrous in 2015 how can you build on it when there is only one entrance on to a very busy road? Need to maintain the open spaces between villages.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Other	Nicholas Parr	Response-01253	I operate a local business which would be negatively impacted by further development in the village ? why was I not notified? To post on Facebook and the EBC website is not enough! My company does not use Social Media and why would I check the website if I have no inkling that I need to? The same applies to our local Parish Council who have not even displayed details on their notice boards! Everyone in the village should have been notified. It is only by pure chance that I heard about the Public Consultation and I found the Core Strategy Amendment link very hard to locate. This is not Open and Transparent it is Closed and Obscure and makes a Mockery of Democracy. How can the Council offer a Public Consultation of which many of the public is unaware? This consultation has been rushed through and poorly considered. The Government should not be imposing impossible quotas on the local councils and encouraging salami tactics on the Green Belt but developing new towns where the infrastructure can be incorporated during development, choosing areas with the least possible impact on the ecology. I trust that I shall receive a full report on the consultation findings.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Other	Nicola Ashton	Response-00081	We need to preserve our green belt for future generations, do we really want our legacy to be the generation that concreted over every blade of grass and killed off our wildlife forever, I don't want that to be done in my name
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Other	P. Hart	Response-00623	Their seems be no mention of childcare facilities. Presumably these houses are intended mostly for families.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Other	Peter John Ball	Response-00703	Development of this land to the west of Borrowwash will complete the ribbon of development along Nottingham Road Spondon and Derby Road Borrowash. There will be no clear break between the City of Derby and Borrowash.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Other	P Fisher	Response-01175	We are a small village and the infrastructure just isn't there for an expansion on this scale.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Other	Sarah Cresswell	Response-01206	The NPPF is clear that inappropriate development in the Green Belt should not be approved except in 'very special circumstances?' (paragraph 147). Paragraph 119 of the NPPF further directs that: 'Planning policies and decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses, while safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions. Strategic policies should set out a clear strategy for accommodating objectively assessed needs, in a way that makes as much use as possible of previously developed or 'brownfield' land.' The Core Strategy must prioritise sustainable development patterns that make full use of brownfield and underutilised infill sites elsewhere in the Borough, particularly in areas less constrained by Green Belt designation. There is no evidence that all reasonable opportunities for such development have been exhausted. The proposed allocation at Borrowash is premature, disproportionate, and inconsistent with national policy guidance.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Other	Stephen Peat	Response-01793	(1) When deciding on a new development, including approving an application for the new construction of houses, planning within the Council must follow the principle of the Equality Act 2010 and the Disability Discrimination Act. This means planners must check that the development is ideal for the disabled, the elderly and people with mobility problems. (2) This includes the design of houses, the road layout and whether the design is suitable for public transport access, which is required by law to be between 200 and 250 metres from a bus stop. For example, this development for 280+ houses will require two bus stops within the site for each direction to comply with the Equality Act 2010, and other disabled acts that influence the ruling that a development must cater for different groups of the local community, including the disabled and elderly. Erewash Council should examine the full cost-benefit analysis, including the benefits and cons of a new development within the local neighbourhood. The cost-benefit analysis would provide the real cost of a development, including forcing the developer to pay the real costs added to S106 payments to compensate for the development on the local community. ? When you examine the S106 payment for Spondon Wood, only £275,000 was offered from the developer for medical services, knowing that 1 doctor costs £140,000 a year, a nurse costs around £50,000 a year, and other staff costs around £25,000 to £45,000 a year. The £275,000 was too small a payment by the developer, and you add the real costs the developer would need to pay, around £1 million to cover health costs of a large new development.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Other	Sue Higginbottom	Response-01143	Please please think of our lovely little community we do not want it to be ruined by more people using roads gp,s school local amenities, let us keep Our country side
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Adele Pinkney	Response-01456	Derby Road is already very busy in rush hour. Additional vehicles joining from a large new estate would add to this and increase the risk of accidents and air pollution.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Alice Fitzpatrick	Response-00543	or each house built there is potential for at least 2 x cars plus delivery vans, waste collectors etc etc. The access roads to the A52 (Victoria Avenue & Borrowash Road) cannot cope with current traffic or parking outside houses with no off-street parking and I seriously worry about the impact of further traffic on the foundations and structure of the existing old houses. Pollution will be increased ? electric cars not withstanding! The surrounding roads notably the A52, Derby Road, Victoria Avenue and Borrowash Road are already overloaded with far too much traffic, especially at peak times. Both Victoria Avenue and Borrowash Road have schools which cause huge traffic problems already ? more homes will only increase this problem with potentially fatal results. The proposed exit onto Derby Road is a black spot with poor visibility as is access from Borrowash Road onto the A52 ? more traffic cannot logistically and safely be accommodated. I am a cyclist as I chose not to drive where possible. The roads are already unsafe for cyclists so more traffic means more danger likewise to pedestrians and existing motorists. Victoria Avenue was built for horse and cart - it already has far too much heavy traffic such as car transporters, container lorries etc
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Angela Chapman	Response-01331	With the issues of speeding through the village, the lack of any support from council or police to the west of the village, this will increase the abysmal safety already seen along the Derby Road section of the village.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Ann Daykin	Response-01453	The extra traffic and access from the development pulling onto the A6005 would create road safety issues and problems for the residents of Borrowash . The road is difficult and easily congested, outside of the peak traffic flows. with traffic weaving in and out of stationary traffic. The development would make this situation a lot worse..and cause potential road safety issues for both pedestrians and drivers alike. The pavement on the side of the proposed development is narrow and is consistently used, with not a lot of space for traffic to pull out into a fairly narrow road. This would definitely be a potential hazard and road safety issue.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Ashley Dunn	Response-01560	Additional traffic from the development will create additional risk for young children attending Ashbrook Infants School. New infrastructure directing additional traffic away from Victoria Avenue would need to be installed prior to any development.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Barry Shaw	Response-01482	The road is not very wide, the pavements are thin. This is a dangerous road as is.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Breanne Rodda	Response-00708	The car safety coming off of the a52 already feels quite dangerous this will create more drivings coming off a busy slip road
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Britton	Response-00877	We live on Derby Road - cars speed daily and do not stick to 30mph - the proposed housing will only add to the traffic and amount if cars in derby Rd- there are no speed cameras or speed sensors to slow speeding cars
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Carol Shaw	Response-00797	The development of around 280 homes west of Borrowwash will create significant traffic congestion on the A6005 Derby Road. The creation of a new vehicular access and pedestrian crossing point will increase traffic flow and potentially lead to congestion at peak times. This could also impact road safety, especially with the increased number of vehicles entering and exiting the development. Bottleneck Without Direct A52 Access: Without direct access to the A52, the development will force additional traffic onto local roads, creating a bottleneck. Stationary traffic is already a common issue on Victoria Avenue and Station Road, and the increased volume from the new development will exacerbate this problem. This will lead to longer travel times, increased frustration for drivers, and higher risks of accidents. Impact of Events at Elvaston Castle: Events at Elvaston Castle, which attract large numbers of visitors, will have huge implications for traffic in the area. The additional traffic from the development will compound the congestion during these events, making it difficult for residents and visitors to navigate the area. National Policy Context: The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) emphasizes that transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals. It encourages developments that limit the need to travel and promote sustainable transport modes to reduce congestion and improve road safety. The NPPF also highlights the importance of designing schemes that contribute to making high-quality places and ensuring patterns of movement, streets, parking, and other transport considerations are integral to the design. Narrow Derby Road and Pavements: Derby Road is already narrow with very narrow pavements, increasing the chances of fatalities, especially for children who may be forced to use this as an alternative to motor transport. The increased traffic from the development will exacerbate these safety concerns, making it more dangerous for pedestrians, particularly school children.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Catherine Casartelli	Response-01428	The proposed access point is in a 40mph speed limit. At peak times traffic through Borrowwash is already high. This plan could add 280- 560 additional cars moving through the village. When there are issues with A52, A50 or M1 then village traffic is very high causing road safety issues. The village has already suffered from fatal accidents.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Christine Cole	Response-01254	Infrastructure before site construction is started needs to be addressed. Possible widening of the road at site entrance with speed being reduced from 40mph? The entrance is after an incline in the road.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Craig Hydes	Response-00782	Road safety on Derby Road and Victoria Avenue will be severely increased.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Dale Harlow	Response-00887	There is only one pedestrian crossing at the coop crossroad. There is not enough infrastructure for people's safety when crossing busy areas and the small shopping area of coop and birds will be heavily populated with cars which already has limited child spots and very few disabled bays
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Dan Pilgrim	Response-00932	Limited access road to area,
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	David Modrovic	Response-00803	Increase in traffic brings more pollution and increased risk of road traffic accidents
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	David Steare	Response-01300	1 If there is only one road entrance and exit, and if there are two entrances and exits this increases the risk of collision when speeding vehicles meet other vehicles manoeuvring to enter or leave the development. 2 The development being located near to a brow of a hill on the A6005 reduces visibility and reaction time for speeding vehicles to avoid crashing into queues into and out of the development. 3 West Park School pupils walking home to Borrowwash will have to cross an additional road junction. This increased risk also applies to parents with pushchairs and the elderly walking to/from Borrowwash and Spondon. 4 There is no pavement after Borrowwash House on the A6005 going from Borrowwash to Spondon. Crossing the road at the top of the hill already seems difficult without additional traffic from the development. 5 If a Pelican Crossing is installed this will decrease traffic flow, increase traffic density and if placed to the Spondon side of the development entrance/exit may lead to difficulties associated with the brow of the hill and speeding vehicles.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	David Tyler	Response-00835	Accessing the proposed site from Derby road will have safety concerns
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Deborah young	Response-01306	If cars are allowed to come out of road opposite ashbrook school it will be an accident waiting to happen .
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Dr Sarah Mee	Response-01320	The proposed housing allocation site sits on the crest of a hill with the prevailing traffic speed often exceeding the designated 30mph limit on the entry to the village by cars and motorbikes with poor visibility of existing turnings into driveways of houses on on Derby Road. The increased traffic volumes could lead to an increased potential for collisions. The entry to the housing allocation site must incorporate a bell mouth design to allow for adequate visual splays and this is a challenge without significantly impinging on the property to the East of the allocation at number 72 or the parkland on the West boundary of the proposed housing allocation site. I am very concerned about the lack of robust proposals for secondary emergency access to the proposed housing allocation site. It is currently unclear how this is to be accommodated and a major objection on both road and public health and safety grounds. I note the proposal for new pedestrian access but this alone will not be adequate and must be supported by revisions to the prevailing traffic speeds and adequate visibility splays at the proposed housing allocation site.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Ellen Young	Response-01357	Covent Garden Close would turn into one of the main roads out of the development. This road is opposite the school and the increased traffic increases the danger to children and parents. School times are already dangerous as parents park anywhere without care, limiting the view of the road when trying to cross. Extra traffic coming from a side street would make it more hazardous. Speeding is also a big issue on Derby Road and Victoria Avenue. There have been many collisions on the Kimberly Road junctions due to the people turning out of the junction not being able to judge the speed of oncoming vehicles as they're either speeding or doing the speed limit. If we had more traffic coming out of another side street then it adds to the risk of collisions. Something needs to be done about the speeding issue in the village. Trying to cross the road safely is difficult; one car could be doing 60mph but the car in the opposite direction could be doing 20mph. Judging the speed of the cars can be difficult when everyone is doing whatever speed they want. The extra cars will only add to the dangers.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Emma Gregory	Response-01454	Too much traffic already going through Borrowwash.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Eve barker	Response-00443	Speeding is a problem in the village, the sheer amount of vehicles is already too much for borrowwash to cope with
			Gary Mortimer	Response-01148	The narrow pavements already put pedestrians at risk and any additional traffic will increase this risk unacceptably
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Geoff Whittaker	Response-01805	There is talk about the need for suitable and safe routes for pedestrians and cyclists, but no account is taken about the amount of work that will be needed to meet this requirement or the significant costs this will incur. This could involve work by Derby City Council on its network.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Gillian Fitzpatrick	Response-00482	The surrounding roads notably the A52, Derby Road, Victoria Avenue and Borrowwash Road are already overloaded with far too much traffic, especially at peak times. Both Victoria Avenue and Borrowwash Road have schools which cause huge traffic problems already ? more homes will only increase this problem with potentially fatal results. The proposed exit onto Derby Road is a black spot with poor visibility as is access from Borrowwash Road onto the A52 ? more traffic cannot logistically and safely be accommodated.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Gillian Hitchcock	Response-00446	Again there are many boy racers using Derby Road and Victoria Avenue as a racing track! More traffic when the kids are going to school would be horrendous
			Hayley Dexter	Response-00519	A lot more traffic and people will have an impact on road safety in a negative way
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Helena Lucas	Response-00644	Increased traffic as a result of 280 new builds without a plan to update access infrastructure, will mean more vehicles on the already over used roads. This will mean increased congestion, particularly during peak hours, and will increase the risk of accidents. There are no safety features in place as it is running through Borrowwash. Cars frequently speed down Nottingham road, and use our road Princess Drive as a cut through, a double parked street. My car has been damaged twice by careless drivers cutting through. I am deeply concerned that this will increase the frequency of traffic taking this option to cut through furthermore, and put mine and other families at risk who live along Princess Drive/Manor Road at risk.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Henrietta heron	Response-01354	Already far too many cars
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Ian Frearson	Response-01267	The additional pressure generated by this proposal on the existing highway network will lead to a less safe access and egress to Derby Road and potentially increase accidents substantially
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Ian Hamilton	Response-01325	The A52 junctions in Borrowwash, Spondon and Ockbrook are already very busy and result in queues. The number of houses proposed will result in issues in safely accessing and exiting the road.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	James Dean	Response-00553	Again... this will be a mistake. We have schools and many elderly residents and the roads are already too congested let alone with extra houses.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Jane Shepherd	Response-01333	More people, including children could cause more road traffic accidents. People may become impatient and less considerate of pedestrians and cyclists. Cole Lane junction with A52 is already a nightmare- very small run off and extremely tricky to get on. I fear there will be traffic accidents unless this is improved massively
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Jayne Bennett	Response-01519	Most properties own two vehicles so this will definitely increase the flow of traffic in the area. I already have to deal with traffic congestion going to and from work with the usual amount of traffic within this village so any extra vehicles would certainly generate a lot more traffic. Also we have traffic that cuts through Manor Rd and up Princess Drive out onto Derby Rd all the time especially during working hours which makes our road busy and unsafe and I have myself to have an accident along this route. Victoria Avenue is also very congested during school terms and if there are any accidents on the A52 then all traffic comes through Borrowwash bringing it to a standstill. It will increase pressure further on the parking provision for the local shops because people do not always walk.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Jennifer Sutton	Response-00518	A development of this scale will increase traffic on a proven dangerous road that children use to attend school. The proposed new junction location is poorly placed and poses safety risks. Emergency vehicle access could be delayed. No provision for active travel infrastructure, the space simply is not there to make this safe on our existing local road network. Permanent speed enforcement and a reduced speed to 20mph should be considered. This location is inherently unsafe for the following reasons: Limited Visibility: Drivers pulling out of the new estate will struggle to see oncoming traffic, especially during low light or bad weather. This significantly increases the risk of collisions. Speeding Risk: Despite being within a 30mph zone, speeding is not uncommon on this stretch. A single junction will not safely accommodate increased traffic flows, especially during peak hours. No Alternative Entry/Exit: The lack of a second access point raises serious concerns for emergency services access and evacuation routes. In the event of a crash, blockage, or fire, residents could be trapped or cut off. Conflict with Pedestrians and Cyclists: Introducing more turning vehicles at a single junction increases the risk of conflict with pedestrians (especially children walking to school) and cyclists who use Derby Road as a commuting route. The development's plan to install a pedestrian crossing point adjacent to this junction only adds complexity ? vehicles slowing or stopping for pedestrians at the same location where others are accelerating or turning creates a dangerous mix of competing movements. This aspect of the proposal conflicts with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraph 110(b), which states: ?Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users.? It also fails to satisfy paragraph 111 of the NPPF: ?Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety.? Given the increase in vehicle numbers, limited sight lines, and lack of alternative access, this clearly constitutes an unacceptable safety risk.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Jodie Brown	Response-01213	The bend on the main road is not ideal for exit/entry point to the site
			John & Anna Mead	Response-00772	Safety will also be compromised
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Julie Margaret Smith	Response-01090	As current routes experience increased traffic and the centre of the village additional footfall, in an area where crossing the road on foot is already hazardous, safety concerns for both pedestrians and motorists will increase. The area around Ashbrook School is already fraught with dangers of badly and thoughtlessly parked vehicles at peak times. It is already an accident waiting to happen, with no provision in place for children to safely cross alone.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Kirsty Murray	Response-01003	More traffic will always be of detriment to road safety
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Laura Dewsnap	Response-00936	In Borrowwash, there is currently an insufficient number of safe crossing places. There is one traffic light controlled pedestrian crossing near to the Co op on Nottingham road, one further down Nottingham road near to the Nags Head pub and one on Station road on the approach to the bridge. There are no safe crossing points anywhere on Victoria Avenue which is where the infant and junior schools are located. This is where the main flow of traffic to and from the A52 Brian Clough Way can be found. In addition to the lack of safe crossing points, there is no school crossing patrol employed on Victoria Avenue outside of the school. At school drop off and collection times, the road gets very busy and visibility is limited due to parent's cars being parked close by. An increase in traffic will compound this issue and increase the risk of a serious accident taking place. Road safety in Borrowwash seems to rely heavily on chance.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Lauren Fardoe	Response-00039	What pedestrian facilities will be implemented to ensure derby road users are safe.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Lewis Sutton	Response-00415	Introducing a new access point and pedestrian crossing on the A6005 could create new hazards, particularly for pedestrians, school children, and cyclists. The road already has a high traffic volume and limited visibility in places, raising real safety concerns for existing and future road users. The last few years has seen some serious accidents, this will only increase with throughput and congestion. A development of this scale will increase traffic on a proven dangerous road that children use to attend school. The proposed new junction location is poorly placed and poses safety risks. Emergency vehicle access could be delayed. No provision for active travel infrastructure, the space simply is not there to make this safe on our existing local road network. Permanent speed enforcement and a reduced speed to 20mph should be considered.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Lindsay Hodson	Response-01434	Already a concern and these developments would add to the issues Borrowwash already faces.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Maisie Harlow	Response-00963	The increase in traffic will therefore increase the amount of speeding vehicles next to Ashbrook infant and nursery school.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Mandy Dickens	Response-00590	Due to extra traffic it's obviously going to have an adverse effect on road safety
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Mary-Jo McDermott	Response-01437	More traffic will endanger pedestrians, especially children and the elderly. Current road crossings are insufficient, and more cars will heighten the risk of accidents, especially near bus stops and school zones.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Maxwell Sutton	Response-01093	Max aged 5 already finds Derby road intimidating with loud vehicles hurting his ears and the smell of fumes. Not to mention the fear that the vehicles on a very narrow road may hit him as they are already very close to the slim pavement.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Mike Casartelli	Response-01211	A development this size is going to cause a huge spike in traffic flow that inevitably will have an impact on safety.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Mrs.A.Pickard	Response-00802	Victoria Avenue is a dangerous rat run to the A52 as it is with standing traffic every evening at rush hour.It is also narrow and extra traffic would be an absolute disaster,passing the local primary school.Also only one entrance road to the site would also cause congestion .
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Mrs Kay Rigby	Response-00876	All the extra traffic could be very dangerous to the public of Borrowwash and our children going to and from school
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Mrs M McCroft	Response-00532	With lots of extra people in the houses and little children going to school it would get very congested
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Mrs Sheila Hardington	Response-01232	Traffic often difficult in the area already.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Mr Timothy Shepherd	Response-01334	Additional road crossings will be required at two point on Victoria Avenue, close to the school and close to Nottingham Road.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Nathan Thomson	Response-01328	As above

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Neil Raistrick	Response-01365	The addition 250 dwellings will bring an expected 336 cars (average to access to cars 1.2 per dwelling *) the estate has a single entrance on Nottingham Road. This will vastly increase the traffic along this road and Victoria Avenue as the easiest option to go to Derby / Nottingham / A38 / A50. This additional traffic congestion needs to be considered in addition to the traffic generated by the new housing that is being built in Spondon along Nottingham Road. This traffic is likely to be heaviest at rush hour in the morning this will increase the danger to children at the Ashbrook School, there is currently a crossing person here; however it would be even better if the scheme also included crossing provision on Victoria Avenue. * Average value from National Travel Survey 2022 (Updates 14th Dec 2023) <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/national-travel-survey-2022/national-travel-survey-2022-household-car-availability-and-trends-in-car-trips#household-car-access">https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/national-travel-survey-2022/national-travel-survey-2022-household-car-availability-and-trends-in-car-trips#household-car-access</a> . Other sources have suggested it's as high as 1.29 per dwelling if London is excluded.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Nicholas Parr	Response-01253	The surrounding roads notably the A52, Derby Road, Victoria Avenue and Borrowwash Road are already overloaded with far too much traffic, especially at peak times. Both Victoria Avenue and Borrowwash Road have schools which cause huge traffic congestion already ? more homes will only increase this problem with potentially fatal results. The proposed entrance/exit onto Derby Road is a blind spot with poor visibility as is access from Borrowwash Road onto the A52 ? more traffic cannot logistically and safely be accommodated. Parking space in the village is very restricted and inconsiderate parking outside the schools, opposite junctions etc is rife. Illegal parking at the top of Ladysmith Road makes it very difficult to enter and exit safely. The village is very hazardous for cyclists. I myself cycle to work at times and it is outright dangerous. (See also Traffic Congestion)
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Nick Coates	Response-00393	Paths around the area are very small additional traffic would increase risk
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Nicola Ashton	Response-00081	Roads round Borrowwash are completely grid locked if there is an accident on the A52 or the M1 With the issue around the school it's absolutely chaos at school time
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Paul and Dawn Davison	Response-01804	The Derby / Nottingham road would become especially dangerous, having to have a brand new road and junction forced upon it. Also Victoria Avenue has a School which would have even more traffic effecting it's safety.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Paul Barker	Response-00800	Extra vehicles causing traffic problems is bound to have an impact on road safety.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Paul collinge	Response-00941	It would be great if you included cycle lanes around Borrowwash and ockbrook to improve road safety of cyclists in the area as the traffic will be increased because of the development.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Peter HINKLEY	Response-00775	An increased risk to all wishing to cross the A6005 in Borrowwash. School children and shoppers at this busy junction of Station Road/Victoria Ave. Cars coming from all directions, run on and off the A52 at peak travel times and school runs.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Phil Adcock	Response-01488	An increasingly busy road for it's size, and indeed causing increased use of Station Rd to A6.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Phil Self	Response-00759	As above getting busier and busier
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Raoul Pinkney	Response-01457	Vehicles exiting the proposed housing estate on to Derby Road would be joining an already busy road, and right hand turns would be particularly difficult and potentially dangerous. Extra vehicles from the proposed site means more traffic going through the village and likely past the primary school in the morning on the way to the A52.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Rebecca Peach	Response-00404	Derby Road is an accident waiting to happen as it is. Victoria Avenue too. My children go to Ashbrook and the lack of traffic management is going to end in an accident at some point
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Sarah Cresswell	Response-01206	The section of the A6005 from Spondon to Borrowwash which passes the proposed site is within a 40mph zone which would make access to and from the site extremely dangerous. This section of road is also very narrow, in part due to an existing building. There is no provision or alternative route available for cyclists travelling between Borrowwash and Spondon and the pavement, which for part of this route only runs on the north side of the road, is already dangerously narrow and frequently overgrown forcing pedestrians to walk in single file. It is also the only available route for parents who walk their children to either Ashbrook Infant & Junior Schools in Borrowwash, or Asterdale School in on the eastern edge of Spondon and one that I used for years with my own children.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Sarah McAulan	Response-01248	Our roads are narrow and hard for pedestrians to cross. Additional traffic will cause large implications
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Simon Shaw	Response-01152	Unsafe currently
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	sophy peacock	Response-00678	Increased traffic poses more risk
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Steven Hoolan	Response-00912	Speed and volume of traffic along this stretch of road is a big cause for concern. Having young children and hearing and seeing the speed of traffic along the road worries me
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Sue Higginbottom	Response-01143	My grandchildren live in a relatively safe community and it won't be
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Road Safety	Suzanne Prior	Response-00907	Much of the existing traffic travelling along Derby Road between Victoria Avenue Spondon exceeds the speed limits, particularly within the Borrowwash Boundary. The pavements are very narrow towards the Spondon boundary, which necessitates walking onto the road when overtaking slower pedestrians. If there is an increase in both pedestrians and motorists, this will result in a more dangerous road.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Alice Fitzpatrick	Response-00543	The schools are at capacity already!
1.12	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Anthony Clarke	Response-00559	We only have one infant school in Borrowwash, where are they all going to go
1.12	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Ben Foster	Response-00838	Under subscribed at ash rook
1.12	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Breanne Rodda	Response-00708	With the number of houses planned, if no further educational facilities are built I struggle to see how the current capacity would keep up
1.12	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Carmen Buckley	Response-00737	As a parent and also someone who works in the local education system the development will negatively affect our local school's ability to provide efficient education to all students. The schools are already struggling.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Chris Archer	Response-01142	With only one infant and junior school an increase of such a large scale will create further issues for over sized classes

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.12	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Craig Hydes	Response-00782	The two primary schools located in Borrowwash and Ockbrook are at full capacity and there is an annual difficulty on getting a child place in catchment. I had this issue with both my children.
			Daniel Lang	Response-00322	There will need to be additional places available to go with the increase in population.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	David Modrovic	Response-00803	Schools already at capacity and in need of repair, where you putting those extra children?
1.12	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Dr Sarah Mee	Response-01320	The housing development at this site will bring families and children who will need adequate educational provision. There are two small state funded primary schools near the housing allocation site and adequate resourcing of these schools and the secondary schools some distance away must be considered.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Elizabeth	Response-01215	Schools especially West park will struggle to provide
			Gary Mortimer	Response-01148	There is already capacity issues at local schools which would be made much worse by this development
1.12	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Gillian Fitzpatrick	Response-00482	The schools are already at capacity
			Gillian Hitchcock	Response-00446	The schools in the area are pretty full now, why bring yet more people traffic and chaos to them?
1.12	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Hayley Dexter	Response-00519	There is one school for the whole of Borrowwash and adding this many houses will seriously impact this
1.12	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Helena Lucas	Response-00644	West Park and the local Borrowwash Ashbrook school are oversubscribed. Placing this housing estate between West Park and the existing village will prioritise children in the new estate who will become closer in proximity to the school, potentially forcing families out of the original village in order to fall closer to the catchment area. This will cause families significant costs or force families to transport their children to alternative schools, causing increased pressure and stress on families, and again increasing road pollution and congestion.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Henrietta heron	Response-01354	West park is already at capacity where are kids meant to go to school ??
1.12	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Ian Frearson	Response-01267	This proposal is unsuitable for the existing school provision and would generate a potentially estimated 300 school placements based on similar developments. It would overwhelm the existing school provision and should not be considered as a suitable site for development without a serious commitment for increasing the school placements available.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Jaime Grant	Response-00512	As with all public facilities - has the impact of adding an additional 280 homes been considered on local schools and GP surgeries?
1.12	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	James Dean	Response-00553	School places are again already at a premium... this will lead to over crowding and reduction in the quality of education delivered.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Jane Shepherd	Response-01333	Any increase in housing must be matched by funding for extra school placement. Will additional classrooms/ teachers etc be funded fully. Education budgets are already stretched to the limit. We do not want class sizes to increase. If both of the Borrowwash schemes go through we will need at least another local primary school. School budgets are stretched as it is 'class sizes must not increase. Where will the extra funding come from?
1.12	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Jayne Bennett	Response-01519	The schools in Borrowwash and Spondon are at full capacity so where would the additional children go. During school drop offs the roads are filled with parked cars especially on Victoria Avenue and we do not also have a traffic warden.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Jennifer Sutton	Response-00518	The policy assumes that housing = school-aged children, but does not guarantee funding or infrastructure expansion. Realistically, families may have to commute out, adding to congestion, or face denial of places ? an issue observed across Derbyshire.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Joanne	Response-01252	Schools are already full, are they going to be building another one?
1.12	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	John & Anna Mead	Response-00772	One school cannot cope with the input of local housing as it is, 34 to a class !
1.12	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Judith Anderson	Response-00934	Schools don't have enough places for the increased number of inhabitants.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Julie Margaret Smith	Response-01090	There is apparently capacity at Ashbrook School but an increased school population will inevitably increase traffic congestion and surrounding issues on Victoria Avenue.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Kirsty Millward	Response-01327	As a local parent to two young children who will be starting school in the next 3/4 years. The additional housing will mean that both local primary schools in Borrowwash become oversubscribed. This is grossly unfair to families who already live in the area and within close proximity to the schools. You should build these houses elsewhere in an area that is either having a new school built or a major extension to an existing school. Adding this many houses puts families already living in Borrowwash at risk of having our children sent to school outside of the village. This is not fair and will damage our children's ability to make friends and socialise within the village, another move away from community cohesion.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Laura Dewsnap	Response-00936	Whilst Ashbrook infant and junior school is often under subscribed, it is also under staffed. Often year groups are joined together in the same class which presents a difficulty for teaching age/stage appropriate lessons and providing an education which is reflective of the children's needs according to their age. The other primary school which serves Borrowwash is Redhill primary school. This school is one of the most over subscribed schools in Derbyshire. An increase in population in the area will have a negative impact on both schools. If Ashbrook school receives a sudden influx in numbers due to a surge in the local population, they will have difficulty in recruiting enough high quality teachers to meet a sudden rise in demand within a short time frame.
			Lesley Eccles	Response-00814	Will impact on school as currently only one school in borrowwash.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Lewis Sutton	Response-00415	National birth-rates continue to fall, building houses to attract "children" is myopic and simply a plaster for the wound.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Lindsay Hodson	Response-01434	Ashbrook might be able to accommodate more students but the surrounding secondary schools are often fully subscribed. Buses to secondary schools are always very busy and if students have to travel further for a place this would be a future concern.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Maisie Harlow	Response-00963	New homes attract young families, increasing the number of children in borrowwash. This will put a strain on our local schools and make it difficult to accommodate everyone. Therefore children will struggle to get places or overcrowding and hindering learning environments for children.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Margaret Irene Wheatley	Response-00915	Capacity of the School needs to adequately cater for future demands.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Mark Birkinshaw	Response-00046	Will the schools need to reduce the catchment areas to ensure that more local children can be accommodated in the primary and secondary offerings closest to Borrowwash?

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Mark Burrow	Response-00655	Not enough placements to support this level of population increase
1.12	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Mark Fearn	Response-00507	Schools in the local area are already at full capacity of all age groups so an increase of families wishing to move in will not only put even more strain on the local education system but also result in children having to go dangerously far away for schooling.
	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Middleton	Response-00893	Another maybe 300 children to go to ashbrook school crazy, would need another 50% capacity
1.12	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Mrs.A.Pickard	Response-00802	This proposal would stretch school facilities to it's limit - and cause congestion on the already busy Victoria Avenue.
	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Mrs Kay Rigby	Response-00876	We only have one school in Borrowwash which is full at the moment so where will all the extra children go
1.12	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Mrs M McCroft	Response-00532	I doubt there would be any more room in the schools nearby
1.12	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Mr Timothy Shepherd	Response-01334	Significant additional investment will be required to build additional classrooms and fund additional staff at local primary schools to accommodate children from the new houses.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Nathan Thomson	Response-01328	The schools are already serving a large number of families in the local area adding more houses the schooling would need to be provided as well
1.12	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Nicholas Parr	Response-01253	Whether or not the schools are at capacity, an increase in children attending the Ashbrook Schools will increase the already serious traffic congestion and surrounding issues on Victoria Avenue.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Nick Coates	Response-00393	Not enough school to meet additional demands
1.12	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Nicola Ashton	Response-00081	I believe the school is also at full capacity
1.12	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Peter Howell	Response-00829	no new school in the development.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	P Fisher	Response-01175	The last time this application was proposed, the school was at capacity which was one of the reasons for it being turned down.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Phil Self	Response-00759	Schools will be overwhelmed
	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Sarah Davies	Response-01137	The local schools are already at capacity, a new primary school would be required to facilitate the extra potential new residents.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Simon Shaw	Response-01152	Adding houses does not necessarily help our schools or teachers. UK birth-rate is falling, these houses wont help that.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Stephen Peat	Response-01793	(1) When you look at the Spondon Wood Planning Application, you are aware that the Schools in Spondon and the Borrowwash area are full, especially West Park School, which will need over £20 million in new buildings and a yearly payment of £1 million to maintain the school. The primary schools will require additional buildings to be constructed, but there is limited land within the primary school sites. This could mean the loss of the sports field or playground to build a new building. (2) The majority of the schools in Spondon are built on narrow roads, with high traffic congestion and excessive parking around the schools, and neighbouring homes, and traffic would cause difficulty for passing traffic, including public transport to access the area during the school run. Households will be angry if they cannot leave their driveways because parked cars block their access to the road. (3) New schools will need to be built to cope with the development around Borrowwash because schools in Borrowwash cannot expand further without losing sports fields or playgrounds. I believe building too many homes in one location will cause excessive pressure on the local neighbourhood. Houses could be built across the Erewash area, including old industrial and parking areas, and the Erewash Council should look at smaller-scale developments with around 50 houses to reduce pressure on schools and the local neighbourhood.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Steve Brown	Response-01153	Will obviously increase capacity no mention of provisions for this.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Steven Hoolan	Response-00912	Schools are currently at maximum capacity. Additional housing will put extra stress on already stretched resources
1.12	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Sue Higginbottom	Response-01143	Parents struggle to get their children into schools now , this is going to make matters much worse
1.12	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Tanya caldbeck	Response-00917	No school places
1.12	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	T McKinnon	Response-01368	Children in our area have waited months to get a place locally , capacity seems to be an issue already
	West of Borrowwash	School Capacity	Virginia Locke	Response-00580	One school joke
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Adele Pinkney	Response-01456	Borrowwash village centre already becomes very congested where Victoria Avenue meets Derby/Nottingham Road. Extra traffic feeding on to Derby Road, particularly during rush hour, will add to this heavy congestion, cause additional pollution and increase risk of accidents.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Alex Lowe	Response-00707	Traffic around peak and school times along the A52 and Victoria Avenue is already incredibly high, especially with all cars parked outside houses. This will increase it
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Alice Fitzpatrick	Response-00543	For each house built there is potential for at least 2 x cars plus delivery vans, waste collectors etc etc. The access roads to the A52 (Victoria Avenue & Borrowwash Road) cannot cope with current traffic or parking outside houses with no off-street parking and I seriously worry about the impact of further traffic on the foundations and structure of the existing old houses. Pollution will be increased ? electric cars notwithstanding! The surrounding roads notably the A52, Derby Road, Victoria Avenue and Borrowwash Road are already overloaded with far too much traffic, especially at peak times. Both Victoria Avenue and Borrowwash Road have schools which cause huge traffic problems already ? more homes will only increase this problem with potentially fatal results. The proposed exit onto Derby Road is a black spot with poor visibility as is access from Borrowwash Road onto the A52 ? more traffic cannot logistically and safely be accommodated. I am a cyclist as I chose not to drive where possible. The roads are already unsafe for cyclists so more traffic means more danger likewise to pedestrians and existing motorists. Victoria Avenue was built for horse and cart - it already has far too much heavy traffic such as car transporters, container lorries etc The old Bemrose site on the edge of Spondon is less than a mile from Borrowwash; the extensive development of this site has already increased traffic congestion in the area to an unacceptable level - we do not need any more vehicles!
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Alison Vine	Response-01813	There will be a huge increase in traffic using roads that are already in poor condition. Victoria Avenue, leading to and from the A52, is already very busy and it is possible that the majority of cars from the Derby Road site will use this road. This will also affect the school crossing.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Amy Brown	Response-00514	I live on Covent Garden Close and can safely say that traffic within Borrowwash as a whole can be rather daunting at the best of times. Whilst there is no planned road route from my street in particular, having further vehicles parking on this street to access a pedestrian access would cause such havoc. We already struggle twice a day during school hours due to people parking here for school pick up/drop off and sometimes we can't even access our own driveways due to this. Where a pedestrian route would go here, I can only imagine would be down the side of our home (number 3) in the corner which leaves us exposed from our driveway, garage and garden which I find very intruding. This is a small cul de sac in which we struggle already so putting more traffic through here would be catastrophic. I also feel that the heavy traffic from any building works/access would be very detrimental via Nottingham Road - again this is a thorough route for many, especially with the A52 close by and being in between schools and other local towns would cause further congestion. Victoria Avenue is a hazard as it is most of the day due to parked cars but when we have the high traffic time (school hours/work commutes) alongside traffic coming off the A52 especially when accidents have occurred, I can confidently say this will cause a lot of distress to a small village that is only just getting by.
			Andrew Hozack	Response-01322	The area is heavily congested with traffic as it is without adding to the problem.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Angela Chapman	Response-01331	Borrowwash already has begun to have severe traffic issues, the building of the by-pass some 40 years ago is no longer viable, with many people using the village as a way through to Spondon, with a significant rise of vehicles on the road network as a whole, small narrow roads through and around the village only make the matters worse. At an average of 2 cars per household, this will increase traffic with some 500 cars onto an already suffocating road network.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Ann Daykin	Response-01453	Despite the creation of new road to the development, the number of potential cars that would be accessing the A6005 would be overwhelming. The road is currently congested at rush hour, so the extra traffic would cause massive issues and traffic congestion throughout Borrowwash.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Anne Anderson	Response-00980	It is already difficult to cross the road if you are not in the vicinity of the crossing and the traffic noise will make life unbearable for residents living on the main road.
			Anthony Clarke	Response-00559	Already a very busy village which could not accept the added traffic
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Ashley Cartledge	Response-01417	Borrowwash already suffers with gridlock at times.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Ashley Dunn	Response-01560	The junction of the A52 and Victoria Avenue is already busy during peak times and there is a lot of congestion around Ashbrook Infants School. Without significant improvements to infrastructure (e.g. entire new junction), this development would unacceptably exacerbate these problems.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Barry Shaw	Response-01482	impossible to cross the road currently let alone with 1000 more cars
			Breanne Rodda	Response-00708	Too much traffic already through Borrowwash, even with a new road built people visiting the amenities will drive up rush hour traffic
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Britton	Response-00877	We struggle daily to get on and off driveway due to increasing traffic- the proposed amount of housing will only increase the traffic
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Carmen Buckley	Response-00737	Traffic is already bad in the area due to the A52 and M1 being close by. The East Midlands is becoming known as one of the most polluted counties.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Carol Shaw	Response-00797	The development of around 280 homes west of Borrowwash will create significant traffic congestion on the A6005 Derby Road. The creation of a new vehicular access and pedestrian crossing point will increase traffic flow and potentially lead to congestion at peak times. This could also impact road safety, especially with the increased number of vehicles entering and exiting the development. Bottleneck Without Direct A52 Access: Without direct access to the A52, the development will force additional traffic onto local roads, creating a bottleneck. Stationary traffic is already a common issue on Victoria Avenue and Station Road, and the increased volume from the new development will exacerbate this problem. This will lead to longer travel times, increased frustration for drivers, and higher risks of accidents. Impact of Events at Elvaston Castle: Events at Elvaston Castle, which attract large numbers of visitors, will have huge implications for traffic in the area. The additional traffic from the development will compound the congestion during these events, making it difficult for residents and visitors to navigate the area. National Policy Context: The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) emphasizes that transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals. It encourages developments that limit the need to travel and promote sustainable transport modes to reduce congestion and improve road safety. The NPPF also highlights the importance of designing schemes that contribute to making high-quality places and ensuring patterns of movement, streets, parking, and other transport considerations are integral to the design.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Catherine Casartelli	Response-01428	The plans could add 280-560 additional cars moving through the village. At peak times traffic is already high. With only one road access road to the development has congestion on that development been considered at peak times?
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Catherine Fox Charlton	Response-00659	This will no doubt cause traffic congestion on Derby Road
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Chris Archer	Response-01142	The traffic on Victoria is already a problem for the village due to the lack of off street parking for residents there. By adding a large number of houses in this area is will create and even greater issue
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Christine Cole	Response-01254	I see it says the necessary road adjustment will be made but does not specify how that A6005 will cope with the additional potential traffic (+500 vehicles) that an estate this size will generate? The entrance is on an incline and currently 40mph. It is also the route many children take walking and on bikes to West Park school in Spondon. There is only 1 small path. During construction this will be a major problem. Infrastructure needs to be adjusted before site is constructed.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Craig Hydes	Response-00782	This site will heavily impact accessibility to the nearby coop and local amenities.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Dale Harlow	Response-00887	Traffic onto the A52, Victoria avenue leading to ockbrook, at borrowwash cross roads and leading into spondon will be more hectic, especially in peak travel times causing major disruptions to travel and infrastructure along with the school traffic already causing delays and issues. More housing will cause major delay.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Daniel Lang	Response-00322	At peak times there are already queues around borrowwash junction. The additional traffic will only make this worse. Additionally there will need to be yellow lines on Derby road as parked cars often exacerbate the problem.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Dan Pilgrim	Response-00932	Traffic in Borrowwash is already busy on a day to day basis. The village comes to a standstill when m1 or a52 is shut, this project will only increase the demand on the roads
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	David House	Response-01489	The development will exacerbate congestion in Borrowwash, especially at the busy junction by the Coop.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	David Modrovic	Response-00803	Borrowwash and Victoria Ave particularly already congested
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	David Smith	Response-01115	I am particularly concerned about the quantity of increased traffic , pollution and danger especially around school opening and closing times. As things stand the crossing of children across Victoria avenue is an accident waiting to happen. Increase of traffic heading to Derby and the M1 via the A52 is already a problematic area.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	David Steare	Response-01300	1 The A6005 road from Spondon to Borrowwash is already very busy at commuter times. When there are lane closures due to repairs or cabling the delays can already cause a queue backing up into the village. The proposed house building will exacerbate this (especially during the construction phase) and as I live on Princess Drive this will cause further delay to my car journeys. 2 Currently there are no parking restrictions on the A6005 near to the proposed site. Visitors to this development may use the A6005 for parking leading to delays when traffic has to give way. 3 The proposed site is near a brow of a hill on the A6005. There are no traffic cameras in the vicinity and speeding motorists risk collision to traffic queuing to enter or leave the site. 4 Currently any diversion because of an A52 closure already causes gridlock in Borrowwash village and along the A6005. The proposed house building will exacerbate this.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	David Tyler	Response-00835	Access will be poor without considerable road realignment on Derby road
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Deborah young	Response-01306	At least 200 to 300 more cars coming out on to Nottingham road . Traffic bad enough as it is
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Denise Ball	Response-01291	The large size of the development will require a complete review of the capacity of the surrounding road system. There are already delays at peak times and any extra traffic caused by the development would increase traffic congestion
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Denise Illsley	Response-00056	The traffic in the village has increased substantially over the past few years and this development will only increase the problem further.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Dianne Simmons	Response-00401	When there is an issue on the A52 which is regular, the village of Borrowwash is gridlocked, with an additional 200 plus houses this will be a disaster
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Dr Sarah Mee	Response-01320	Whilst I note the proposals for off-site highway investment; the scale of this must be determined in the context of existing volume of traffic on the A6005 Derby Road which is frequently at capacity and traffic is completely grid-locked when the A52 is closed. The A6005 was designed to support traffic into and out of the village and access to the village homes. The road is not designed for high volume urban or construction traffic. Additional public transport upgrades will add to the congestion and traffic increases related to school access must be balanced with the need to provide adequate pavement for children to also walk to and from the proposed housing allocation site and the local schools. Pavements are already narrow and often difficult to access due to hedges overhanging and this must be factored in when proposals for easing existing and future traffic congestion worsening are developed. .
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Elizabeth	Response-01215	There will be a huge increase in traffic along Nottingham Road causing queues between Borrowwash and Spondon
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Ellen Young	Response-01357	280 houses could see 560 more cars in the village. This would make congestion in the village worse particularly during rush hour and school times. Borrowwash is one of the main diversions when there has been an incident on the A52. An increase in cars within the village will add to the traffic jams caused by the diversion. Likewise, the village will also see an increase in queues caused by local events, such as the County Show, due to an increase in cars in general around the neighbourhood and cars going to the event.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Emma Gregory	Response-01454	I object because the development would substantially increase the volume of traffic with added noise and air pollution. All traffic leaving and entering the site travelling along the A6005 in an easterly direction to Nottingham would have to go through the village centre creating further congestion. Cars, lorries, buses, vans, cyclists and e-scooters would be increased hugely. All this is detrimental to village life.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Eve barker	Response-00443	Traffic through Borrowwash and ockbrook is awful. Pot holes, from the wear and weight of too many vehicles already.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Francesca Hope	Response-00528	Victoria Avenue is already busy without extra traffic coming into the village
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Gary Mortimer	Response-01148	The road is already heavily congested and a development of this size will have a horrendous effect on the already congested A6005
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Geoff Whittaker	Response-01805	There is talk about the need for work to adjacent junctions but this is not detailed and what the costs will be. There is talk about a new junction on the A6005 but no costs are given. It would be reckless to not consider the overall costs within the proposals.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Gillian Fitzpatrick	Response-00482	For each house built there is potential for at least 2 x cars plus delivery vans, waste collectors etc etc. The access roads to the A52 (Victoria Avenue & Borrowwash Road) cannot cope with current traffic or parking outside houses with no off-street parking and I seriously worry about the impact of further traffic on the foundations and structure of the existing old houses. Pollution will be increased ? electric cars not withstanding! The surrounding roads notably the A52, Derby Road, Victoria Avenue and Borrowwash Road are already overloaded with far too much traffic, especially at peak times. Both Victoria Avenue and Borrowwash Road have schools which cause huge traffic problems already ? more homes will only increase this problem with potentially fatal results. The proposed exit onto Derby Road is a black spot with poor visibility as is access from Borrowwash Road onto the A52 ? more traffic cannot logistically and safely be accommodated.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Gillian Hitchcock	Response-00446	Victoria Avenue is already a nightmare for parking, why isn't there an access road so people who back onto this ? allocation ? could use their gardens as off road parking option.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Hayley Dexter	Response-00519	There is already heavy traffic and terrible potholes on the main roads in Borrowwash

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Helena Lucas	Response-00644	280 new houses will bring an additional one or two, if not more vehicles per household moving in and out of the villages as well as an increase in maintenance vehicles and rubbish lorries, polluting the environment further and increasing noise and road damage. Increased difficulty turning onto Nottingham Road and the back up of traffic onto the A52 will increase risk of road traffic collisions, putting more pressure on the emergency services, and putting more lives at risk. Damage to roads will increase, and in turn damage to cars, as a result will be costly for everyone.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Helen Pearce	Response-01550	Roads are already too busy and it takes a minor accident on the A52 to cause disruption for our small village.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Henrietta heron	Response-01354	Already Victoria Avenue and getting on and off the A52 can be very busy, with that amount of extra car it will make the village into a large car park!
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Iain Pendry	Response-01188	I would have a significant concern about vehicle access onto and off the site. Both adjacent roads are very heavily congested, and clear provision will need to be made to ensure that site access is safe, and maintains the flow of traffic on the Nottingham Road, and on Victoria avenue.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Ian Frearson	Response-01267	A development of around 280 dwellings as proposed will generate far more traffic movements on and off the Derby road than currently that will put more pressure on the the existing highway network and make the routes to and from the village less safe. the proposal does not allow for a secondary access to the site and this would mean a main route into and from the site of Distributor standard. Traffic movements to and from the Derby road would put additional pressure on the existing route that is already extremely busy at peak times
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Ian Hamilton	Response-01325	The roads through and around the village are already in poor state of repair and clearly cannot handle the current volume of traffic. The size of the proposed development is unrealistic.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Jacky Kinirey	Response-01209	The build up of traffic along Nottingham/Derby Road during peak times. The A52 has traffic problems then Borrowwash and surrounding areas are gridlocked. Access to a new housing estate would cause if more traffic chaos
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Jaime Grant	Response-00512	I am concerned about the impact an additional 280 homes will have upon congestion through the area and onto the estate.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	James Dean	Response-00553	This town cannot handle more traffic. We have seen the state of the road already and in ockbrook this has been dire... this will only get worse. The roads are small and already over congested at peak times with parking in the area already at a premium. This will be an appalling decision to add further houses here.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Jane Rothern	Response-00042	Traffic through the village will be badly affected.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Jane Shepherd	Response-01333	The proposed new road/junction will lead to long queues. Whether there traffic lights or not it will cause congestion. There be more pollution from traffic. Extra houses will inevitably lead to more traffic at a difficult junction and therefore more congestion leading to poorer air quality and probably more road traffic accidents
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Jayne Bennett	Response-01519	Most properties own two vehicles so this will definitely increase the flow of traffic in the area. I already have to deal with traffic congestion going to and from work with the usual amount of traffic within this village so any extra vehicles would certainly generate a lot more traffic. Also we have traffic that cuts through Manor Rd and up Princess Drive out onto Derby Rd all the time especially during working hours which makes our road busy and unsafe and I have myself to have an accident along this route. Victoria Avenue is also very congested during school terms and if there are any accidents on the A52 then all traffic comes through Borrowwash bringing it to a standstill. It will increase pressure further on the parking provision for the local shops because people do not always walk.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Jennifer Sutton	Response-00518	Borrowwash already faces notorious traffic bottlenecks, especially along the A6005 Derby Road, which regularly backs up during rush hours and particularly during A52 closures or incidents. Adding 280 homes (10% more than current Borrowwash housing stock) means a significant increase in daily vehicle trips ? conservatively over 500 new car journeys per day, including school drop-offs, commutes, deliveries, and service vehicles. A link should be put into Field Close or similar, to access the A52 directly to alleviate the massive increase in village traffic this proposal will cause. The plan includes a single point of access on a sweeping, poorly visible bend of the A6005. This is inherently dangerous. The installation of one pedestrian crossing does not mitigate the issue ? it may exacerbate tailbacks, especially in peak hours. A link should be put into Field Close or similar, to access the A52 directly to alleviate the massive increase in village traffic this proposal will cause. The Core Strategy (2025 update) promises ?network resilience,? yet this site deliberately avoids it. It creates a bottleneck, not a solution.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Joanne	Response-01252	Traffic is terrible already without another 300 plus cars
		Traffic Congestion	Jodie Brown	Response-01213	Concerned about the traffic with one entry and exit onto nottingham road.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	John & Anna Mead	Response-00772	There will be an increase in traffic - the potholes are bad enough with it at the current moment
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Judith Anderson	Response-00934	Traffic through Borrowwash will increase considerably.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Julie Margaret Smith	Response-01090	The housing allocation of 280 dwellings will put increased traffic pressure on Victoria Avenue and its west-bound junction with the A52. This junction is a notorious blackspot as vehicles speed downhill towards it, making peak traffic very difficult to join. This danger has increased since the slip road onto it was shortened, and queues occur which will only increase. Peak times on Victoria Avenue already see huge congestion around Ashbrook school where the road begins to narrow, leading to dangers for both pedestrians and motorists, and there has been no pedestrian crossing approved on what is already a very difficult route to negotiate. The southern end of this road, leading to the centre of Borrowwash, is narrower and its older housing has no off-road parking provision, thus the road is further narrowed by permanent parking on the west side. This leads to instances where there is only sufficient road width for two passing vehicles or only one in (frequent) instances of wide vehicles (eg buses and lorries) passing. Many of the junctions, especially Ladysmith Road) are occluded, presenting possible collisions. No pedestrian crossing is provided for those needing to safely cross the road in the busy centre of the village, where footfall and vehicle numbers would increase.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	kelvin cross	Response-01187	280 new houses is going to add approx another 560 + extra cars into the village area, into roads which are already heavily used (and poorly maintained!) . A single entrance/exit from the A6005 is going to cause considerable congestion on that road which will certainly tail back into the cross roads at the village centre, which is already congested at peak times. Where can the impact assessment that was carried out (?) for all this extra traffic be seen ?
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Ken Hardy	Response-00928	Traffic along Derby Road is always very heavy my concern would be the massive increase due to only having one way in and out of the site?
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Kirsty Murray	Response-01003	Borrowwash village is already congested and the council are unable to care for the current roads and fill the potholes we have now and they would be damaged further by more traffic
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Laura Dewsnap	Response-00936	The increased traffic on Victoria Avenue would be a particular problem with the conflicting movements between cars and pedestrians being an issue outside of the Infant and Junior schools. There will problems exiting towards Derby as the junction at Spondon Lane End is already at capacity causing significant congestion at peak times. There is a restriction on the capacity on Station Road caused by the traffic light control on the bridge over the River Derwent, this causes frequent bottle necks in and around the village with traffic at current levels. An increase in traffic would create even more frequent bottleneck situations. The centre of Borrowwash has a traffic light controlled pedestrian crossing. This crossing is well used and creates a further bottleneck. This bottleneck affects traffic flows on Victoria Avenue, Derby Road, Nottingham Road and Station Road. The junctions with Victoria Avenue from and to the A52 Brian Clough Way are often congested causing tailbacks at peak periods. Increased traffic flows from the development would make these queues worse. This problem relates to the junction just to the north of the flyover and to the south of the bridge. The entry slip roads to Brian Clough Way are substandard in both the east and west directions. Increased traffic flows from this development would increase the accident risk at both slip roads.
	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Lauren Fardoe	Response-00039	Extra vehicles on derby road will create greater pollution and disruption to community
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Lesley Eccles	Response-00814	Will greatly increase traffic congestion as homes will have 2 car parking spaces and thus will impact on parking in centre of village
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Lesley Young	Response-00902	I live by where this housing is being suggested. Many times it takes me at least 10 mins to get out now. The increased amount of traffic will make this far worse. Also, if there are accidents on the A52, and motor way, traffic is diverted down the Derby Road and the standing traffic will be untenable with the extra vehicles.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Lewis Sutton	Response-00415	The development will create a significant increase in vehicular traffic accessing the A6005 Derby Road. This is already a busy route, and the added traffic from 280 homes (and future safeguarded land development) will intensify congestion at peak times, particularly near key junctions. A link should be put into Field Close or similar, to access the A52 directly to alleviate the massive increase in village traffic this proposal will cause.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Lindsay Hodson	Response-01434	Traffic along derby road has already significantly increased in past few years this would ruin village of Borrowwash further. Making it both unsafe and unpleasant.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Lucas Hodson	Response-01435	There are lost of children in borrowwash and some roads are difficult to cross especially to the village so by using the roads many pedestrians will be at risk especially cyclists and children.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Lynda Gamble	Response-00910	Isn't there enough traffic already causing congestion in Borrowwash already? Derby Road just seems to get busier and busier without additional housing traffic.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Maisie Harlow	Response-00963	The increased volume of traffic from construction vehicles and new residents will worsen the existing rush hour congestion, impact commute times, fuel consumption, greenhouse gas emissions and traffic noise for locals.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Mandy Dickens	Response-00590	The traffic in the morning is already very bad along Nottingham Road, any additional traffic would make the journey into Borrowwash and A52 nigh on impossible
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Margaret Irene Wheatley	Response-00915	This is a problem which needs constant monitoring
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Mark Birkinshaw	Response-00046	With only one access to circa 280 homes, each with potential for a minimum of 1 vehicle per household this will negatively impact the ease of travel into Spondon for school travel and critically up Victoria Avenue to access an already busy commuting routes into Derby and Nottingham via the A52.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Mark Burrow	Response-00655	No doubt Borrowwash will become far more congested of this were to go ahead. I strongly object.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Mark Fearn	Response-00507	This will bring far too many vehicles into an area with roads that are both already congested and not suitable for such a level of regular traffic.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Mark Green	Response-00940	The traffic congestion along Derby Road is already troublesome at peak times and the creation of these homes will significantly increase the problem.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Mary-Jo McDermott	Response-01437	This development would significantly increase traffic on already congested and noisy local roads, particularly during peak school and commuting hours. Our infrastructure is not equipped to handle a large influx of vehicles, which would worsen bottlenecks and increase journey times for residents and emergency services.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Matt Harvey	Response-01312	The village is busy enough with vehicles queuing at the T-junction from the A52. It can't handle anymore.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Maxwell Sutton	Response-01093	Max aged 5 already finds Derby road intimidating with loud vehicles hurting his ears and the smell of fumes. Not to mention the fear that the vehicles on a very narrow road may hit him as they are already very close to the slim pavement.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Middleton	Response-00893	Another 350 cars trying to get on a6005
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Mike Casartelli	Response-01211	This is such a huge development and with traffic flow at times in the area already being high, I believe this will have a negative impact on the area.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Mr N D NICHOLLS	Response-01192	The junction at Victoria ave. And Derby road is already a bottle neck

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Mrs.A.Pickard	Response-00802	There isn't enough parking at the moment never mind with an increase of traffic this proposal would bring, around the village, school and facilities.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Mrs Kay Rigby	Response-00876	Derby Road is a busy road already and gets very busy at peak times and when any accidents happen on the M1. We live on Derby road and have trouble getting off our drive at these times now. With all the extra traffic from these houses it will cause too much traffic and chance of more accidents
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Mrs M McCroft	Response-00532	Derby Road is a busy enough Road without another 280 cars at least coming on to it
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Mrs Sheila Hardington	Response-01232	Too much traffic in the village already.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Mr Timothy Shepherd	Response-01334	A single exit for 280 houses would be a significant bottleneck even if additional traffic lights were installed. Traffic flow along Nottingham Road, Victoria Avenue and Station Road would also be severely hampered by the level of increased traffic.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Nathan Thomson	Response-01328	Traffic around that area is already congested we also had a road accident in the area very close to the planned development where a life was lost adding to this would only cause a higher risk of this.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Neil Raistrick	Response-01365	The addition of 250 dwellings will bring an expected 336 cars (average of access to cars 1.2 per dwelling *) the estate has a single entrance on Nottingham Road. This will vastly increase the traffic along this road and Victoria Avenue as the easiest option to go to Derby / Nottingham / A38 / A50. This additional traffic congestion needs to be considered in addition to the traffic generated by the new housing that is being built in Spondon along Nottingham Road. This traffic is likely to be heaviest at rush hour in the morning this will increase the danger to children at the Ashbrook School. * Average value from National Travel Survey 2022 (Updates 14th Dec 2023) <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/national-travel-survey-2022/national-travel-survey-2022-household-car-availability-and-trends-in-car-trips#household-car-access">https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/national-travel-survey-2022/national-travel-survey-2022-household-car-availability-and-trends-in-car-trips#household-car-access</a> . Other sources have suggested it's as high as 1.29 per dwelling if London is excluded.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Nicholas Parr	Response-01253	Every new house will have one and possibly two vehicles along with delivery vans, waste collectors, visitors etc etc. The access roads to the A52 (Victoria Avenue & Borrowwash Road) already cannot cope with current traffic, especially at peak times, or with parking outside houses with no off-street facility. Both these roads have schools which exacerbate the problem. The proposed exit onto Derby Road is a black spot with poor visibility as is access from Borrowwash Road onto the A52 ? more traffic cannot logistically and safely be accommodated. As well as cars, there are already far too many wide vehicles (eg buses and lorries) using these roads which were not built for this purpose. Many of the junctions, especially Ladysmith Road, Kimberley Road and Elm Street are occluded, presenting possible collisions. Pollution will be increased ? electric cars notwithstanding! (See also Road Safety
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Nick Coates	Response-00393	Borrowwash is busy enough at peak time as it is we don't need any additional traffic. There are a number of people who break the speed limit as it is.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Nicola Ashton	Response-00081	Borrowwash is already gridlocked at busy times morning & evening, school times you have parked cars everywhere. To add another 200 plus cars through the village will just cause even more problems. We have lorries thundering up the roads already. The roads weren't designed to cope with the amount of traffic we have now just look at the potholes we already have in the village.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	P. Hart	Response-00623	Borrowwash already has heavy congestion at various times of day, and inevitably suffers any problems on A52 and/or M1.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Paul and Dawn Davison	Response-01804	Our main concern is the traffic situation on the Derby / Nottingham road and the Victoria Avenue Road. Both of these roads would become even more congested.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Paul Barker	Response-00800	More vehicles through already very busy village is not desirable.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Peter HINKLEY	Response-00775	Increased traffic flows right in the heart of Borrowwash at crossroads of Station Road, A6005 and Victoria Ave and pelican controlled traffic lights and ensuing traffic congestion. That's right now and not if additional housing comprising sites to both West and North Borrowwash not 1/2 a mile in either direction. Access to the housing from A6005 will reduce speed limit from 40mph to 30mph because of limited sighting from new access road and subsequent slowing of traffic flow and being backed-up to centre of Borrowwash
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	P Fisher	Response-01175	The traffic through the village is already very heavy and this proposed development would seriously slow the flow of traffic even further.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Phil Self	Response-00759	Traffic is constantly getting busier year on year due to ridiculous amounts of new houses in the Chellaston area, and people using Victoria Ave as a rat run to the A52 and Ilkeston.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Raoul Pinkney	Response-01457	Borrowwash already has significant problems with traffic congestion, especially at rush hour and around the junction of Victoria Avenue and Derby/Nottingham Road. More cars joining Derby Road will make this problem even worse
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Ray Kirk	Response-01378	The traffic through Borrowwash is already increasing, 280 homes with at least 1 car each but more likely 2+ cars can only be bad news.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Rebecca Peach	Response-00404	It is already very busy around this area and with small children I am very concerned to the amount of extra traffic this will cause.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Richard Hodgkinson	Response-00530	Traffic is already bad on Victoria Ave and can only worsen with additional housing
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Sarah Cresswell	Response-01206	Borrowwash already experiences significant traffic pressure, particularly around its central junction which serves as a key route from the Nottingham-bound A52 to neighbouring villages such as Draycott, Elvaston and on to the A50. The dog-leg junction is congested at peak times on a daily basis and a road traffic incident on the M1, A50 or A52 quickly results in the roads through Borrowwash being completely gridlocked as drivers look for alternative routes. There is limited capacity and few options for meaningful upgrade due to the location of the junction within the village centre.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Sarah Davies	Response-01137	Parking is already a problem in the village, there are not enough spaces in the main carpark for the local shops that surrounding streets are then used as an overflow which then impacts local residents who have limited parking on the road. The public are already using creative parking to find spaces putting pedestrians in danger.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Sarah McAuslan	Response-01248	The village is already heavily congested with narrow roads that would not cope with additional traffic. We have seen the impact before for example when download is on and traffic diverts to our village the roads are gridlocked

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Simon Shaw	Response-01152	Victoria Avenue and Derby road are already overwhelmed easily with current numbers at rush hour. If the A52 was to close temporarily the village would be gridlocked for days
			sophy peacock	Response-00678	Borrowwash can't handle more traffic
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Stephen Peat	Response-01793	(1) The land west of Borrowwash would have around 260 to 300 houses, creating between 700 and 900 extra car movements during the day, excluding visitors to the site. (2) The 700-900 extra car movements would cause higher congestion in Borrowwash and Spondon along the Nottingham and Derby Road. The problem with this location the road is a single carriageway towards the Willowcroft Road traffic island. The traffic around this island is highly congested, with large amounts of traffic entering this location from places like Ilkeston and Kirk Hallam. The extra traffic from Borrowwash through this island area towards Derby and Asda would lead the road to be highly congested with major traffic delays at peak times of the day and slow traffic at off-peak times. The people of Spondon and households living along this route are fed up with the pollution from heavy traffic coming from places like Borrowwash, along the A52, and from places like Spondon North, Kirk Hallam, and the Ilkeston area. (3) There is evidence from the Department of Health that air pollution has caused an increased number of deaths, lung disorders, cancers, heart disease, including affecting children's health, caused by heavy traffic and congestion between Borrowwash, the A52, and around the Willowcroft area. (4) A couple of weeks ago, Erewash Council approved the Spondon Wood development, meaning over 900 extra car movements will travel through Spondon into the Willowcroft Traffic Island, adding to the traffic from land west of Borrowwash and developments around Borrowwash would cause a bottleneck on roads into Spondon and towards Asda and Asda Island. The road network in Spondon has now reached capacity with the development of the Smart Park, new housing built since 2010, new housing from Spondon Wood, and the future housing from the Borrowwash areas will cause a shutdown of the present road capacity around and into Spondon. (5) On May 10th, 2025, Derby Telegraph has an article with Spondon Councillors and Derby City Council Traffic Department regarding the heavy traffic and high number of heavy lorries passing through the narrow roads of Spondon, cited on Derby Telegraph. Investigation starts over plans to limit HGVs in gridlocked Derby suburb - Derbyshire Live (6) In the discussion with councillors, a weight limit could be introduced for HGVs travelling through Spondon, looking at a congestion charge to reduce traffic volumes and traffic passing through Spondon. (7) Erewash Council and Derbyshire County Council must look at ways to reduce congestion and traffic flows by making new developments have access to buses within 250 metres of each house, by changing the design for the Spondon Wood development to have a bus to circulate within the development to and from Ilkeston. Building new homes in and around Spondon with no extra road capacity will cause our roads to become car parks with stationary traffic, which could delay buses, and affect emergency vehicles' reaching their destination on time. (8) When examining the effects of your chosen house building locations in the Erewash Amendment Core Strategy, including Borrowwash, it could be detrimental to the local community with a greater risk of flooding, air pollution and traffic congestion.
			Steve Brown	Response-01153	Will obviously increase congestion also combined with proposed developments in Spondon.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Steven Hoolan	Response-00912	Derby Road is already very congested at peak times. When there is an accident on A52 or M1 traffic is at a standstill on Borrowwash, Ockbrook and Elvaston/Thulston. The speed limit on Derby Road is also often ignored as it goes from 40 to 30mph
			Sue Higginbottom	Response-01143	Far too much traffic now!
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Suzanne Prior	Response-00907	Currently there is a huge amount of traffic through Borrowwash past the suggested site. Creating that huge amount of housing will seriously impact the road network. It will create gridlocked roads towards the junction to the east, which currently and constantly has traffic cutting through from the A52 to the A50.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Tanya caldbeck	Response-00917	Too much traffic in and around area
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	T McKinnon	Response-01368	Already busy road, especially at centre of Borrowwash , and Victoria Av, Station road commuter route
			Virginia Locke	Response-00580	Too many cars already
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Traffic Congestion	Wayne Henderson	Response-01207	As a long term resident of Borrowwash I strongly object to this proposed housing development to the west of Borrowwash; based on the inevitable increase in traffic movements and congestion on both Victoria Avenue, Borrowwash and Borrowwash Road, Spondon which both lead to the A52. These roads have infant and primary schools situated on them. The inevitable increase in car movements using either one of these roads to gain quick access to the A52 carriage ways east and west will severely impact the safety of school children and their carers. The congestion in the morning and afternoon is already chaotic with double parking along Victoria Avenue coupled with irresponsible parking on the Avenue and side roads such as Deans Drive and Covent Garden. Given the high volume of traffic at these times, it is clear to see that a very low percentage of children attending the schools actually walk to and from school with the remainder using parent/ carer transport. Working parents driving their children to school have added stress and pressure to be at the school on time. This in turn leads to rash decision making, dangerous and selfish parking that we see on a daily basis. I see it as a recipe for disaster. I am reliably informed by friends living in the vicinity of Asterdale School, Borrowwash road and surrounding roads suffers similar situations. In the past I have highlighted this issue on a number of occasions to the relevant department at the Council with regards to traffic enforcement officer patrols, only to be told that the officers " cannot be in two places at once?. I assume from that comment they are already over stretched with similar issues in other areas around the Borough. My fear is that this problem of traffic congestion will get worse exponentially resulting in somebody getting seriously hurt if not killed. Furthermore, the junction layout connecting to the A52 for both roads is woefully inadequate. in particular, I am aware of at least five collisions / accidents on those junctions in the past few years. The residents of Victoria Avenue have to also contend with high volume of traffic throughout the day from commuters using the road as a cut through from the A52 to A50 and visa versa. All adding to an already very busy Avenue.
			Wendy Coulton	Response-00752	Already too much traffic

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Type of Housing	Alex Lowe	Response-00707	It's high density housing all in a very small space 40% allocation to affordable housing will decrease the value of the surrounding area
			Alice Fitzpatrick	Response-00543	As I am objecting to the proposal I obviously do not want ANY housing on this green site!
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Type of Housing	Ashley Dunn	Response-01560	The borough needs more affordable housing not market housing (which historically have always catered for the luxury or executive market too much). Notwithstanding my wish for the development to not be within this green belt at this location for given reasons, social housing much be priorities in the borough.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Type of Housing	Bella Kelsey	Response-00739	New builds are not affordable or built to last
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Type of Housing	Breanne Rodda	Response-00708	40% affordable housing is huge and would cause issues in the wider area
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Type of Housing	Carol Shaw	Response-00797	The development proposes 280 homes, with 40% designated as affordable housing. While this addresses housing needs, the scale of the development is not in line with the character of Borrowwash and will lead to overdevelopment. Only 10% social housing will cure none of the homeless issues we have nationally. The number of proposed houses represents a huge additional percentage of the size of the current village. This significant increase will change village life negatively and permanently. The influx of new residents will alter the close-knit community feel, increase demand on local services, and potentially lead to overdevelopment
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Type of Housing	Catherine Casartelli	Response-01428	I am not sure that 40% affordable housing is what I would want. Homes sized and priced for first time buyers to enable first time buyers to stay in the village.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Type of Housing	Craig Hydes	Response-00782	A new housing estate and quality will not be with in keeping of the local heritage of the area. The new houses of recent are built of poor quality and will look an eyesore.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Type of Housing	Dale Harlow	Response-00887	New Housing will not be fitting for the area
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Type of Housing	Daniel Lang	Response-00322	Borrowwash is a peaceful and quiet village. Assurances will need to be made that the 40% of affordable houses are in keeping with the area. Nobody wants anti social behaviour.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Type of Housing	David Modrovic	Response-00803	If you were to build it would need to be affordable and in keeping with the area! But it never is!
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Type of Housing	David Smith	Response-01115	it is always a concern about quality of housing and different types of housing. Sadly I believe that developments of this kind rarely if ever stick to the original plans for mixed housing.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Type of Housing	Denise Ball	Response-01291	It has been suggested that the housing is needed for the high number of children living in sub-standard accommodation. The building of £300,000 houses does not address the needs of these people in need. Part of the problem is the low level of support for families with children. These families are more likely to be helped by low cost housing in Ilkeston and Long Eaton where flexible employment is more likely to be found rather than Borrowwash as there is now little local employment opportunities. The employment was available in the past at work places such GIC, narrow fabrics, Bains Drive bedding/ lace works, and the nearby Celanese works at Spondon. The local sites are now housing for commuters to other locations. The type of commuter housing proposed is satisfying the need of the Derby planning area which already has plans to expand housing to the west of Derby. These commuter type houses are not improving the needs of Erewash residents.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Type of Housing	Dr Sarah Mee	Response-01320	I am concerned that the proposed 280 houses will be overlooking one another with small garden areas and won't be in keeping with the design of the majority of the properties in the village which are older style with larger gardens and privacy and influence the village character so well. I am concerned that housing allocation of Greenbelt at this site might include industrial development and that the parkland designation area will be further developed and the character of the current village lost completely for existing residents and future generations.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Type of Housing	Gary Mortimer	Response-01148	ONLY 40% of the new homes would be affordable housing, this is very low
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Type of Housing	Gillian Fitzpatrick	Response-00482	There should be no housing! That field/ green space needs to be preserved. The proposed remaining green area is insufficient to separate Borrowwash from Spondon in other words the city from the borough!
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Type of Housing	Gillian Hitchcock	Response-00446	No housing of any variety is welcome!
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Type of Housing	Helena Lucas	Response-00644	The average new build home has a lifespan of just 40-60 years. This highlights they are not a sustainable or cost efficient way to house people long term. It is a shortsighted solution to a bigger issue. They are an eyesore and will not fit in with the surrounding environment, particularly against the Victorian cottages along Victoria Road. Wear and tear of these houses will increase maintenance costs, again increasing waste and traffic pollution.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Type of Housing	Iain Pendry	Response-01188	Given the lack of affordable housing in the villages, serious consideration must be given to ensuring that a substantial number of houses are affordable, starter homes suitable for young people and young families.
			Ian Frearson	Response-01267	This site should not be considered as it reduces the division buffer between the City of Derby and Erewash.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Type of Housing	Jacky Kinirey	Response-01209	Houses for 1st time buyers is absolutely essential. Maybe part owned. Not 5/6 bedroom houses they're are plenty in Borrowwash.
			James Dean	Response-00553	Just NO to any new houses. Especially on our precious open space and green belt that make our beautiful town what it is.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Type of Housing	Jane Shepherd	Response-01333	I would welcome a smaller number of houses, aimed at first time buyers and young families. We do not need any more fancy 4 and 5 bedroom large houses or gated communities! We do need decent housing, but it needs to be of good quality and future proof with solar panels, car charging points, high quality insulation etc. Also with good gardens, green space but MORE IMPORTANTLY it should be affordable! Aimed at first time buyers or young families. We DO NOT need large 4 or 5 bedroom places, we certainly don't need any more gated communities.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Type of Housing	Jennifer Sutton	Response-00518	The policy offers 40% affordable housing, yet this often equates to smaller, lower quality homes with no long-term affordability guarantee. Developers typically build the minimum standard, not community-enhancing homes. There's no green energy mandate, no requirements for low-carbon builds, or social sustainability.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Type of Housing	John & Anna Mead	Response-00772	Doesn't matter what type of housing, there is not sufficient scope to cope

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Type of Housing	Julie Margaret Smith	Response-01090	How will a target of 40% 'affordable' housing work? Once planning permission is approved, developers will maximise their profits by eschewing the lower cost properties they once agreed to build. Modern housing developments lead to poor environment, lacking character with monotonous exterior design. How will this fit in to a village environment which is varied and relatively pleasing to the eye, making it a pleasant place to live?
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Type of Housing	Kirsty Murray	Response-01003	We currently manage to keep a village feel, if houses have to be built I feel they should be bigger houses with good gardens and sufficient parking allowing people to stay in the village as their families grow, which in turn frees up the smaller starter homes for younger people
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Type of Housing	Laura Dewsnap	Response-00936	Whilst I agree that affordable housing is needed across the country in general, it is not needed in the area in question. At the time of commenting, there are 77 houses listed for sale on Rightmove within a 1 mile radius of the area in question, 10 of which are under £200,000 and there are 6 properties listed for rent within the same 1 mile radius. In addition to this, there are alternative sites within Borrowwash which have previously been developed and are now derelict and empty. It would be more beneficial to the area if these sites were developed rather than building on green belt land.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Type of Housing	Lewis Sutton	Response-00415	The proposed number of homes (280 on 14 hectares) represents a high density for a semi-rural location. This is inconsistent with the character of Borrowwash and the surrounding countryside. Furthermore, there is little clarity on the type of housing? whether it truly meets local needs (e.g., bungalows for elderly residents, small affordable homes for young families) rather than simply meeting numerical housing targets.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Type of Housing	Lindsay Hodson	Response-01434	I am in shared ownership accommodation. Is this an option in the new housing site? I don't approve of the site but if you must I think shared ownership should be considered.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Type of Housing	Mark Birkinshaw	Response-00046	With 40% of the homes being affordable housing then although this ticks a huge box in one respect but this will surely negatively impact the average selling price within the area. In addition, driving away families who live in the adjacent streets who have bought homes based on the outlook and privacy.
			Mrs M McCroft	Response-00532	Need to be inkeeping with the area
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Type of Housing	Mr Timothy Shepherd	Response-01334	What is meant by "affordable housing"? Would this be two bed houses? Would it mean houses sold for less than £150,000?
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Type of Housing	Nicholas Parr	Response-01253	There should be no housing for the reasons given in other categories!
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Type of Housing	P. Hart	Response-00623	These should be of most affordable for the average person/family.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Type of Housing	Paul Barker	Response-00800	More affordable housing should be made available.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Type of Housing	Peter Howell	Response-00829	on site affordable homes, affordable to who!!!!
			Phil Adcock	Response-01488	40% to affordable housing is a huge figure which to be fair will lower the value of current neighbouring mature properties.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Type of Housing	Phil Self	Response-00759	Affordable housing to who ?
			Ray Kirk	Response-01378	Affordable for who? We don't our kids being in that position anytime soon even though they have full time jobs.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Type of Housing	Steven Hoolan	Response-00912	Proposed housing will no doubt be crammed in with as many as possible in a small space with no consideration for how this will affect existing homeowners around this site
			Sue Higginbottom	Response-01143	None needed
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Adele Pinkney	Response-01456	Development of this exclusively Green Belt land would have a devastating impact on flora and fauna habitat and biodiversity. It is a relatively narrow strip of land between the Derby City boundary and Borrowwash village. As such it is part of an essential wildlife corridor . Protected Skylarks nest in the open fields of the proposed development site, just one example of the importance of this natural habit .
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Alice Fitzpatrick	Response-00543	The Green areas and farmland need to be protected. We need wildlife. We need pollinators. We need a clear demarcation between the city and the borough and ANY development on this land would mean Borrowwash feeling part of the sprawling Metropolis of Derby city! I studied Countryside Management at Broomfield but we are no longer living in the countryside - we have a responsibility to wildlife as without it we could not survive - it's their home too. The council should only be using Brown sites for more housing in the borough! There must be plenty of vacant properties in the towns that could be converted to housing - especially affordable housing!
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Amy Brown	Response-00514	At the back of my home (Covent garden close) as you are aware is a very large green space with plenty of wildlife through it. Horses, foxes, birds, pheasants, cats. It's a lovely open space for wildlife and to take this away is simply cruel. We must have some green space left for our wildlife.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Angela Chapman	Response-01331	The suggested area ear-marked for this development is home to many species of wildlife. Most notably there are breeding pairs of barn owl in the area marked for construction of over 200 houses. Being the most protected bird in the UK, it is imperative that these are not torn from their home.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Ann Daykin	Response-01453	Currently the proposed site is to be built on farmland which has deliberately laid barren. Previously this was an area where wildlife could be found and seen. There is still wildlife there despite this and it needs to be saved for future generations.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Ashley Cartlidge	Response-01417	Yet more squeezing of our native wildlife.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Barry Shaw	Response-01482	Diverse wildlife use the field, this cannot simply be moved to elsewhere. In-depth consultation and investigations shall be required.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Bella Kelsey	Response-00739	We need to be preserving the green corridor
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Britton	Response-00877	We live on Derby Rd close to proposed site - we have numerous bird species currently visit the garden along with amphibians/bats - the huge habitat loss will greatly impact the wildlife
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Carmen Buckley	Response-00737	The fields are home to various ground nesting birds including skylarks and lapwings. Hedgehogs are endangered and the area is home to this now red listed species. Now is not the time to be cresting habitat loss. This would disrupt wildlife corridors and impact on protected species.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Carol Shaw	Response-00797	The development will require safeguarding the route of Ockbrook Footpath 41 and creating new parkland and woodland. However, the construction and increased human activity could disrupt local wildlife habitats and biodiversity. The area west of Borrowwash may contain important habitats that could be adversely affected by the development. Current Wildlife: The area is home to various species, including bats, birds of prey, water voles, newts, frogs, and birds. These species rely on the existing habitat for shelter, food, and breeding grounds. Simply moving them to a new park is not a viable solution as it disrupts their established ecosystems and can lead to a decline in their populations. Protected Species: Bats: All bat species in the UK are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. Disturbing or destroying their roosts is illegal. Water Voles: Protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, it is an offense to intentionally kill, injure, or take water voles, or to damage, destroy or obstruct access to any structure or place used by them for shelter or protection. Great Crested Newts: Protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. It is illegal to capture, kill, disturb or trade great crested newts, or to damage or destroy their habitat.
			Craig Hydes	Response-00782	Nesting barn owls, bats, lapwing, will all be affected.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Dale Harlow	Response-00887	Losing fields will risk wildlife to reduce massively
			Dan Pilgrim	Response-00932	Protect nature, currently areas being used for farm land, full of animals
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	David House	Response-01489	The development will consume what has become a wildlife haven in recent years.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	David Modrovic	Response-00803	The impact of the wildlife would be detrimental, has anyone actually done a proper survey?
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	David Smith	Response-01115	The size of the green belt is already quite limited .With the most recent developments in Spondon leading to the City boundary it has left a very narrow portion of land for wildlife which is already being seriously affected by climate change and loss of habitat. There is a considerable variety of bird, mammals and insect life that need to be allowed this channel of green belt.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	David Steare	Response-01300	1 The proposed development will destroy a wildlife habitat corridor between Spondon and Borrowwash and between the A52 dual carriageway and the A 6005. The land is home to many species of insects, reptiles, birds, and small mammals let alone the wild flowers and the grasses. 2 The land is currently only used when occasional dog walkers and the occasional hiker use the footpath. The current occasional footpath use maintains the habitat.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	David Tyler	Response-00835	This is farmed land , cropped annually not a brown field site, as well as wildlife and biodiversity being present
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Deborah young	Response-01306	The site has bats, foxes hedgehogs, large bird population including pheasants buzzards,wrens , plus insects bees , butterflies .
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Denise Illsley	Response-00056	I am really concerned about the loss of more green spaces and the threat to our wildlife that this will bring.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Dr Sarah Mee	Response-01320	The current Greenbelt designated land at this location supports a rich variety of wildlife which will inevitably be destroyed and not re-accommodated in the small strip of parkland proposed as substitute area of demarcation of the village of Borrowwash from the Derby City boundary. This wildlife and area of biodiversity will be forever lost and replaced with some form of manufactured Biodiversity Net Gains to meet guidelines but the original habitat for many existing species will be destroyed forever. In line with my comments on the Greenbelt review in the relevant section of this submission, what constitutes countryside is perception based and highly subjective to individuals. Taking away another natural green space will always negatively impact the original wildlife and biodiversity.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Ellen Young	Response-01357	The fields have a wealth of biodiversity. The well established hedgerow allow a place for insects and animals to hide, nest and eat. The brambles within the hedges supply food for insects and birds. When the fields haven't been planted, the flowers in the fields provide food for insects, particularly bees. The equally established trees within the border provide places for birds to nest and perch. Bats have been observed flying in the field proposed to be built on. Whilst they could be nesting anywhere within a 10Km radius, they would lose a food source and potentially a place to roost. Bats have sensitive eyes and prefer darkness, they may not relocate to the park due to light pollution from the houses and street lights. Pheasants, foxes and hedgehogs have a home in these fields. There's a wide variety of insects and songbirds. Birds of prey hunt in these fields. Some of the wildlife found in the fields prefer fields and not woodland. According to the 2023 State of Nature report, the UK is one of the most nature depleted countries on Earth. According to the report, there has been a 19% decline in 753 species studied since 1970 and the distributions of 54% of flowering plant species and 59% of mosses and liverworts have decreased across Britain. Removing the proposed land from the wild is contributing to the depletion of biodiversity.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Emma Gregory	Response-01454	Loss of precious wildlife and protected wildlife on the Green Belt field. Badgers Water Voles Bats - all species are protected Rabbits Birds - many bird species are protected Doormice - protected species Foxes are commonly found Kingfishers and Herons Frogs and fish are also known to inhabit the area Hedgehogs are plentiful in Borrowwash Birds - Sparrow, Hawks and Birds of Prey come to the field each day
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Eve barker	Response-00443	This field is home to foxes, sparrow hawks, a wide range of wild birds, bats feed here also. Greenbelt is fast disappearing and we'll never get it back
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Fiona Richards	Response-00020	A bee road is needed!
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Francesca Hope	Response-00528	I live at the back of the field and see a whole variation of wildlife who at present have no where else to go as land is borrowwash is continually being built on
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Gillian Fitzpatrick	Response-00482	The Green areas and farmland need to be protected. We need wildlife. We need pollinators. We need a clear demarcation between the city and the borough and ANY development on this land would mean Borrowwash feeling part of the sprawling Metropolis of Derby city! The council should only be using Brown sites for more housing in the borough! There must be plenty of vacant properties in the towns that could be converted to housing - especially affordable housing!



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Gillian Hitchcock	Response-00446	Building on this land would be detrimental to the wildlife in the area. Surely there are enough empty houses in the area that could be do up rather than keep building on greenbelt!
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Hayley Dexter	Response-00519	A large area of brown and green belt which is home to lots of wildlife who will be affected. They are already struggling and have lost many homes and habitats
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Helena Lucas	Response-00644	The field in which the buildings are proposed has offered a crucial biodiverse sanctuary for a variety of birds, including owls, insects, bees, hedgehogs and other wildlife. It has been a well needed open space to allow separation to the next village and a place for these wild creatures a place to thrive. In recent years wildflowers had been planted. We walked through this field almost daily as saw first hand the positive impact on the flourishing wildlife.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Helen Pearce	Response-01550	The proposed building plans will destroy the habitats of the bats, owls and many other threatened species which have had a safe home in our fields for many years.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Ian Frearson	Response-01267	The proposal would adversely affect the wildlife of the area by both displacement to that using the current site and that using the adjacent site
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Ian Hamilton	Response-01325	The hedgerows bordering the proposed development are home to a wide range of birds. The destruction of habitats and disruption caused by a long period of development would be catastrophic to the wildlife in the area.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Ian Wood	Response-00987	The reduction in open space/green belt will inevitably have a negative impact on existing wildlife and biodiversity
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jacky Kinirey	Response-01209	We need green spaces wildlife has to live and thrive.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jane Rothern	Response-00042	Wildlife will be affected if this land is built on. Many birds and wild animals will be lost due to lack of fields and hedges.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jane Shepherd	Response-01333	Every bit of green lost will obviously impact biodiversity- right from small insects, pollinators to birds, small mammals such as hedgehogs. We need to be mindful of the diversity of creatures that will be massively impacted. Losing even small amounts if greenspace is harmful to our environment. We need to ensure hedgerows and trees are left to endure biodiversity.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jennifer Sutton	Response-00518	This land, currently greenfield and Green Belt, is home to bats, amphibians (frogs, toads, newts), birds of prey, and hedgehogs ? all species that rely on low light levels, mature hedgerows, and wild patches. Development will permanently fragment and destroy these habitats. The site includes a small but vital wildlife corridor behind the houses on Derby Road [52°54'31"N 1°23'08"W], which is home to a range of important species. Smooth newts, frogs, hedgehogs, bats, little owls, buzzards, and red kites all rely on this habitat. There has been no credible effort to include a buffer zone or retain the existing wildlife corridor. The development would increase air, noise, and light pollution, especially harmful considering the compounding proximity to the A52. This is true for humans and wildlife. Parks and woodland cannot replace lost biodiversity. New planting won't re-establish populations or replicate existing microhabitats. This breaches NPPF 180(a-c): ?if significant harm to biodiversity cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site)... then planning permission should be refused.?
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Julie Margaret Smith	Response-01090	Once gone, land is gone forever, including its biodiversity and the ecosystems it supports. Where will the already endangered yellowhammers which flock to our boundary hedgerow in late winter and early spring go? How will food chains and pollinators be affected? This is an area completely ignored by planners, while none of us can understand what resulting effects there will be over time. Modern developments have little space for gardens or natural green spaces. What will you tell your grandchildren when our increasingly enlarging settlements become totally sterile and hostile? What effect will stamping out the natural world have on the mental health of populations and food security? Why build on green, agricultural land when there is plenty of brownfield and disused buildings which would be ideal places to develop the 'affordable' housing needed?
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Ken Hardy	Response-00928	This land is currently agricultural land, greenfield in classification within the green belt, therefore its development would not make efficient use of brownfield land. Development of the site could pose a threat to biodiversity interests and assets present on or adjacent to it. However, the land's current arable usage could likely lead to a reduction of the impacts on biodiversity arising from the site's possible development. Development of the site would have a notable impact on the current biodiversity and ecological species. New housing across the entirety of the site could threaten a diverse range of species.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Kevin Highton	Response-00506	Lots of natural hedgerows will be lost, these hedgerows are a haven to wildlife including nesting birds, hedgehog and foxes
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Kirsty Murray	Response-01003	Losing green space for further housing will have a negative impact on wildlife.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Laura Dewsnap	Response-00936	The proposed development will result in loss of habitat for wildlife and therefore, a significant decrease in biodiversity. We will see a sharp decline in the number of pollinators as a result of this development as vegetation in the area will cease to exist. This area of land is crucial for wildlife, it provides food sources, breeding grounds and shelter as well as providing a green corridor for wildlife movement. By reducing and fragmenting the habitat of wildlife, disrupting the ecological network, and potentially increasing pollution we will no doubt see a decline in biodiversity.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Lauren Fardoe	Response-00039	Will the park area have a nature reserve to conserve insects/ bees/ birds
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Lesley Eccles	Response-00814	Could affect wildlife as this was previously a field which attracted wildlife
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Lesley Young	Response-00902	There is quite a large pond in the area under discussion which has been there for 40 years plus and has a plethora of amphibian and nesting as well as being a haven for wildlife. Badgers have been seen as well as badgehogs and birds also nest on the field grounds. All of this will be lost with any new building development.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Lewis Sutton	Response-00415	Wildlife and Biodiversity Loss The proposed site is home to rich biodiversity, including protected and priority species such as: Buzzards, red kites, and kestrels ? all either Schedule 1 or protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. Hedgehogs ? listed as a species of principal importance under the NERC Act. Newts and frogs, potentially including great crested newts, a strictly protected species under UK and European law. Water voles ? a priority species under the UK Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP). Foxes and other woodland mammals ? important for maintaining local ecosystem balance. The site includes a small but vital wildlife corridor behind the houses on Derby Road [52°54'31"N 1°23'08"W], which is home to a range of important species. Smooth newts, frogs, hedgehogs, bats, little owls, buzzards, and red kites all rely on this habitat. There has been no credible effort to include a buffer zone or retain the existing wildlife corridor. The development would increase air, noise, and light pollution, especially harmful considering the compounding proximity to the A52. This is true for humans and wildlife. The destruction of this habitat through development is permanent and irreversible. Once bulldozed, the unique and interconnected ecosystem cannot be relocated, recreated, or adequately protected elsewhere. The loss of this natural space will fragment critical green corridors and have a lasting negative impact on wildlife populations. To date, no credible evidence has been provided that sufficient mitigation or compensation measures can be delivered to offset this loss.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Lindsay Hodson	Response-01434	People of Borrowwash respect and love the nature that surrounds the village and do not wish to stand back and watch it being destroyed.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Lynda Gamble	Response-00910	House building will disturb wildlife habitats. There are enough derelict and unused houses and business premises around and they should be renovated and made habitable again before even thinking about taking away more land for building.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Maisie Harlow	Response-00963	We have only lived in Borrowwash for 1 month and we have already seen a stork, a parakeet, a pheasant and an owl in our garden. Wildlife will be killed and injured during this construction, I can?t imagine how many animals will be disturbed and therefore ran over on the A52. Blocking their movement, losing access to food and breeding. Not to mention the direct destruction of the homes for many badgers, foxes, deer, birds, rabbits etc.
			Mandy Dickens	Response-00590	This land has been farmed for many years and is the habitat of many of our native creatures. Many of which are already endangered
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Margaret Irene Wheatley	Response-00915	It's good that parkland has been set aside but will this fulfil the developers obligations under Bio Diversity Net Gain or be separate to that.
			Mark Fearn	Response-00507	The removal of valuable established green belt will be detrimental to the local wildlife in this area of Erewash.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mary-Jo McDermott	Response-01437	These fields are an essential ecological corridor and a vital habitat for a wide variety of species, including foxes, hedgehogs, voles, badgers, bats, pollinators and multiple species of birds - including birds of prey, which use the area for both hunting and mating. Over the years, I have personally witnessed kestrels and buzzards regularly circling and perching in these fields - a clear sign of established territory. Destroying this habitat would not only displace these apex species but would also destabilize the broader ecological balance. The loss of these fields would represent a direct attack on local biodiversity and is inconsistent with national and local conservation priorities.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Maxwell Sutton	Response-01093	Max aged 5 loves his local nature and believes this is a destructive unnecessary process
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Middleton	Response-00893	Area is perfect for birds
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mrs Kay Rigby	Response-00876	This area has a natural animal community that will have no where to live when trees are cut down and the ground is disturbed
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mrs M McCroft	Response-00532	Wouldn't see any anymore.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Nicholas Parr	Response-01253	The Green areas and farmland need to be protected. We need wildlife. We need pollinators. Once gone, land is gone forever, including its biodiversity and the ecosystems it supports. This is an area completely ignored by planners and none of us can understand what resulting effects there will be over time ? but it will definitely be at our cost.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Nick Coates	Response-00393	This would impact wildlife by taking away more of there natural habitat
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Nicola Ashton	Response-00081	The proposed site supports a wide variety of wildlife including many birds species, it?s wonderful to see the buzzards circling on the thermals looking for prey of which there is a whole selection from mice, voles , shrews . We also have pheasants, goldfinch, blue tits , sparrows and many I don?t know We also have foxes , hedgehogs who live in this beautiful wild green belt land.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	P. Hart	Response-00623	The area has considerable wildlife which use it to get around as well as general habitat.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Paul Barker	Response-00800	Fields are home to badges foxes all bird life . At night bats and owls are active
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Peter HINKLEY	Response-00775	Building on greenbelt does not hep wildlife, there must be a strategy for this at Erewash Council
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Peter John Ball	Response-00703	The open nature of the land west of Victoria Avenue is important for the biodiversity of the village of Borrowwash. Development and the planting of Woodland will change the nature of the site and hence the wildlife that it supports.
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Raoul Pinkney	Response-01457	The Green Belt provides an important habit for wildlife & biodiversity which would be wiped out by the proposed development
			Simon Shaw	Response-01152	We have so few wild spaces left, this should be preserved at all costs
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Steven Hoolan	Response-00912	Current open fields and forest area currently house bats, birds of prey, and other endangered species
			Sue Higginbottom	Response-01143	We have a lot of wildlife in those fields , we don?t need anymore houses in Borrowwash
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Tanya caldbeck	Response-00917	Green belt land needed and not for building
1.12	West of Borrowwash	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Wayne Henderson	Response-01207	As a long term resident of Borrowwash and keen supporter of wildlife and biodiversity in my local area, I have witnessed a vast array of wildlife from garden birds to migrating birds to small mammals up to large mammals such as foxes and badgers. In particular, during late spring through summer and into early Autumn ?Pipistrel? bats visit our gardens feeding and roosting in the mature trees that are situated on and around the edge of the proposed development site. Short to medium term disruption during the proposed building of houses on the land in question; I feel will severely impact if not destroy the delicate habitat that these creatures rely on. Any established colonies in or around the site could be lost forever.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.13	East of Breaston	Air Quality	Wendy Coulton	Response-00752	This is green space , NOT to be built on ,
1.13	East of Breaston	Air Quality	Andrea Valentine	Response-01525	Derbyshire's air quality is already poorer than many other parts of the UK and increasing the amount of homes on greenbelt land will only add to this. More, not less, green spaces are needed in order to fight the air pollution, therefore any new homes being considered should be built on brownfield land only.
1.13	East of Breaston	Air Quality	Beverley Ann Ratcliffe	Response-01098	There will be a risk to Health and Safety through air pollution, air quality (including emissions), dust and noise levels due to the increase in traffic and building work which will take place through the amount of time to complete this project. As close to the M1, air quality is already not of the best.
1.13	East of Breaston	Air Quality	Christopher Baddiley	Response-01132	This land also serves as a necessary buffer zone from the noise and pollution generated by the (recently widened) M1 motorway.
1.13	East of Breaston	Air Quality	Christopher Baddiley	Response-01816	This land also serves as a necessary buffer zone from the noise and pollution generated by the (recently widened) M1 motorway.
1.13	East of Breaston	Air Quality	Dean Corcoran	Response-00798	The proximity of the M1 already impacts this area any increase in users will obviously impact this
1.13	East of Breaston	Air Quality	Diane Corsham	Response-00225	Air quality is going to be going downhill if you build anymore houses because of the traffic congestion it will cause! Air quality is not good really if you think about the proximity of the motorway to where you are proposing to build these houses, it's not going to be a good idea to place more people in that area because the quality of life will suffer!
1.13	East of Breaston	Air Quality	Graham Elliott	Response-00413	M1 Noise & Air Quality - This has been an ongoing issue for residents of Heath Gardens, with little help from the Highways Agency to resolve, leading to difficulties in selling properties in this area.
1.13	East of Breaston	Air Quality	Judith Ratcliffe	Response-00490	50 additional houses using Heath Gardens for access will adversely impact the air quality with pollution of car fumes/ construction
1.13	East of Breaston	Air Quality	Kevin Hopkinson	Response-01126	Increase traffic equals poorer air quality. Medically, air quality in Breaston was considered better than that in Long Eaton. This will be significantly reduced if this was to go ahead.
1.13	East of Breaston	Air Quality	Lauren Davis	Response-00474	Being so close to the m1 the air quality is not ideal so more cars would not help
1.13	East of Breaston	Air Quality	Linda Shaw	Response-00511	There would be a huge impact on the air quality during the building work itself and the increased traffic involved, and from the increased traffic from the new development. Poor air quality is linked with increased health risks, asthma, respiratory conditions, dementia etc. There are a number of elderly residents currently living on Heath Gardens whose health is likely to deteriorate, causing further demands on local health services etc. The development will require the cutting down of trees in the area, further impacting on the local air quality as this will release major greenhouse gases.
1.13	East of Breaston	Air Quality	Lindsey Trueman	Response-01878	Residents of any new development would be subjected to poor quality air from the M1 motorway. My house is currently two fields away from the motorway and we face pollution in terms of fumes and airborne particles on a daily basis. This has increased significantly since the proposed site was cleared of natural wooded vegetation by the current landowner approximately fifteen years ago.
1.13	East of Breaston	Air Quality	Lucy Corcoran	Response-00097	Air quality in the area close to the M1 is already poor so additional road congestion will add to this.
1.13	East of Breaston	Air Quality	Lynette Ratcliffe	Response-00779	Pollution is a concern
1.13	East of Breaston	Air Quality	Melvin Clive Shaw	Response-00513	There would be a huge impact on the air quality during the building work itself and the increased traffic involved, and from the increased traffic from the new development. Poor air quality is linked with increased health risks, asthma, respiratory conditions, dementia etc. There are a number of elderly residents currently living on Heath Gardens whose health is likely to deteriorate, causing further demands on local health services etc. The development will require the cutting down of trees in the area, further impacting on the local air quality as this will release major greenhouse gases.
1.13	East of Breaston	Air Quality	Mr s e Taylor mrs j p tayloe	Response-01288	It's bad enough with the motorway besides anything else. Traffic noise is already a problem it doesn't require adding too.
1.13	East of Breaston	Air Quality	Mrs M Rigby	Response-00808	Poor air quality with more traffic.
1.13	East of Breaston	Air Quality	Nicholas Trueman	Response-01879	Residents of any new development would be subjected to poor quality air from the M1 motorway. My house is currently two fields away from the motorway and we face pollution in terms of fumes and airborne particles on a daily basis. This has increased significantly since the proposed site was cleared of natural wooded vegetation by the current landowner approximately fifteen years ago.
1.13	East of Breaston	Air Quality	Nicola Connell	Response-00731	The proposal conflicts with the UK's Climate Change Act 2008 undermining efforts to reduce carbon emissions
1.13	East of Breaston	Air Quality	Roger Day	Response-00027	Air quality due to the M1 is already poor. adding more homes and the added traffic would make matters worse.
1.13	East of Breaston	Air Quality	S M Corcoran	Response-01319	There will be a significant increase in both noise and air pollution to a level which will be unacceptable to the current residents of Heath Gardens or Holly Avenue in relation to their health both physical and mental well-being. This additional pollution will occur during both construction and after its completion. The removal of all or some of the existing trees on the proposed site (currently in excess of 100 trees ) will reduce the air quality of residents on both Holly Ave and Heath Gardens that are facing the Motorway. Currently these trees not only help block the noise from the motorway but also reduce the car emissions pollution
1.13	East of Breaston	Air Quality	Stephen Hooley	Response-00774	It is obvious from the start of construction that site traffic pollution, eventual increased residency traffic pollution and the growth in traffic on the adjacent M1 motorway ,will have a detrimental impact on the local air quality.
1.13	East of Breaston	Air Quality	Sylva Jolliffe	Response-01512	The new houses will be very close to M1 and may suffer air pollution
1.13	East of Breaston	Air Quality	Terence Corcoran	Response-00318	The removal of the trees on the proposed site (in excess of 120 trees ) will reduce the air quality of residents on both Holly Ave and Heath Gardens that are facing the Motorway. These trees not only help block the noise from the motorway but also reduce the car emissions pollution
1.13	East of Breaston	Bus Services	Andrea Valentine	Response-01525	Building on greenbelt land will lead to urban sprawl ? high carbon development, car-dependent development. What we really need is compact cities, where people can live near to amenities, where older people and people on low incomes are not isolated by lack of public transport, where teenagers and even younger children can get about independently, where we are not all choked by pollution, congestion and facing constant noise and road danger.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.13	East of Breaston	Bus Services	Diane Corsham	Response-00225	The bus service provided is not even enough to deal with the traffic congestion that is experienced already and they took off a really useful bus service which connected the village to all surrounding areas! The old and the vulnerable needs aren't being met either!
1.13	East of Breaston	Bus Services	Graham Elliott	Response-00413	Currently a reasonable service and bus stops at the end of the street, however a long walk from the proposed end of the street, particularly for the elderly.
1.13	East of Breaston	Bus Services	Judith Ratcliffe	Response-00490	Bus Services from Breaston are already poor and unreliable
1.13	East of Breaston	Bus Services	KARL BARROW	Response-00793	This development is close to the bus stop at the junction of Richmond Avenue and Wilsthorpe Road. Long Eaton bound buses stopping here, predictably, slow following Long Eaton bound traffic leading to congestion and dangerous overtakes as vehicles overtaking accelerate to pass the bus immediately before the proposed entrance to this development via Heath Gardens. This is just creating more opportunities for vehicle to vehicle conflict. That said, the fact that Wilsthorpe Road is served by regular frequent bus services to Long Eaton, Nottingham and Derby is appreciated. Unfortunately those loving on Holly Avenue and Longmoor Lane are completely denied this opportunity as there is no footpath through to Wilsthorpe Road. If this development does go ahead, it should include a footpath for Holly Avenue into the new development to enable more people to use the bus rather than private cars.
1.13	East of Breaston	Bus Services	Linda Shaw	Response-00511	Heath Gardens is not wide enough to facilitate extensions of any existing bus services and would not be promoting sustainable transportation. There would be insufficient space for a bus turning area and it would be difficult to integrate a bus service with other modes of transport, cycling, walking etc. due to the narrow road.
1.13	East of Breaston	Bus Services	Lindsey Trueman	Response-01878	Heath Gardens has access to Wilsthorpe Road which is serviced by bus routes. Access from Longmoor Lane is not convenient for main bus routes without at least a 15 minute walk, leading to a dependency on vehicle ownership.
1.13	East of Breaston	Bus Services	Lynette Ratcliffe	Response-00779	Bus services area already limited on Wilsthorpe road
1.13	East of Breaston	Bus Services	Melvin Clive Shaw	Response-00513	Heath Gardens is not wide enough to facilitate extensions of any existing bus services and would not be promoting sustainable transportation. There would be insufficient space for a bus turning area and it would be difficult to integrate a bus service with other modes of transport, cycling, walking etc. due to the narrow road.
1.13	East of Breaston	Bus Services	Mrs M Rigby	Response-00808	There use to be a bus service from Breaston to Nottingham the 5A what happened to that.?
1.13	East of Breaston	Bus Services	Nicholas Trueman	Response-01879	Heath Gardens has access to Wilsthorpe Road which is serviced by bus routes. Access from Longmoor Lane is not convenient for main bus routes without at least a 15 minute walk, leading to a dependency on vehicle ownership.
1.13	East of Breaston	Bus Services	Roger Day	Response-00027	The only bus service to my knowledge takes you to Nottingham or Derby, getting north or south is an issue.
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	Andrea Valentine	Response-01525	The proposed site in Breaston is already prone to flooding and although it may be intended to build flood defences there is no guarantee these will be adequately effective. Given that new homes built since 2009 are not covered by the Flood Re insurance scheme this would leave the new homeowners and tenants at risk.
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	Andrew Knight	Response-01824	The proposed site regularly becomes waterlogged and currently acts as a natural soakaway. Replacing this with hard surfaces would significantly increase flood risk for surrounding properties?particularly in light of severe local flooding in late 2023 and early 2024. During the last flood the sewage system could not cope with the surface water, this flooded drives and properties in Holly Avenue. SANDBAGS were delivered by Erewash Council. This is a serious issue. I note that monitoring wells have been installed in the graveyard next to the proposed development. This reading will not be REPRESENTATIVE as we current have one of the driest springs on record. Also although the drainage channels have been cleaned this year ? this has never happened in the past decade! Once the building work is complete -its unlikely the drainage channels will be cleaned again. If a further development down stream is added to the sewer load the system will back up further as the capacity cannot be increased through the culvert.
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	Beverley Ann Ratcliffe	Response-01098	There is very limited Green belt in this area and in addition you are trying to put new houses in a small plot which already floods so increasing the risk of flooding to the neighboring cemetery and grounds also residents on nearby streets.
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	Caroline Okeowo	Response-01814	Recent flooding events in late 2023 and early 2024 demonstrated the village's vulnerability to extreme weather. The proposed site, which currently functions as a natural soakaway and is often waterlogged, plays a key role in managing surface water. Development would replace permeable land with hard surfaces, significantly raising flood risk for both existing and future properties at a time when climate unpredictability is on the rise.
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	Charlotte Fennemore	Response-01536	That area is already subject to flooding and drainage issues. More houses will only make that worse
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	Christopher Baddiley	Response-01132	LANDSCAPING / FLOODING Storms in late 2023 and early 2024 have highlighted Breaston's vulnerability to flooding. Many properties in Holly Avenue suffered external and internal flood damage as a result of that weather. The proposed development site is a natural soakaway and is frequently waterlogged. The fields provide essential drainage and relief against further flooding. Replacing this green belt with hard surfaces would increase surface water run-off, raising the flood risk even further for homes on Holly Avenue and Heath Gardens. It would be irresponsible to compromise this natural buffer with 50 new homes.
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	Christopher Baddiley	Response-01816	Storms in late 2023 and early 2024 have highlighted Breaston's vulnerability to flooding. Many properties in Holly Avenue suffered external and internal flood damage as a result of that weather. The proposed development site is a natural soakaway and is frequently waterlogged. The fields provide essential drainage and relief against further flooding. Replacing this green belt with hard surfaces would increase surface water run-off, raising the flood risk even further for homes on Holly Avenue and Heath Gardens. It would be irresponsible to compromise this natural buffer with 50 new homes.
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	Claire Cherry	Response-01817	Recent events, including severe storms in late 2023 and early 2024, have highlighted Breaston's vulnerability to flooding, with many properties suffering internal damage. The proposed development site acts as a natural soakaway and is frequently waterlogged, as evidenced by photos and videos taken by local residents. Replacing this land with hard surfaces would increase surface water runoff, raising the flood risk for both existing homes and new properties, especially given the increasingly unpredictable climate.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	Dean Corcoran	Response-00798	As mentioned numerous times in previous answers this area is known to flood regularly and often remaining underwater for many weeks with birds such as Egrets seen on many occasions the previously mentioned change of water runoff from the M1 and water table means that you are considering providing housing for people in the knowledge that any development will be prone to these issues
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	Debbie Hunt	Response-01803	Recent flooding events in late 2023 and early 2024 demonstrated the village's vulnerability to extreme weather. The proposed site, which currently functions as a natural soakaway and is often waterlogged, plays a key role in managing surface water. Development would replace permeable land with hard surfaces, significantly raising flood risk for both existing and future properties at a time when climate unpredictability is on the rise. Our house will be directly affected by this and I am very concerned about our garden and house flooding.
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	Diane Corsham	Response-00225	This area is known as flood plain and why would you want to build on this area as it already floods massively without any more drainage problems being brought into this area it's not fair to the residents who already live there and complete lack of thought to anyone else that lives in the area as I'm sure that the residents of Holly Avenue have already sent in their videos of the area under water when they have had recent flooding occur!
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	Ed Huntley	Response-01120	This is an area which regularly floods. We would have reduced flood protection and the people living in the new houses might be subject to flooding.
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	Geoff Potts	Response-01205	The report on the site attributes the poor drainage to unauthorised ground works. However the water table has always been high, when we moved into our property in the mid 1980's the field behind was uncultivated brush land yet the house next door was left with standing water in the rear garden after periods of heavy rain. For the reason above I am opposed to any development which could increase the flood risk.
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	Graham Elliott	Response-00413	The adjacent 'Flood Alleviation Ditch' running from Longmoor Lane to Wilsthorpe Road has often proved inadequate to protect this area from flooding. Storm rainwater from the hills in Risley to the North, runs down past the Cemetery and floods Holly Avenue and the proposed site, making it totally unsuitable for residential properties, particularly as the reduction in natural soakaway land will make any potential flooding even worse.
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	Greg Cherry	Response-01818	Recent events, including severe storms in late 2023 and early 2024, have highlighted Breaston's vulnerability to flooding, with many properties suffering internal damage. The proposed development site acts as a natural soakaway and is frequently waterlogged, as evidenced by photos and videos taken by local residents. Replacing this land with hard surfaces would increase surface water runoff, raising the flood risk for both existing homes and new properties, especially given the increasingly unpredictable climate.
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	Hilary M McCullagh	Response-00804	Our garden has suffered a number of episodes of flooding up to the house, but fortunately not inside - yet. The first occurred in 1986 but there were no further major episodes here until 2019. Since then there have been at least three occurrences following severe storms in the 2020s. They have highlighted Breaston's vulnerability to flooding, with many properties suffering internal damage. The development site acts as a natural soakaway and is frequently waterlogged, as evidenced by photos and videos taken by local residents. Replacing this land with hard surfaces would increase surface water runoff, raising the flood risk for both existing homes and new properties, especially given the increasingly unpredictable climate.
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	Ian Burton	Response-00194	The area is prone to flooding and has done so many times
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	Jack Collins	Response-00908	Recent flooding events in late 2023 and early 2024 demonstrated the village's vulnerability to extreme weather. The proposed site, which currently functions as a natural soakaway and is often waterlogged, plays a key role in managing surface water. Development would replace permeable land with hard surfaces, significantly raising flood risk for both existing and future properties at a time when climate unpredictability is on the rise.
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	Jessica Collins	Response-00899	The land in question is entirely unsuitable for development. It suffers from frequent and severe flooding, which we have personally witnessed on numerous occasions. Breaston is already prone to flooding, as evidenced by recent severe weather events in 2023 and 2024. The proposed development site is frequently waterlogged and currently serves as a natural soakaway, helping to manage surface water. Developing this site with impermeable surfaces would only increase the flood risk, endangering existing homes as well as new ones, especially considering the unpredictable nature of future climate conditions.
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	Judith Ratcliffe	Response-00490	You will turn the current area into a flood risk by concreting over the land. the 'ditch' the runs at the side of Heath gardens already fills with water during heavy rain
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	Julie Yelland and Ed Huntley	Response-00904	Perhaps even more concerning is the fact that the intended fields are often flooded in the winter. Water will be displaced if more housing is built, possibly endangering the existing houses on Holly Avenue and other surrounding streets.
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	KARL BARROW	Response-00793	This area of Breaston is already experiencing increasing frequency of flooding incidents due to increased intensity of rainfall from anthropogenic climate change. Adjacent Holly Avenue and Longmoor Lane now experience road flooding every year with residents forced to build ad hock walls of sandbags across Holly Avenue. Adding more hard impermeable paving on this new development will mean the water has to go elsewhere. There is no where for it to go without extensive on site SUDS schemes including swales and river garden systems which will consume land reducing the numbers of houses.
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	Kelly Steed	Response-00444	Recent extreme weather has highlighted our village's vulnerability to flooding. The proposed site is often waterlogged and acts as a natural soakaway. Replacing this with impermeable surfaces increases flood risk for both new and existing homes.
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	Kevin Hopkinson	Response-01126	In recent years flooding has been a significant issue in this area and I suspect that the infrastructure which will be put in place will only serve to push the issue further down the line, giving someone else the problem to sort. Short term developers gain at the long term expense of the established local community.
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	Lauren Davis	Response-00474	Flooding issues are present

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	Lee Hargreaves	Response-01184	The land already floods
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	Linda Shaw	Response-00511	New housing developments come with an increased risk of flooding in the local area. Breaston is a known risk area for flooding and the area proposed for a change from greenbelt is known to have an extremely high water table and is prone to frequent flooding. Current flood alleviation methods have proved insufficient for this area and the building of a housing estate here and the consequent removal of natural soak-aways and replacement with hard surfaces is likely to only increase the flooding risk, potentially widening or diverting the flooding risk to other residential housing and roads in the area. The removal of trees and the change of status of the area from greenbelt will have an adverse impact upon water levels. Sustainable drainage systems would need to be an essential for a much wider area than just for any potential housing development in order to alleviate flooding risks. The properties on Heath Gardens are high risk as they are all bungalows and mostly accommodating elderly and infirm residents.
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	Linda Sheppard	Response-01321	This field is often flooded with quite deep water. Holly Avenue has increasing had water flowing down the street with some homes needing to use sand bags. Longmoor Road also has a section which regularly floods. It seems insane to build on a natural sink for the water.
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	Lindsey Trueman	Response-01878	Since the land was cleared of more dense trees and vegetation as outlined previously, I have observed regular waterlogging over the subsequent years. As climatic changes have become more extreme in recent years, severe flooding has occurred several times since 2023. During one particular storm in October 2023, the current and depth of water flowing across the field was sufficient to move a plastic pallet containing two hay bales across the length the field. Building on this land with associated hard surfaces will only increase the surface water run off leading to increased flood risk for new and existing homes. My own property stands approximately 0.7 metres above the height of my garden, which is level with the proposed development site. The garden border adjacent to the field frequently floods during periods of heavy rain.
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	Lisa Patrick	Response-00085	This land floods and has insufficient drainage and this causes problems for the local area
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	Lucy Corcoran	Response-00097	The land in ear marked regularly floods to due run off from the M1 and lack of sufficient drainage. Land is below the water table and is used as flood plains during which Egrets and water wildlife are sited.
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	Lynette Ratcliffe	Response-00779	The area has been prone to flooding. Surely concreting over the greenbelt will only make this worse.
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	Melvin Clive Shaw	Response-00513	New housing developments come with an increased risk of flooding in the local area. Breaston is a known risk area for flooding and the area proposed for a change from greenbelt is known to have an extremely high water table and is prone to frequent flooding. Current flood alleviation methods have proved insufficient for this area and the building of a housing estate here and the consequent removal of natural soak-aways and replacement with hard surfaces is likely to only increase the flooding risk, potentially widening or diverting the flooding risk to other residential housing and roads in the area. The removal of trees and the change of status of the area from greenbelt will have an adverse impact upon water levels. Sustainable drainage systems would need to be an essential for a much wider area than just for any potential housing development in order to alleviate flooding risks. The properties on Heath Gardens are high risk as they are all bungalows and mostly accommodating elderly and infirm residents.
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	Michael Sidebottom	Response-01807	The land in question is a FLOOD PLAIN. I have witnessed this with my own eyes on numerous occasions. The land i believe acts a natural soakaway for surrounding areas so is often waterlogged in times of extreme weather. Any development would take this natural occurrence away and this water has to go somewhere. I fear it will impact Holly Avenue also which again i have witnessed flooding on numerous occasions. I am very concerned for the future threat of flooding for my property. Please talk to your own Erewash grave diggers who tend the neighbouring Cemetery. They often struggle with waterlogged graves at present. If development were to go ahead then this would surely escalate the problem.
			Molly Allison	Response-01528	Constant flooding in breaston
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	Mr s e Taylor mrs j p tayloe	Response-01288	You are planning to build on a flood plain area which is counter productive. A more suitable site would prove the best option.
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	MRS JULIE ROWLINSON	Response-01000	Breaston has suffered a lot of flooding in recent years. Building on land that is meant to be fields is only going to make things worse. We must keep the existing landscape to avoid further flooding , especially as this land has trees that will take up excess water.
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	Mrs M Rigby	Response-00808	Holly Avenue suffers with flooding this project will make it worse.
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	Nicholas Trueman	Response-01879	Since the land was cleared of more dense trees and vegetation as outlined previously, I have observed regular waterlogging over the subsequent years. As climatic changes have become more extreme in recent years, severe flooding has occurred several times since 2023. During one particular storm in October 2023, the current and depth of water flowing across the field was sufficient to move a plastic pallet containing two hay bales across the length the field. Building on this land with associated hard surfaces will only increase the surface water run off leading to increased flood risk for new and existing homes. My own property stands approximately 0.7 metres above the height of my garden, which is level with the proposed development site. The garden border adjacent to the field frequently floods during periods of heavy rain.
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	Nicola Connell	Response-00731	Recent events, including severe storms in late 2023 and early 2024, have highlighted Breaston's vulnerability to flooding, with many properties suffering internal damage. The proposed development site acts as a natural soakaway and is frequently waterlogged, as evidenced by photos and videos taken by local residents. Replacing this land with hard surfaces would increase surface water runoff, raising the flood risk for both existing homes and new properties, especially given the increasingly unpredictable climate.
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	Pauline Wilcox	Response-00839	Flooding is a major concern for this area, despite work being carried out to clear ditches. The building of more houses is only going to exacerbate the problem and how on earth do people get insurance!?
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	Paul Wells	Response-00284	The area regularly floods and landowners including EBC have failed to maintain flood defences, clear ditches and manage the land in its current state. What commitment will be given that more will be done if/when 50 more houses are built
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	Rachel Lacey	Response-00784	The area floods regularly and there is already danger to houses. This will only create more flooding risk.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	Rafik Fanous	Response-01161	This area is already at significant flood risk and the nearby brook into which drainage occurs has seen record high levels and flooding over the last few years. Additional housing draining into this will lead to significant increase in water levels and flooding
			Robert Mee	Response-01502	I am concerned about the flood risk at this site
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	Roger and Iris Woodward	Response-00302	I understand that residents on Heath Gardens are aware that the land is liable to flooding and this has happened on a several occasions to the rear of my property. Any removal of trees which help to dissipate the water would potentially lead to more flooding.
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	Samantha Honeybell	Response-01815	Recent events, including severe storms in late 2023 and early 2024, have highlighted Breaston's vulnerability to flooding, with many properties suffering internal damage. The proposed development site acts as a natural soakaway and is frequently waterlogged, as evidenced by photos and videos taken by local residents. Replacing this land with hard surfaces would increase surface water runoff, raising the flood risk for both existing homes and new properties, especially given the increasingly unpredictable climate. The old chapel has sustained severe damage from flooding due to waterlogged land on all sides. Despite claims that flood defences would be put in place by the developers, the risk of moving the flood problems to other housing areas and roads is high.
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	Simon Hartopp	Response-01201	The brooks that run along the bungalows back gardens regularly fill high with run off water during times of heavy rain. With more areas that are presently fields being turned into hard standing surfaces, the potential for flooding will be greatly increased, as the extra run off will be directed into these brooks that are not designed or have the capacity for the extra water that 50 homes would cause.
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	S M Corcoran	Response-01319	The proposed site and the area surrounding it is know to flood regularly with a high water table in the whole area. The change of use and " concreting over "of the land will only cause increased flooding and water damage to the properties on both Holly Ave and Heath Gardens plus the surrounding area. Although work as been done recently on the draining / run off in the area this as only been in the form of cleaning-up and general maintenance to the drainage systems already there rather than providing another outlet or water-course. The fact that the current system required such a large amount of work to bring it back to ?fit for purpose? only illustrates the fact that such maintenance work is low down on the councils priorities particularly in times of budget cut and reduced government funding. A Flood Risk Assessment should be requested for developments within or so close to a Flood Zone, this development will only further exacerbate existing flooding areas Having walked around the cemetery during many of these periods of flooding I can only imagine the upset and distress this causes to the relatives and friends of people buried there to see their loved ones graves literally under water so frequently.
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	Stacey lester	Response-01239	My garden and part of my house flooded last year , Breaston is known for poor drainage and this would further that issue
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	Stephen Hooley	Response-00774	The land within the proposed site has an extremely high water-table and is prone to frequent flooding during adverse weather conditions. It is understood the current flood alleviation measures are proven insufficient. Recent flooding of Breaston Church and the Cemetery bare witness. The building of 50 houses on the proposed site does not appear to consider natural soak-away. How is all the rain-water going to be absorbed when the land is covered with bricks, concrete and tarmac!
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	Stephen Lacey	Response-00785	The area floods regularly and has caused damage to homes. Further building will only increase this risk to new and existing houses.
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	Sylva jolliffe	Response-01512	This land floods regularly why would you put houses here????
1.13	East of Breaston	Flooding / Drainage	Terence Corcoran	Response-00318	The proposed site and the area surrounding it is know to flood regularly with a high water table in the whole area. The change of use and " concreting over "of the land will only cause increased flooding and water damage to the properties on both Holly Ave and Heath Gardens plus the area around it. Although work as been done recently on the draining / run off in the area this as only been in the form of cleaning-up and general maintenance to the drainage systems already there rather than providing another outlet or water-course. The fact that the current system required such a large amount of work to bring it back into use only illustrates the fact that such maintenance work is low down on the councils priorities particularly in times of budget cut and reduced government funding. Having walked around the cemetery during one of these periods of flooding I can only imagine the upset and distress this causes to the relatives and friends of people buried there to see their loved ones graves literally under water.
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	Andrea Valentine	Response-01525	The fifth purpose of the greenbelt policy is ?to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.? so rather than developing on our greenfield land, regenerating pre-used land and buildings, often left neglected and decaying anyway, should be the priority.
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	Andrew Knight	Response-01824	The site is designated Green Belt for good reason: to prevent urban sprawl, protect natural habitats, and maintain the character of rural communities. This development would cause permanent environmental damage and biodiversity loss. The proposal contradicts the National Planning Policy Framework, which allows changes to Green Belt boundaries only in exceptional circumstances?none of which have been clearly demonstrated. There is also insufficient evidence that brownfield or non-Green Belt alternatives have been exhausted.
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	Beverley Ann Ratcliffe	Response-01098	Absolutely disgusting that you can change the Green Belt to Grey Belt. There is very limited Green belt in this area and in addition you are trying to put new houses in a small plot which already floods so increasing the risk of flooding to the neighboring cemetery and grounds also residents on nearby streets.
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	Caroline Okeowo	Response-01814	Contradiction with Planning Policy and Legislation Under the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2023): ? Paragraph 140 states that changes to Green Belt boundaries should only be made in exceptional circumstances. ? Paragraphs 149?150 highlight that inappropriate development in the Green Belt should only be permitted under very special circumstances. No compelling justification has been presented to meet these thresholds. Additionally: ? The Council is required to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply before Green Belt release is considered. There is no clear evidence that all brownfield and non-Green Belt options have been fully explored.
			Charlotte Fennemore	Response-01536	Greenbelt land is that for a reason and should be protected

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	Christopher Baddiley	Response-01132	There are more appropriate, sustainable locations for housing development which do not involve sacrificing protected green belt and countryside. Once lost, these green spaces and their ecological value cannot be replaced.
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	Christopher Baddiley	Response-01816	I feel there are more appropriate, sustainable locations for housing development which do not involve sacrificing protected green belt and countryside. Once lost, these green spaces and their ecological value cannot be replaced.
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	Claire Cherry	Response-01817	Conflict with National and Local Planning Policy According to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2023): ? Paragraph 140 states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. ? Paragraphs 149-150 confirm that inappropriate development in the Green Belt should not be approved except in very special circumstances. No compelling justification has been provided to demonstrate that these criteria have been met. Furthermore: ? The Council must first demonstrate a five-year housing land supply before considering Green Belt release. No clear evidence has been presented to confirm that all suitable brownfield and non-Green Belt options have been exhausted.
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	Claire Matthews	Response-01203	Green belt means green belt, no development. Erewash is not following the rules and wrecking the green belt, very gradually. If this development goes ahead, the adjoining land is certainly in danger of being developed.
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	Dawn Fish	Response-01165	The houses are being built on greenbelt land. Once it's gone, it's gone forever. Why are brownfield sites not being used
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	Dean Corcoran	Response-00798	This area was designated as Green belt for a reason it acts as both a place for wildlife , presents a break between homes and the M1 and a flood plain ( flooding increased when pipework was removed from central reservation in the next field over ( between The proposed development and M1 the farmer that uses this land can confirm that the flooding that now occurs each year is exacerbated as a result of this with the flooding impacting both his fields and tge fields where work is being proposed
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	Debbie Hunt	Response-01803	Contradiction with Planning Policy and Legislation Under the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2023): ? Paragraph 140 states that changes to Green Belt boundaries should only be made in exceptional circumstances. Why is this proposal exceptional circumstances when there are other locations available? ? Paragraphs 149?150 highlight that inappropriate development in the Green Belt should only be permitted under very special circumstances. No compelling justification has been presented to meet these thresholds. Additionally: ? The Council is required to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply before Green Belt release is considered. There is no clear evidence that all brownfield and non-Green Belt options have been fully explored.
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	Diane Corsham	Response-00225	Green belt areas should just be that green belt and be left alone!
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	Ed Huntley	Response-01120	This is an area which regularly floods. We would have reduced flood protection and the people living in the new houses might be subject to flooding.
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	Graham Elliott	Response-00413	We strongly object to this Development , particularly the use of Protected ?Green Belt Land?, which was a key reason for us purchasing this property and we are particularly concerned as to the precedence it may set for other Green Belt land around us.
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	Greg Cherry	Response-01818	Conflict with National and Local Planning Policy According to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2023): ? Paragraph 140 states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. ? Paragraphs 149-150 confirm that inappropriate development in the Green Belt should not be approved except in very special circumstances. No compelling justification has been provided to demonstrate that these criteria have been met. Furthermore: ? The Council must first demonstrate a five-year housing land supply before considering Green Belt release. No clear evidence has been presented to confirm that all suitable brownfield and non-Green Belt options have been exhausted.
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	Hilary M McCullagh	Response-00804	This proposed development would have a deeply damaging impact on Breaston?s Green Belt, infrastructure, natural environment, flood resilience, and community identity. There are more appropriate, sustainable locations for housing development that do not involve sacrificing protected countryside
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	Jack Collins	Response-00908	The land in question is designated Green Belt, protected to limit urban sprawl, safeguard the countryside, and preserve biodiversity. Development here would lead to the permanent loss of vital green space. Contradiction with Planning Policy and Legislation. Under the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2023): ? Paragraph 140 states that changes to Green Belt boundaries should only be made in exceptional circumstances. ? Paragraphs 149?150 highlight that inappropriate development in the Green Belt should only be permitted under very special circumstances. No compelling justification has been presented to meet these thresholds. Additionally: ? The Council is required to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply before Green Belt release is considered. There is no clear evidence that all brownfield and non-Green Belt options have been fully explored. More appropriate, sustainable sites should be prioritised - sites that do not require sacrificing protected countryside and the long-term wellbeing of our community
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	Jessica Collins	Response-00899	The land earmarked for development is currently designated as Green Belt, intended to limit urban expansion, protect the countryside, and preserve important natural habitats. Allowing development here would result in the permanent loss of valuable green space, irreversibly disrupting wildlife habitats and the biodiversity they support, including birds, bats, and small mammals. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2023) clearly states: ? Paragraph 140, which emphasises that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. ? Paragraphs 149?150, which assert that inappropriate development in the Green Belt should only occur under very special circumstances. The proposal fails to meet these exceptional criteria. Furthermore: ? The Council must demonstrate a five-year housing land supply before considering the release of Green Belt land. There is insufficient evidence that all other options, including brownfield sites, have been fully explored.
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	Judith Ratcliffe	Response-00490	Please do not remove more Greenbelt in the area. Very sad to do this.
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	Judy Arcy	Response-01167	There are plenty of brown field sites ! We should not be building on green belt - which is being gradually being eroded



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	Kelly Steed	Response-00444	The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) emphasises the importance of prioritising brownfield (previously developed) land for new housing developments. Despite this, the current proposal targets valuable green space while numerous brownfield sites across the borough remain underutilised. Before considering Green Belt release, the Council must exhaust all brownfield land opportunities. Yet multiple such sites remain neglected: ? The derelict industrial units on Longmoor Lane, scheduled for demolition before the Covid pandemic, remain untouched more than five years on. These buildings continue to deteriorate, attract vandalism and visually blight the area ? a missed opportunity for sustainable housing. ? The former Wilmot Arms site in Borrowash, another derelict and underutilised location, could feasibly accommodate part of the proposed housing, if properly considered. These sites offer viable alternatives that preserve precious countryside while contributing to local regeneration. Furthermore, all the links to the Council's own brownfield land register on the website appear to be broken. This raises serious concerns about the transparency of the site selection process and whether all brownfield alternatives have been properly assessed and ruled out. Without this evidence, the proposal is not in line with national planning guidance. According to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2023): ? Paragraph 140: Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. ? Paragraphs 149?150: Development on Green Belt land is inappropriate unless justified by very special circumstances ? none of which have been demonstrated. Further, the Council must demonstrate a five-year housing land supply and confirm that all non-Green Belt alternatives have been explored ? including the sites mentioned above. The proposal also undermines targets under the Climate Change Act 2008 and Environment Act 2021, particularly the goal of 10% Biodiversity Net Gain.
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	Kevin Hopkinson	Response-01126	Conversion of green belt to brown belt land is an underhanded way of opening the door for developers to make a profit at the expense of the local community. They will develop to profit off the local community and then just move on to the next development with little or no respect for the damage they have caused to both the environment and the local community.
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	Lauren Davis	Response-00474	Must be protected
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	Lee Hargreaves	Response-01184	We need to protect our green belt areas
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	Linda Shaw	Response-00511	Changing the status of this area from greenbelt to allow a development of housing would cause numerous issues which are highlighted in other sections of this submission ? road safety, traffic congestion, air quality, effect upon wildlife, increased risk of flooding etc. etc. It adversely impacts upon the prevailing status of the current housing on Heath Gardens and Holly Avenue as well as the entire natural beauty and character of the Breaston area.
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	Lindsey Trueman	Response-01878	Loss of this designated Green Belt land is my prime objection to this development. The purpose of Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl and safeguard the countryside. This Green Belt provides a clear open space between the Breaston and Long Eaton. Degradation of this Green Belt into Grey Belt is in direct conflict with National and Local Policy, as already clearly pointed out by Breaston Parish Council. Furthermore I feel that alternative Brown Field and non-Green Belt options within the Borough have not been sufficiently considered. It appears that the reclassification of Green Belt is very much the easy option. The description of 'rounding off' the eastern fringe of Breaston as described in one of the draft proposals of the Core Strategy is at the cost of precious and irreplaceable Green Belt. This was both annoying to read and makes light of the loss of Green Belt. This terminology implies the proposal is a 'tidying up' exercise of the eastern village border and is totally inappropriate.
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	Lisa Patrick	Response-00085	This is green belt and not building land it frequently floods
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	Lucy Corcoran	Response-00097	Removal of green belt will bring Breaston closer together with Long Eaton, destroy wildlife, increase congestion and pollution to the area.
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	Lynette Ratcliffe	Response-00779	Its Green belt land - what more is there to say?
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	Matt Tovey	Response-00840	There are other brown field sites that should be developed before green belt.
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	Melvin Clive Shaw	Response-00513	Greenbelt Changing the status of this area from greenbelt to allow a development of housing would cause numerous issues which are highlighted in other sections of this submission ? road safety, traffic congestion, air quality, effect upon wildlife, increased risk of flooding etc. etc. It adversely impacts upon the prevailing status of the current housing on Heath Gardens and Holly Avenue as well as the entire natural beauty and character of the Breaston area.
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	Michael Sidebottom	Response-01807	Loss of our Green Belt Land and long term environmental impact. The land in question is designated Green Belt. This is currently preventing us from the urban sprawl which identifies the village boundaries, its rural character and protects the natural beauty of the land. The land allows peace and tranquility for the neighbouring cemetery and its regular visitors who tend there loved ones graves. Contradiction with Planning Policy and Legislation Under the National Planning Policy Framework ? Paragraph 140 states that changes to Green Belt boundaries should only be made in exceptional circumstances. Why is this proposal exceptional circumstances when there are other locations available? ? Paragraphs 149?150 highlight that inappropriate development in the Green Belt should only be permitted under very special circumstances. No compelling justification has been presented to meet these thresholds. Additionally: ? The Council is required to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply before Green Belt release is considered. There is no clear evidence that all brownfield and non-Green Belt options have been fully explored.
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	Mr s e Taylor mrs j p tayloe	Response-01288	Designated green belt land . Should remain exactly that regardless of political manipulation.
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	MRS JULIE ROWLINSON	Response-01000	Green belt should be kept sacrosanct. There is plenty of brown land that is not used. We must retain our Green belt.
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	Mrs M Rigby	Response-00808	Green belt should not be built on.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	Nicholas Trueman	Response-01879	Loss of this designated Green Belt land is my prime objection to this development. The purpose of Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl and safeguard the countryside. This Green Belt provides a clear open space between the Breaston and Long Eaton. Degradation of this Green Belt into Grey Belt is in direct conflict with National and Local Policy, as already clearly pointed out by Breaston Parish Council. Furthermore I feel that alternative Brown Field and non-Green Belt options within the Borough have not been sufficiently considered. It appears that the reclassification of Green Belt is very much the easy option. The description of 'rounding off' the eastern fringe of Breaston as described in one of the draft proposals of the Core Strategy is at the cost of precious and irreplaceable Green Belt. This was both annoying to read and makes light of the loss of Green Belt. This terminology implies the proposal is a 'tidying up' exercise of the eastern village border and is totally inappropriate.
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	Nicola Connell	Response-00731	The proposed site lies within designated Green Belt land, which is protected to prevent urban sprawl, safeguard the countryside, and preserve natural habitats. Once lost, these green spaces and their ecological value cannot be replaced. According to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2023): Paragraph 140 states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. Paragraphs 149-150 confirm that inappropriate development in the Green Belt should not be approved except in very special circumstances. No compelling justification has been provided to demonstrate that these criteria have been met. Furthermore: The Council must first demonstrate a five-year housing land supply before considering Green Belt release. No clear evidence has been presented to confirm that all suitable brownfield and non-Green Belt options have been exhausted. There are more appropriate, sustainable locations for housing development that do not involve sacrificing protected countryside.
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	Oliver Lowe	Response-01162	Should stay green belt
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	Pauline Wilcox	Response-00839	Yes! It's green belt, what does that mean, I wonder? There are dozens of more suitable sites for building new houses which are brownfield. Why aren't they used?
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	Paul Wells	Response-00284	Why is the green belt being proposed to be removed/built on when grey and brownfield sites are not being utilised. In Breaston the old Litho factory site on Longmoor. lane has remained empty/derelict for years. This sits, witching th village could support many new homes. Why not utilise that instead (perhaps the owner, Richard Lesger is happy to have the site derelict while he?s busy sorting Long Eaton?s derelict sites.
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	Rachel Lacey	Response-00784	This is prime Green belt land that should be protected.
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	Rafik Fanous	Response-01161	This land is green belt and should not be used for housing
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	Richard Whitehead	Response-01182	I strongly object to building on green belt land in the uk. There is no need for this development in this area and would be a great shame to loose such beautiful green fields to pointless houses when redevelopment in other areas would be more beneficial.
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	Robert Mee	Response-01502	My main reason for objecting to these developments is that I do not believe that the criteria set out in the NPPF has been met justifying any encroachment into the Green Belt at this time. The Core Strategy and this Amendment are developed in order to meet the housing targets allocated to the council by central government. I do not believe that the number of houses required by government constitutes, in itself, the ?exceptional circumstances? which are required under the Framework. This is particularly so in view of there being no published objective basis for the numbers allocated to each authority. The term ?exceptional circumstances? does include ?instances where an authority cannot meet its identified need for homes?. The waiting list for social housing in the general area might suggest that this is the case, but I do not accept that these plans will go far to address this issue ? the vast majority of the planned housing allocations are not even for affordable housing, let alone social housing. Additionally, I do not remember seeing evidence that Erewash has specifically quantified local (i.e. Erewash) housing needs. I also do not believe that much, if any, of the Green Belt selected for development would fit the definition of ?Grey Belt?. As a concept, I can support the idea of Grey Belt as originally reported, i.e. pieces of land within the Green Belt which have previously been developed ? indeed, I can think of a few locally, though they are all fairly small. I find the arguments that I have heard over distances between the edge of Derby and the edge of other towns, and how these distances will still be maintained, extremely spurious. The Green Belt in its entirety exists to prevent Nottingham and Derby from merging ? while building on any of these sites does not immediately make the two cities any closer to each other, it does reduce the green space between the two cities, which is precisely what the Green Belt was established to prevent. The Green Belt is a regional initiative, covering two counties and several local authorities. With Erewash having such a high proportion of its land earmarked as Green Belt it is incumbent on the region as a whole to find a solution to the housing shortage, rather than to expect our authority to have to sacrifice its green spaces.
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	Samantha Honeybell	Response-01815	The proposed site lies within designated Green Belt land, which is protected to prevent urban sprawl, safeguard the countryside, and preserve natural habitats. The site is home to many animals which are already being impacted by the pre-work that has been taking place over the last few months, with trees and hedgerows being destroyed. Once lost, these green spaces and their ecological value cannot be replaced. The small amount of planting that house builders are required to complete is nothing in comparison to the natural habitat that has been destroyed to pave the way for housing developments. According to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2023): ? Paragraph 140 states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. ? Paragraphs 149-150 confirm that inappropriate development in the Green Belt should not be approved except in very special circumstances. No compelling justification has been provided to demonstrate that these criteria have been met. Furthermore: ? The Council must first demonstrate a five-year housing land supply before considering Green Belt release. No clear evidence has been presented to confirm that all suitable brownfield and non-Green Belt options have been exhausted.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	S M Corcoran	Response-01319	The Green Belt areas in the village of Breaston are of both environmental, social and mental health well-being importance to all its residents. Any loss of these areas will have a negative affect on all who live in the village and are a limited resource, so once they have gone they cannot be replaced and the negative impact of their loss will be felt not only today but also by all the future generations to come. Green Belt Areas matter. I believe that there are in excess 100 existing Brownfield sites within Erewash Borough Council control the vast majority of which have full planning permission. Surely these sites should be prioritized for development before Green Belt land is considered.
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	Stacey lester	Response-01239	Leave beautiful green belts alone to be enjoyed by locals and wildlife
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	Stephen Hooley	Response-00774	What Green Belt?.....Now Grey Belt!! A decision rushed through by Erewash Borough Council without informing or consulting with residents of Holly Avenue and Heath Gardens.
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	Stephen Lacey	Response-00785	The land proposed is protected green belt land. Why can this now be classified as other?
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	Susan Holliday	Response-01577	Green belt land was designated as green belt for a reason- it should be fiercely protected at all costs and brownfield sites used instead. This is more expensive but is essential. Otherwise we may as well just build on all green belt sites! Let's protect this planet and build responsibly.
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	Sylva jolliffe	Response-01512	There is lots of land such as the old factory that has been derelict for years. We do not need to destroy our green belt
1.13	East of Breaston	Green Belt	Terence Corcoran	Response-00318	The Green Belt areas in the village of Breaston are of both environmental, social and mental health well-being importance to all its residents. Any loss of these areas will have a negative affect on all who live in the village and are a limited resource, so once they have gone they cannot be replaced and the negative impact of their loss will be felt not only today but also by all the future generations to come. Green Belt Areas matter.
1.13	East of Breaston	Healthcare Facilities	Beverley Ann Ratcliffe	Response-01098	Again, you are planning homes in both Breaston and Draycott. In Breaston, there is only one small Dental practice, which only takes on Private Patients, one Doctor's surgery which also covers Draycott and also has a surgery in Borrowash, which serves all three parishes. Getting an appointment into my doctors in Breaston is very difficult, how they are going to manage with an influx of around 200 new homes, equalling approx 400 people not including children? Quality of care would be highly impacted.
1.13	East of Breaston	Healthcare Facilities	Caroline Okeowo	Response-01814	Local GP surgeries and dental practices are under significant strain, and any increase in population would make access to timely care even more difficult.
1.13	East of Breaston	Healthcare Facilities	Christopher Baddiley	Response-01132	The existing infrastructure in Breaston is already under considerable pressure. The local GP surgery is in high demand. The local dentist is now private, not NHS. Both practices are overstretched, and this proposed development would make it harder to access timely medical and dental care.
1.13	East of Breaston	Healthcare Facilities	Claire Cherry	Response-01817	Local GP surgeries and dental practices are overstretched, and this development would exacerbate difficulties in accessing timely medical and dental care. Accessing GP services for primary health care provision for both children and adults is a significant challenge, within an already overstretched catchment. Adding further housing to the locality will further exacerbate this situation, reducing access to primary care, putting lives at risk and putting further stresses on already stretched A&E departments. Dental care is unavailable for those not already under the care of the Breaston Dental Surgery, and waiting lists exceed the lifespan of many residents within the village.
1.13	East of Breaston	Healthcare Facilities	Dawn Fish	Response-01165	Local doctors and nhs dentists are at capacity
1.13	East of Breaston	Healthcare Facilities	Dean Corcoran	Response-00798	Availability of health care is a known issue countrywide Breaston is no different - any increase in residential development will of course impact this
1.13	East of Breaston	Healthcare Facilities	Debbie Hunt	Response-01803	Healthcare: Local GP surgeries and dental practices are under significant strain, and any increase in population would make access to timely care even more difficult.
1.13	East of Breaston	Healthcare Facilities	Debra Martin	Response-01469	You can't get a GP or hospital appointment very easy in this area as it is. The schools are also full to capacity. I could have ticked every option for my objection
1.13	East of Breaston	Healthcare Facilities	Diane Corsham	Response-00225	There isn't enough healthcare facilities in the area for people who reside in this area never mind draining the resources even further to accommodate more people in an area that cannot offer proper healthcare facilities for the people living in the village already!
1.13	East of Breaston	Healthcare Facilities	Ed Huntley	Response-01120	There are no available NHS Dentists and Doctors as it is.
1.13	East of Breaston	Healthcare Facilities	Graham Elliott	Response-00413	Breaston Chemists and Surgery are some distance away at the other end of the village and they are already very busy so its often difficult getting a prompt appointment. Also a problem for anyone that doesn't drive, particularly the elderly.
1.13	East of Breaston	Healthcare Facilities	Greg Cherry	Response-01818	Local GP surgeries and dental practices are overstretched, and this development would exacerbate difficulties in accessing timely medical and dental care. Accessing GP services for primary health care provision for both children and adults is a huge challenge, within an already overstretched catchment. Adding further housing to the locality will further exacerbate this situation, reducing access to primary care, putting lives at risk and putting further stresses on already stretched A&E departments - no such solution is offered or suggested as part of the plans, I find it alarming that this would be overlooked. Dental care is unavailable for those not already under the care of the Breaston Dental Surgery, and waiting lists exceed the lifespan of many residents within the village.
1.13	East of Breaston	Healthcare Facilities	Jack Collins	Response-00908	Local GP surgeries and dental practices are under significant strain, and any increase in population would make access to timely care even more difficult.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.13	East of Breaston	Healthcare Facilities	Jessica Collins	Response-00899	The local GP surgeries and dental clinics are already struggling to keep up with demand, and any additional residents would make it even harder to access healthcare services in a timely manner. Dental services are similarly overstretched. I have been forced to pay for private dental care since the age of 18 due to a complete lack of NHS dental provision in the area. Access to essential services is already limited: I was unable to secure an appointment with my local GP for four months due to capacity issues. Even after the wait, I was not able to see the required doctor. Eventually, another GP saw me and urgently referred me to the hospital for a potential skin cancer diagnosis. If there had been more housing and increased demand, how much longer would I have had to wait for potentially life-saving care?
1.13	East of Breaston	Healthcare Facilities	Joanne Parkin	Response-01163	Unable to get an urgent GP appointment
1.13	East of Breaston	Healthcare Facilities	Judith Ratcliffe	Response-00490	Again .. where are the 50+ new housing residents supposed to get in at Doctors when they are already full?
1.13	East of Breaston	Healthcare Facilities	Judy Arcy	Response-01167	Struggling for GP appointments now so more residents will just impact the already existing extremely busy service - so wait times will be even longer to see GP
1.13	East of Breaston	Healthcare Facilities	Kelly Steed	Response-00444	GP and dental services are already overstretched, and this development would further delay access to care.
1.13	East of Breaston	Healthcare Facilities	Kevin Hopkinson	Response-01126	The Doctors Surgery in Breaston is exceptionally responsive, this could well be affected with the possible increase of the population.
1.13	East of Breaston	Healthcare Facilities	Lauren Davis	Response-00474	As is with everywhere these are stretched but I cannot get appointments at our local gp I have to go to borrowwash. There is no dentist that will take me and my 1 year old daughter on within miles so more people joining the community would make matters worse not better
1.13	East of Breaston	Healthcare Facilities	Linda Shaw	Response-00511	These are inadequate already and an increased population in this area will hugely exacerbate this issue.
1.13	East of Breaston	Healthcare Facilities	Lindsey Trueman	Response-01878	Local GP Surgeries and dental practices are already overstretched. An increase in population from an additional 50 houses will inevitably add further strain.
1.13	East of Breaston	Healthcare Facilities	Lisa Patrick	Response-00085	Our doctors and dentists are at capacity
1.13	East of Breaston	Healthcare Facilities	Lucy Corcoran	Response-00097	As a resident of Breaston I have been unable to register with the surgery due to lack of space so continue to be supported by an alternative practice.
1.13	East of Breaston	Healthcare Facilities	Lynette Ratcliffe	Response-00779	Local Doctors are already full and very difficult to get appointments
1.13	East of Breaston	Healthcare Facilities	Melvin Clive Shaw	Response-00513	These are inadequate already and an increased population in this area will hugely exacerbate this issue.
1.13	East of Breaston	Healthcare Facilities	Michael Sidebottom	Response-01807	Local GP surgeries and dental practices are under significant strain, and any increase in population would make access to timely care even more difficult.
1.13	East of Breaston	Healthcare Facilities	Mrs s e Taylor mrs j p tayloe	Response-01288	They are over subscribed already.
1.13	East of Breaston	Healthcare Facilities	MRS JULIE ROWLINSON	Response-01000	GP and Dental services will be even more in demand and this will affect the provision for existing patients.
1.13	East of Breaston	Healthcare Facilities	Mrs M Rigby	Response-00808	Doctors surgery struggle to get an appointment. My dentist has gone private. I am struggling to find a NHS dentist . Not had a dentist for 6 months
1.13	East of Breaston	Healthcare Facilities	Nicholas Trueman	Response-01879	Local GP Surgeries and dental practices are already overstretched. An increase in population from an additional 50 houses will inevitably add further strain.
1.13	East of Breaston	Healthcare Facilities	Nicola Connell	Response-00731	Local GP surgeries and dental practices are overstretched, and this development would exacerbate difficulties in accessing timely medical and dental care
1.13	East of Breaston	Healthcare Facilities	Oliver Lowe	Response-01162	Surgery's already busy
1.13	East of Breaston	Healthcare Facilities	O'Connor	Response-01514	Already struggling to get an appointment
1.13	East of Breaston	Healthcare Facilities	Pauline Wilcox	Response-00839	Are you providing additional Healthcare Facilities? The existing ones are stretched to breaking point.
1.13	East of Breaston	Healthcare Facilities	Rachel Lacey	Response-00784	The Breaston surgery is already at capacity and will be forced to take more patients.
1.13	East of Breaston	Healthcare Facilities	Roger Day	Response-00027	There is not mention of increasing any health care support in the strategy review.
1.13	East of Breaston	Healthcare Facilities	Samantha Honeybell	Response-01815	The local GP surgery is already overstretched and struggling to accommodate the residents of the 3 villages it supports. It is important to note that all 3 villages have proposed development sites, how the surgery is expected to provide timely and urgent medical care with the proposed increase of inhabitants is completely unknown and there does not appear to be any review of this situation. In addition to the GP surgery concerns, the dental practises are overstretched and it is already impossible to receive NHS dental treatment locally.
1.13	East of Breaston	Healthcare Facilities	S M Corcoran	Response-01319	As with the schools in the area the Healthcare facilities in Breaston are already stretched beyond acceptable levels with residents having great difficulty in getting appointments with both Doctors and Dentists. The further addition of approx. 200 people would take the Healthcare system beyond breaking point to the detriment of all Breaston residents. This, of course, does not take into consideration that the main surgery in Breaston caters for patients from both Draycott and Borrowwash other neighbouring areas which are also being targetted with a further 600 houses.
1.13	East of Breaston	Healthcare Facilities	Stacey lester	Response-01239	No local doctors
1.13	East of Breaston	Healthcare Facilities	Stephen Lacey	Response-00785	Breaston surgery is already overwhelmed by demand. More housing will not help this.
1.13	East of Breaston	Healthcare Facilities	Sylva jolliffe	Response-01512	Local doctors are oversubscribed and offer appointments for 3 weeks later already, and nhs dentists are not taking on new clients.
1.13	East of Breaston	Healthcare Facilities	Terence Corcoran	Response-00318	As with the schools in the area the Healthcare facilities in Breaston are already stretched beyond acceptable levels with residents having great difficulty in getting appointments with both Doctors and Dentists . The further addition of approx. 200 people would take the Healthcare system beyond breaking point to the detriment of all Breaston residents.
1.13	East of Breaston	Landscape	Andrea Valentine	Response-01525	Many people value the countryside and with mental health and welfare being one of this generations top priorities the need to plant forests, to tackle climate change, to grow food locally to cities, to help manage rainfall, to moderate the urban heat island effect, to provide habitat to address species decline is required more than ever.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.13	East of Breaston	Landscape	Beverley Ann Ratcliffe	Response-01098	There will be implications, felling of trees, loss of habitat for wildlife including foxes, rabbits, birds and all the smaller species due to this being a natural area for their habitat. This has always been a green belt, with no pollution, which has allowed the animals, trees and flora to develop and grow naturally. Also there is a high risk of flooding on this land which is proposed to build on.
			Dean Corcoran	Response-00798	The view from entering the village from Longmore Lane will be impacted destroying the wildlife that currently live and feed there
1.13	East of Breaston	Landscape	Diane Corsham	Response-00225	The houses would be a blot on the landscape as once they go up the fields would be changed forever!
			Graham Elliott	Response-00413	No comment until detail of the location, type of housing and landscaping is known.
1.13	East of Breaston	Landscape	Judith Ratcliffe	Response-00490	Trees and vegetation will surely be removed
			Kevin Hopkinson	Response-01126	If this development was to proceed Breaston would lose the charm and individuality the village currently enjoys.
1.13	East of Breaston	Landscape	Lauren Davis	Response-00474	Is beautiful and building around our village would impact our landscape
1.13	East of Breaston	Landscape	Linda Shaw	Response-00511	Changing the status of this area from greenbelt will completely alter the local landscape for the worse. Local wildlife and local habitats will be affected whilst the replacement of a green area with hard surfaces and additional demands on drainage etc. will cause an increased flooding risk for Breaston as a whole. It will also impact upon the environment of Breaston Cemetery which is very close to this area. A new development would completely change the character and existing aesthetics of the area.
1.13	East of Breaston	Landscape	Lindsey Trueman	Response-01878	The two fields in question have a unique landscape and provide a backdrop that is compatible with the various rewilding projects within the Borough.
1.13	East of Breaston	Landscape	Lucy Corcoran	Response-00097	The land is visible from the M1 and as you enter the village via Longmoor Lane, removing this landscape would destroy current wildlife and habitats for numerous species including bats.
1.13	East of Breaston	Landscape	Melvin Clive Shaw	Response-00513	Changing the status of this area from greenbelt will completely alter the local landscape for the worse. Local wildlife and local habitats will be affected whilst the replacement of a green area with hard surfaces and additional demands on drainage etc. will cause an increased flooding risk for Breaston as a whole. It will also impact upon the environment of Breaston Cemetery which is very close to this area. A new development would completely change the character and existing aesthetics of the area.
			Mr s e Taylor mrs j p tayloe	Response-01288	The outlook from our property is idyllic and has been so since the 12 bungalows were built on a market garden.
1.13	East of Breaston	Landscape	Nicholas Trueman	Response-01879	The two fields in question have a unique landscape and provide a backdrop that is compatible with the various rewilding projects within the Borough.
			Paul Wells	Response-00284	The road is opposite the M1 and so will be noisy for any future residents
1.13	East of Breaston	Landscape	Rachel Lacey	Response-00784	The development will spoil the local area - there is a lovely view across the fields and this will be destroyed.
			Stephen Lacey	Response-00785	The Landscape will be damaged beyond repair. It is a lovely natural area currently.
1.13	East of Breaston	Number of Houses	Andrew Knight	Response-01824	Local infrastructure is already under pressure. GP services, schools, and roads are near or at capacity. An increase in population would worsen access to healthcare, limit school places, and create traffic congestion and safety issues. A large-scale housing development would undermine Breaston's distinct rural character and sense of community, turning it into a suburban extension of neighbouring settlements.
1.13	East of Breaston	Number of Houses	Caroline Okeowo	Response-01814	Breaston is a historic rural village with a strong sense of identity and community. Introducing a large-scale development of 50 houses would significantly alter the village's scale and character, pushing it toward becoming a suburban extension rather than a distinct settlement. This would undermine the very qualities that make Breaston a desirable place to live.
1.13	East of Breaston	Number of Houses	Christopher Baddiley	Response-01132	The proposed development of 50 homes would fundamentally change the look and feel of the east side of the village, undermining the very reason why I (and many of my neighbours) choose to live here in the first place. At the north edge of the proposed new development is the cemetery / burial ground. This should be a quiet place to pay respect to our loved ones. While the cemetery is already close to the (recently widened) M1 motorway, building 50 new homes on the adjacent green belt will introduce even more noise and disturbance not just to the cemetery, but also to the residents of Holly Avenue who back directly onto the proposed new development.
1.13	East of Breaston	Number of Houses	Claire Cherry	Response-01817	Breaston is a historic, rural village with a distinct character and strong sense of community. The proposed development of 50 houses would fundamentally alter the scale and character of the village, threatening to turn it into a town and undermining the reasons many residents choose to live here.
1.13	East of Breaston	Number of Houses	Dawn Fish	Response-01165	Breaston and Draycott are lovely villages with a good community feel. More and more houses being added will take that away and make it more of a town and ruin the community feel.
			Dean Corcoran	Response-00798	This land floods so it is foolish to even be considering building any number of houses here
1.13	East of Breaston	Number of Houses	Debbie Hunt	Response-01803	Breaston is a historic rural village with a strong sense of identity and community. Introducing a large-scale development of 50 houses would significantly alter the village's scale and character, pushing it toward becoming a suburban extension rather than a distinct settlement. This would undermine the very qualities that make Breaston a desirable place to live, undermine our house prices and essentially connect Breaston to Long Eaton.
1.13	East of Breaston	Number of Houses	Diane Corsham	Response-00225	Also the number of homes that you are proposing to build, if this is passed then what usually happens is that more houses are built than previously planned and I think that would be unfair to the residents who already live near that area!
1.13	East of Breaston	Number of Houses	Ed Huntley	Response-01120	50 houses seems greedy. 5 or 10 houses would raise no objections. The noise and disruption will be awful for years.
			Graham Elliott	Response-00413	No comment until detail of the location and type of housing is known.
1.13	East of Breaston	Number of Houses	Greg Cherry	Response-01818	Breaston is a historic, rural village with a distinct character and strong sense of community. The proposed development of 50 houses would fundamentally alter the scale and character of the village, threatening to turn it into a town and undermining the reasons many residents choose to live here.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.13	East of Breaston	Number of Houses	Jack Collins	Response-00908	Breaston is a historic rural village with a strong sense of identity and community. Introducing a large-scale development of 50 houses would significantly alter the village's scale and character, pushing it toward becoming a suburban extension rather than a distinct settlement. This would undermine the very qualities that make Breaston a desirable place to live.
1.13	East of Breaston	Number of Houses	Jessica Collins	Response-00899	Breaston is a charming, rural village with a unique character and a strong sense of community. The introduction of a development of 50 new homes would drastically alter the scale and character of the village, turning it from a close-knit community into something more akin to a suburban town. This change would diminish the reasons many residents, myself included, choose to live here. Numerous empty properties across the wider area remain unused, why is green belt land being targeted instead of addressing these?
1.13	East of Breaston	Number of Houses	Judith Ratcliffe	Response-00490	As per previous comments - you cannot turn a small cul-de-sac which currently gets very little traffic and is small and narrow into a through-road for a 50 house new development.
1.13	East of Breaston	Number of Houses	Lauren Davis	Response-00474	No houses built at all
1.13	East of Breaston	Number of Houses	Linda Shaw	Response-00511	Heath Gardens is currently a narrow cul de sac and the increased road usage from a new development would cause numerous issues which are highlighted in other sections of this submission ? road safety, traffic congestion, air quality, effect upon wildlife, increased risk of flooding etc. etc. Currently Heath Gardens is the home of many elderly residents, some of whom have severe health conditions. Their way of life would be adversely affected by the complete change in the character of the cul de sac on which they live.
1.13	East of Breaston	Number of Houses	Lindsey Trueman	Response-01878	50 additional houses concentrated on the area proposed is totally disproportionate to the size of Breaston. Any additional housing on the proposed scale will erode the character of this historic village and strong sense of community.
1.13	East of Breaston	Number of Houses	Lucy Corcoran	Response-00097	50 houses too excessive due to aforementioned comments.
1.13	East of Breaston	Number of Houses	Lynette Ratcliffe	Response-00779	Please do not extend Heath Gardens and make it into housing estate. Its currently a small, peaceful community of bungalows - which by the nature of the cut-de-sac is occupied by elderly retired people. Its a peaceful and currently a safe environment. Opening it up to a housing estate will ruin this.
1.13	East of Breaston	Number of Houses	Melvin Clive Shaw	Response-00513	Heath Gardens is currently a narrow cul de sac and the increased road usage from a new development would cause numerous issues which are highlighted in other sections of this submission ? road safety, traffic congestion, air quality, effect upon wildlife, increased risk of flooding etc. etc. Currently Heath Gardens is the home of many elderly residents, some of whom have severe health conditions. Their way of life would be adversely affected by the complete change in the character of the cul de sac on which they live.
1.13	East of Breaston	Number of Houses	Michael Sidebottom	Response-01807	Breaston is a historic rural village with a strong sense of identity and community. Introducing a large scale development of 50 houses would significantly alter the village's scale and character, pushing it toward becoming a suburban extension rather than a distinct settlement. This would undermine the very qualities that make Breaston a desirable place to live, undermine our house prices which residents have worked hard to achieve and essentially connect Breaston to Long Eaton.
1.13	East of Breaston	Number of Houses	Mr s e Taylor mrs j p tayloe	Response-01288	No houses as far as we are concerned. Certainly not accessed via Heath gardens.
1.13	East of Breaston	Number of Houses	MRS JULIE ROWLINSON	Response-01000	Breaston is a very large village and very stretched out. To build at the end of the village will add houses we don't need, but also it will increase the feeling of us and them that already exists in the 2 ends of the village. Any number of houses on this land is too many.
1.13	East of Breaston	Number of Houses	Nicholas Trueman	Response-01879	50 additional houses concentrated on the area proposed is totally disproportionate to the size of Breaston. Any additional housing on the proposed scale will erode the character of this historic village and strong sense of community.
1.13	East of Breaston	Number of Houses	Nicola Connell	Response-00731	Breaston is a historic, rural village with a distinct character and strong sense of community. The proposed development of 50 houses would fundamentally alter the scale and character of the village, threatening to turn it into a town and undermining the reasons many residents choose to live here.
1.13	East of Breaston	Number of Houses	Paul Wells	Response-00284	50 is too many houses on that road
1.13	East of Breaston	Number of Houses	Roger Day	Response-00027	What is the supporting data to say that more housing is required in this area? Having people on a housing list does not mean that there are no houses just that they are looking for social housing.
1.13	East of Breaston	Number of Houses	Simon Hartopp	Response-01201	An increase of 50 homes on the same road as 12 long standing bungalows would be detrimental to the character and quality of life to those presently living on Heath Gardens. The majority of the residents are in their post retirement years and chose to live here for the peacefulness living on the road offers. This would be shattered if the proposed development went ahead!!
1.13	East of Breaston	Number of Houses	S M Corcoran	Response-01319	EBC is proposing nearly 700 houses in Draycott, Borrowwash, and Breaston, which is significantly overbearing and unrealistic considering infrastructure, road networks, and amenities. The proposal for 50 houses will change the village's look and feel, impacting its rural identity and risking amalgamating into a single unit with Long Eaton, Draycott and Borrowwash.
1.13	East of Breaston	Other	Beverley Ann Ratcliffe	Response-01098	This site if build on would cause a high increase in foot flow, traffic and noise through Heath Gardens causing a risk to Health & Safety to residents and other members of the public, as there are no pavements and limited access due to comments already submitted earlier. Also, please bear in mind the ages of residents currently residing in Heath Gardens, who your proposals would have impact on.
1.13	East of Breaston	Other	Christopher Baddiley	Response-01132	NOISE AND DISTURBANCE RESULTING FROM PROPOSED USE At the north edge of the proposed new development is the cemetery / burial ground. This should be a quiet place to pay respect to our loved ones. While the cemetery is already close to the (recently widened) M1 motorway, building 50 new homes on the adjacent green belt will introduce even more noise and disturbance not just to the cemetery, but also to the residents of Holly Avenue who back directly onto the proposed new development. OVERLOOKING / LOSS OF PRIVACY Residents of Holly Avenue backing directly onto the proposed new development (and homes such as mine which overlook the green belt) would suffer overlooking from the new development and experience a massive loss of privacy. Many residents on Holly Avenue (myself included) chose to live here because of the open aspect across the fields. The proposed development of 50 homes would fundamentally change the look and feel of the east side of the village, undermining the very reason why I (and many of my neighbours) choose to live here in the first place.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.13	East of Breaston	Other	Christopher Baddiley	Response-01816	At the north edge of the proposed new development is the cemetery / burial ground. This should be a quiet place to pay respect to our loved ones. While the cemetery is already close to the (recently widened) M1 motorway, building 50 new homes on the adjacent green belt will introduce even more noise and disturbance not just to the cemetery, but also to the residents of Holly Avenue who back directly onto the proposed new development. Residents of Holly Avenue backing directly onto the proposed new development (and homes such as mine which overlook the green belt) would suffer overlooking from the new development and experience a massive loss of privacy. Many residents on Holly Avenue (myself included) chose to live here because of the open aspect across the fields. The proposed development of 50 homes would fundamentally change the look and feel of the east side of the village, undermining the very reason why I (and many of my neighbours) choose to live here in the first place.
1.13	East of Breaston	Other	Dean Corcoran	Response-00798	I strongly object to this proposal
1.13	East of Breaston	Other	Geoff Potts	Response-01205	Have any checks been undertaken to ensure that there is no hazardous waste on the sight? There is a raised area of land just west of the row of trees and north of the perpendicular row of trees dividing the propose sight. This raised area is the result of something being emptied from tipper trucks several years ago ago.
1.13	East of Breaston	Other	Graham Elliott	Response-00413	Infrastructure - As with Heath Gardens, the potential occupants are likely to be elderly, retired and with some non-drivers. Hence remoteness from shops, medical care, transport and the village centre is likely to be a major problem. Anyone having to walk down the street, particularly in the area with no pavement, would be at significant risk of harm.
1.13	East of Breaston	Other	Hilary M McCullagh	Response-00804	The Holly Avenue end of Breaston suffers from wind affected noise pollution from the M1, exacerbated by the 4 lane running now in operation. The proposed development would be even nearer to the motorway and would require some form of noise mitigation measures.
1.13	East of Breaston	Other	Jessica Collins	Response-00899	As residents of Holly Avenue, my husband and I chose Breaston as the place to raise our future family, drawn by its green surroundings, community feel, and access to nature. We are deeply concerned that the development of new houses directly behind our home will not only destroy the character of the area, but will also significantly reduce the value of our property a devastating blow for a young couple who have invested in their future here.
1.13	East of Breaston	Other	Judith Ratcliffe	Response-00490	Please do not use Heath Gardens as access - as previously stated Heath Gardens is a very small cul-de-sac of Bungalows, that is occupied by retired/elderly residents. The reason why they live there is because it is a quiet, peaceful and supportive community of residents. Heath Gardens is narrow (its not even a proper road), and 2 cars cannot pass side by side. This is not an issue currently due to the small number of traffic that Heath gardens is currently used for. Opening up Heath Gardens to allow through traffic for a 50 house housing development is NOT viable. You will adversely impact the lives of the residents that currently live there (noise, stress, pollution, ambiance of the cul-de-sac, access etc etc) , and turn what is currently a pleasant cut-de-sac where elderly residents enjoy living into a noisy, un-safe through road.
1.13	East of Breaston	Other	Kelly Steed	Response-00444	Our village maintains a distinct rural identity and sense of community. This scale of development would fundamentally alter its character, threatening to urbanise a cherished countryside setting.
1.13	East of Breaston	Other	Kevin Hopkinson	Response-01126	There are within the village, currently developed areas which could be repurposed to fulfil the additional housing requirement without the need to build on existing green belt.
1.13	East of Breaston	Other	Linda Shaw	Response-00511	The development will have a detrimental effect upon current residents of Heath Gardens and Holly Avenue. Their quality of life, particularly for the elderly residents of Heath Gardens, will be severely impacted and lead to stress and potential health problems.
1.13	East of Breaston	Other	Lindsey Trueman	Response-01878	Motorway Noise - I do not feel that any additional new build should be any closer to the M1 Motorway as the noise levels we are subjected to have increased over the years and significantly impact my quality of life. Residents in any new houses built even closer to the motorway would inevitably suffer the same unacceptable noise and air pollution levels.
1.13	East of Breaston	Other	Matt Tovey	Response-00840	I don't believe that there is demand for large numbers of new developments. It seems housing developers are driving this to make massive profits.
1.13	East of Breaston	Other	Melvin Clive Shaw	Response-00513	The development will have a detrimental effect upon current residents of Heath Gardens and Holly Avenue. Their quality of life, particularly for the elderly residents of Heath Gardens, will be severely impacted and lead to stress and potential health problems.
1.13	East of Breaston	Other	Mr and Mrs S E Taylor	Response-01888	My wife and I moved into Heath Gardens just over three and a half years ago! after forty four years in Kegworth! Night flying aircraft noise drove the decision! Heath Gardens is a well laid out Cul de Sac. Well spaced out well maintained and detached Bungalows a credit to all of the owners. Its a treat to behold, its a pleasant surprise and its a real pleasure to live here
1.13	East of Breaston	Other	Mr s e Taylor mrs j p tayloe	Response-01288	We were assured 3.5 years ago that the adjacent land to our property was GREEN BELT. This was our first move in 44 years of marriage to a nice secluded location. It was an enforced move due to the continued expansion of East Midlands airport. Which encompasses night time flying every night. We were forced to move out of our family home. So we certainly don't savour the prospect of further upheaval.
1.13	East of Breaston	Other	Mr S E Taylor Mrs J P Taylor	Response-01290	Response no 01288 should read 10 Heath gardens not 17. Also Mrs JP Taylor
1.13	East of Breaston	Other	MRS JULIE ROWLINSON	Response-01000	Please listen to the public on his occasion rather than ask for opinions and then ignore them as has been done many times in the past. We who live in Breaston know what is best for Breaston.
1.13	East of Breaston	Other	Nicholas Trueman	Response-01879	Motorway Noise - I do not feel that any additional new build should be any closer to the M1 Motorway as the noise levels we are subjected to have increased over the years and significantly impact my quality of life. Residents in any new houses built even closer to the motorway would inevitably suffer the same unacceptable noise and air pollution levels.
1.13	East of Breaston	Other	Roger and Iris Woodward	Response-00302	At this stage we do not know what the proposed development consists of other than potentially fifty properties, but clearly. we are concerned about loss of light, overshadowing or overlooking and loss of privacy.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.13	East of Breaston	Other	Roger Day	Response-00027	What new jobs are being brought to the area? If jobs are not local it means more traffic, more pollution, less productivity. Just because a piece of land is available does not mean it is a good place to build. Don't be lead by targets, be led by necessity.
1.13	East of Breaston	Other	S M Corcoran	Response-01319	Although this is a long-term issue / concern I believe that consideration should be given to the fact that the building of houses on the proposed site will curtail the councils (both Breaston Parish council and Long Eaton's) ability to expand the cemetery over time as demand for plots increases and will, eventually lead to the earlier closure of the site. I strongly object to the proposed development on Green Belt land east of Breaston due to its impact on the village, residents, environment, and wildlife. Erewash Borough Council should prioritize existing Brownfield sites for development and protect Green Belt land.
1.13	East of Breaston	Other	Terence Corcoran	Response-00318	Although this is a long-term issue / concern I believe that consideration should be given to the fact that the building of houses on the proposed site will curtail the councils (both Breaston Parish council and Long Eaton's) ability to expand the cemetery over time as demand for plots increases and will, eventually lead to the earlier closure of the site.
		Road Safety	Beverley Ann Ratcliffe	Response-01098	As mentioned in previous entry on Road Congestion.
1.13	East of Breaston	Road Safety	Dean Corcoran	Response-00798	The A6005 is already an extremely busy road with access from Heath Gardens already difficult for existing Heath Garden residents - an increase of users would just add to this issue and in my opinion increase the likelihood of accidents particularly for anyone wanting to turn right from Heath Gardens across both cycle lane and against quick moving traffic and school children at peak times
1.13	East of Breaston	Road Safety	Diane Corsham	Response-00225	Road safety is another burning issue as the roads are chocker blocked with traffic and the pedestrians are going to suffer as more and more cars are going to be on the road and the roads are going to be busier if you build more houses. The roads don't need anymore traffic on them!
1.13	East of Breaston	Road Safety	Graham Elliott	Response-00413	The increased traffic and pedestrian footfall would inevitably lead to 'Highway Safety Concerns?', particularly as the rear half of Heath Gardens has no pavement or room to construct one without purchasing land from the householders.
1.13	East of Breaston	Road Safety	Ian Burton	Response-00194	Heath garden is a small culdesac with a very tight S bend that would be unsuitable for large construction type vehicles. I would consider it dangerous due to health and safety.
1.13	East of Breaston	Road Safety	Judith Ratcliffe	Response-00490	Heath Gardens is currently nearly all retired/elderly residents - there is no pavement - which is fine while there are only 11 bungalows with very low traffic as its a cut-de-sac. Allowing access for 50+ houses is not sustainable
1.13	East of Breaston	Road Safety	Judy Arcy	Response-01167	Increased traffic will impact pedestrians and cyclists
1.13	East of Breaston	Road Safety	KARL BARROW	Response-00793	Exit onto the 40mph section of Wilsthorpe Road from this proposed development increases risks of collisions as vehicles entering Breaston are frequently travelling at well over the speed limit off the M1 over bridge whilst those leaving Breaston start their acceleration well before the 40mph sign . Collision risks are also increased because of vehicles entering Breaston turning right into the adjacent Toal energies filling station. This filling station issue already creates problems for vehicles leaving Richmond avenue where we live when turning right onto Wilsthorpe Road. The only way this could be avoided would be to completely remove the 40mph section to Wilsthorpe island and make it a 30mph limit. Inserting a mini roundabout at the entrance to Heath Gardens would also have the effect of slowing traffic and making entry onto Wilsthorpe Road safer.
1.13	East of Breaston	Road Safety	Kelly Steed	Response-00444	The local road network is not equipped to handle the increased volume of traffic that would result from this development. Existing roads have been severely neglected and now consist of a patchwork of potholes and temporary repairs. These refilled holes frequently reopen, leading to even worse road conditions. The cumulative effect of poor maintenance and increased usage from new development poses safety concerns and a further decline in road quality.
1.13	East of Breaston	Road Safety	Kevin Hopkinson	Response-01126	Increased traffic volumes on existing roads in and around the area will significantly increase the health and safety risks to fellow road users and pedestrians.
			Lauren Davis	Response-00474	More cars make it more dangerous for our young children on what is a village!
1.13	East of Breaston	Road Safety	Linda Shaw	Response-00511	There would be a huge impact on the safety of pedestrians, cyclists and other road users, and especially pupils from local schools, at the junction of Heath Gardens and the A6005. Making this junction wider would not help as there are 3 access areas so close together ? the petrol station, the horse field lane and Heath Gardens itself which would become much busier from more houses. Pedestrians on Heath Gardens itself would be extremely vulnerable due to the narrowness of the road and the lack of pavements. Elderly people and those with mobility scooters or wheelchairs, as well as parents with pushchairs and small children would be at particular risk of severe injury. The narrowness of the road and the dogleg bend also makes it difficult for passing vehicles and increases the potential of an accident. When there are wider vehicles on the street e.g. refuse lorries, emergency vehicles and delivery lorries, the road is already impassable due to its narrowness and further development would hugely exacerbate the danger. The narrow road and its increased use by large vehicles would greatly restrict access for emergency vehicles
1.13	East of Breaston	Road Safety	Linda Sheppard	Response-01321	We believe that the person who owns the field owns two houses in Holly Avenue so the concern is that an entrance could potentially be created from Holly Avenue by knocking down the houses. Holly Avenue is a relatively narrow road especially as many people park on the road. It is also a place where children are safe to play because the people driving on it live on the road and drive slowly. I worry about it becoming a rat run with people driving quickly.
1.13	East of Breaston	Road Safety	Lucy Corcoran	Response-00097	Visibility from Heath Gardens is not great due to the motorway bridge and traffic entering the petrol station next to the proposed access point. School children use the pedestrian and cycle paths to and from school and additional turning traffic would be hazardous to them.
1.13	East of Breaston	Road Safety	Lynette Ratcliffe	Response-00779	Heath Gardens is a narrow cut-de-sac - it cannot accommodate access for a housing estate of 50 houses. There is no pavement and will make it dangerous for existing residents. In addition to this, Wilsthorpe Road is already very busy with traffic (near the junction of Heath Gardens) and crossing the road is already difficult. It can also be a bottle-neck with traffic accessing the Petrol station.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.13	East of Breaston	Road Safety	Melvin Clive Shaw	Response-00513	There would be a huge impact on the safety of pedestrians, cyclists and other road users, and especially pupils from local schools, at the junction of Heath Gardens and the A6005. Making this junction wider would not help as there are 3 access areas so close together ? the petrol station, the horse field lane and Heath Gardens itself which would become much busier from more houses. Pedestrians on Heath Gardens itself would be extremely vulnerable due to the narrowness of the road and the lack of pavements. Elderly people and those with mobility scooters or wheelchairs, as well as parents with pushchairs and small children would be at particular risk of severe injury. The narrowness of the road and the dogleg bend also makes it difficult for passing vehicles and increases the potential of an accident. When there are wider vehicles on the street e.g. refuse lorries, emergency vehicles and delivery lorries, the road is already impassable due to its narrowness and further development would hugely exacerbate the danger. The narrow road and its increased use by large vehicles would greatly restrict access for emergency vehicles
1.13	East of Breaston	Road Safety	Mr and Mrs S E Taylor	Response-01888	There are several hazards at the entrance to Heath Gardens, it is only four metres wide! Not wide enough for cars to pass safely! in and out? simultaneously. To the left is the exit/entrance to and from the riding school, which is only seven metres away! To the right at just eighteen metres away is the exit from the petrol filling station, with the entrance a few metres further up! This is obviously in constant use! At this Tee junction, crossing all of these potential hazards is the footpath and designated cycle track, not the best location along Wilsthorpe Road? It is a potentially dodgy area. School times etc. People do need houses, may be an alternative way in, and out could be found, there are several safer possibilities!
1.13	East of Breaston	Road Safety	Mr s e Taylor mrs j p tayloe	Response-01288	The junction in and out onto wilsthorpe road . Is crossed by footpath and cycle track. This is compounded both by filling station , car wash, laundrette, convenience store entrance and exit on right hand side. 18.5 metres from Heath gardens entrance. On the opposite side is entrance and exit to riding stables. To increase foot fall and traffic without serious consideration could result in serious incidents.
		Road Safety	Mrs M Rigby	Response-00808	It will not make a safe environment for families.
1.13	East of Breaston	Road Safety	Oliver Lowe	Response-01162	People using Steven?s Lane as a cut through are often travelling at 40mph plus. More houses would mean more of this.
1.13	East of Breaston	Road Safety	Pauline Wilcox	Response-00839	Where is the access to the proposed development? Whichever point is going to seriously impact local roads, causing more congestion and subsequently road safety.
1.13	East of Breaston	Road Safety	Paul Wells	Response-00284	The road is very narrow. It?s not suitable for supporting 50 additional houses or emergency vehicles who may need access
		Road Safety	Rachel Lacey	Response-00784	School children walk along the main road that access is proposed from. This will add more risk to road crossings.
1.13	East of Breaston	Road Safety	Roger and Iris Woodward	Response-00302	The proposed development would generate increasing traffic levels affecting Wilsthorpe Road. There will be a concern for all traffic users as vehicles attempt to turn in or out of the development as well as for pedestrians and cyclists using the footway and cycle lane.
1.13	East of Breaston	Road Safety	Simon Hartopp	Response-01201	Having lived on Heath Gardens for 42+ years, I can say that the width and shape of the road is not suitable for more than one car to go up or down the road at a time. If you meet another car on the part leading from the main road, or on the double bends, one of you has to either reverse to a dropped kerb or drive up the full kerb onto the pavement so you can pass each other without collision. In the past weeks I was a passenger in a friends car going out towards the main road when a car turned off the main road onto Heath Gardens. Even though both cars slowed right down to pass each other, the wing mirrors collided with each other causing some damage to both. With potentially 5 times the amount of cars using the road, this kind of problem will only get worse with possibly more serious accidents as a result. Over half of the road does not have a pavement for pedestrians to use. This means that for a large part, pedestrians and vehicles are forced to use the same space. With potentially 5 times the amount of traffic and pedestrians using the road, there will be a far greater risk of serious accidents happening. At times there are a lot of carers cars parked on the road outside some houses which makes it difficult when cars are passing as well as pedestrians. When trying to drive out the end of Heath Gardens onto the A6005, passing vehicles speed up going in the direction of Long Eaton where the road goes from a 30MPH zone to a 40MPH one. At the same time vehicles travelling in the opposite direction routinely carry their speed from the 40MPH zone into the 30MPH zone. This at times makes getting out the junction a precarious manoeuvre and with potentially 5 times the amount of traffic using the road the risk of more accidents would be significantly increased.
1.13	East of Breaston	Road Safety	S M Corcoran	Response-01319	The proposed entrance road to the new housing estate is via Heath Gardens which is little more than a single track road in places and is totally unsuitable for the increased traffic both during construction and afterward. Should the planned access, via Heath Gardens be changed then the current alternatives, but even less viable solutions could be via Longmoor Lane and Holly Avenue both of which would be unacceptable. unsuitable. Longmoor Lane access would be via a dirt track which runs along the flood gully and adjacent to the cemetery, Holly Avenue like Heath Gardens is not wide enough to deal with the increased traffic and would require two or more houses being demolished to allow access to the site. It should be noted that Holly Avenue is subject to moving and standing water along its length whenever there is a bad storm due to drainage system being unable to cope with the sheer volume of water and that is after the improvements done up to now.
1.13	East of Breaston	Road Safety	Stephen Hooley	Response-00774	Heath Gardens is a very narrow Cul-De-Sac and has no pedestrian walkway after Number 1 H G and before the two ninety degree bends. It is not equipped to deal with the volumes of increased traffic both during and eventual completion of the housing development, this situation must be looked at in conjunction with traffic congestion concerns. No pedestrian walkway, increased footfall and substantial motor vehicle traffic, increase a serious risk of road accidents.
1.13	East of Breaston	Road Safety	Stephen Lacey	Response-00785	Lots of people - elderly and school pupils - use the main road access may be taken from. This adds more risk to the roads.
1.13	East of Breaston	Road Safety	Sylva Jolliffe	Response-01512	The proposed pedestrian crossing will be dangerously as it will be situated in wiring traffic to go to petrol station and proposed housing development. Pedestrians what be obscured by this traffic and get run over. This is especially true of the children from wilsthorpe school walking back to village at rush hour. A really dangerous idea

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.13	East of Breaston	Road Safety	Terence Corcoran	Response-00318	The proposed entrance road to the new housing estate is via Heath Gardens which is little more than a single track road in places and is totally unsuitable for the increased traffic both during construction and afterward. Plus there will be an increase in both noise and pollution to a level which will be unacceptable to the current residents of Heath Gardens in relation to their health both physical and mental.
1.13	East of Breaston	School Capacity	Beverley Ann Ratcliffe	Response-01098	There is already an over-subscribed list of pupils for Breaston School and the infra-structure for Breaston will not accommodate any more capacity to increase pupils. In addition, whilst not just Breaston, you are planning new homes in Draycott, (a higher number of homes) and again, there is only one small school, how can both schools accommodate the further increase in capacity? Where do you suggest these young children go to school?
1.13	East of Breaston	School Capacity	Caroline Okeowo	Response-01814	The village primary school already faces constraints in space and facilities, while nearby secondary schools operate near or at full capacity. An influx of families would worsen the situation and could force children to seek school places outside the area.
			Charlotte Fennemore	Response-01536	Firfield School is already oversubscribed.
1.13	East of Breaston	School Capacity	Christopher Baddiley	Response-01132	The existing infrastructure in Breaston is already under considerable pressure. Firfield primary school and surrounding secondary schools are at (or near) capacity. The primary school in particular struggles with limited space and a lack of outdoor facilities already. An increase in population will add unsustainable pressure, likely forcing families to seek school places further afield.
1.13	East of Breaston	School Capacity	Claire Cherry	Response-01817	The village primary school and surrounding secondary schools are at or near capacity. The primary school in particular struggles with limited space and a lack of outdoor facilities already. An increase in population will add unsustainable pressure, likely forcing families to seek school places further afield.
1.13	East of Breaston	School Capacity	Dawn Fish	Response-01165	Local schools are at capacity!
			Dean Corcoran	Response-00798	Schools in the area are already struggling with capacity so further housing development will just exacerbate this issue
1.13	East of Breaston	School Capacity	Debbie Hunt	Response-01803	: The village primary school already faces constraints in space and facilities, while nearby secondary schools operate near or at full capacity. An influx of families would worsen the situation and could force children to seek school places outside the area.
1.13	East of Breaston	School Capacity	Diane Corsham	Response-00225	Schools are going to be fuller as well so are you thinking of offering more classes for the extra students that the schools are going to have to take on!
1.13	East of Breaston	School Capacity	Ed Huntley	Response-01120	The nearest schools, Firfield and Wilsthorpe are currently full.
1.13	East of Breaston	School Capacity	Graham Elliott	Response-00413	I believe all local schools have very limited places.
1.13	East of Breaston	School Capacity	Greg Cherry	Response-01818	The village primary school and surrounding secondary schools are at or near capacity. The primary school in particular struggles with limited space and a lack of outdoor facilities already. An increase in population will add unsustainable pressure, likely forcing families to seek school places further afield. As a teacher at a local school, I can assure you that the pressures on schools is immense and close to breaking point. Adding more pupils into the area, with no extra provision considered, would be very worrying.
1.13	East of Breaston	School Capacity	Jack Collins	Response-00908	The village primary school already faces constraints in space and facilities, while nearby secondary schools operate near or at full capacity. An influx of families would worsen the situation and could force children to seek school places outside the area.
1.13	East of Breaston	School Capacity	Jessica Collins	Response-00899	The village primary school is already experiencing space constraints, and nearby secondary schools are nearing full capacity. An increase in population would place unsustainable pressure on these educational facilities. There is also considerable pressure on local schools, particularly for early years and nursery places, with waiting lists already in place.
1.13	East of Breaston	School Capacity	Judith Ratcliffe	Response-00490	Local schools are full already
1.13	East of Breaston	School Capacity	Judy Arcy	Response-01167	School classes already full
1.13	East of Breaston	School Capacity	KARL BARROW	Response-00793	Breaston's Firfield School is already over subscribed with Breaston parents sometimes struggling to get their children accepted into the school. How will the school accommodate children from this proposed development? Moreover many parents from outside Breaston are sending their children to this school exacerbating the pupil capacity problem and driving to and from the school. This causes significant congestion on Wilsthorpe Road sometimes even stopping buses. it is a certainty that some of the residents of this proposed development will also drive their children to this school adding further congestion.
1.13	East of Breaston	School Capacity	Lauren Davis	Response-00474	Already full! I cannot get my daughter into the preschool as it is
1.13	East of Breaston	School Capacity	Lee Hargreaves	Response-01184	Small village school will be over run and good ofsted rating will be affected
1.13	East of Breaston	School Capacity	Linda Shaw	Response-00511	A housing development in Breaston would put further strain and demand on local schools and nurseries which are already at full capacity. It is likely that the occupants of the new housing would compound the existing issues of road safety and traffic congestion around local schools at the start and end of the school day.
1.13	East of Breaston	School Capacity	Linda Sheppard	Response-01321	My understanding is that if the Hills Road development goes ahead there won't be enough places at the school so has this actually been considered?
1.13	East of Breaston	School Capacity	Lindsey Trueman	Response-01878	I understand that the village primary school is already close to full capacity and lacks both indoor and outdoor space. Secondary schools are also experiencing capacity issues. Any increase in child population will only exacerbate these issues and could lead to children being offered places outside of the immediate locality.
1.13	East of Breaston	School Capacity	Lisa Patrick	Response-00085	Our local school already is at capacity
1.13	East of Breaston	School Capacity	Lucy Corcoran	Response-00097	Families within the catchment area for Breaston schools are already struggling to get places, by adding additional housing will only add to this issue.
1.13	East of Breaston	School Capacity	Lynette Ratcliffe	Response-00779	Presume current schools (especially the primary school) are already full. Traffic congestion on Wilsthorpe Road during school drop off/pick up times is already dangerous.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.13	East of Breaston	School Capacity	Melvin Clive Shaw	Response-00513	A housing development in Breaston would put further strain and demand on local schools and nurseries which are already at full capacity. It is likely that the occupants of the new housing would compound the existing issues of road safety and traffic congestion around local schools at the start and end of the school day.
1.13	East of Breaston	School Capacity	Michael Sidebottom	Response-01807	The village primary school already faces constraints in space and facilities, while nearby secondary schools operate near or at full capacity. An influx of families would worsen the situation and could force children to seek school places outside the area.
1.13	East of Breaston	School Capacity	Molly Allison	Response-01528	Limited primary school capacity for the village
1.13	East of Breaston	School Capacity	Mr s e Taylor mrs j p tayloe	Response-01288	Additional schools are required. If you build more houses.
1.13	East of Breaston	School Capacity	MRS JULIE ROWLINSON	Response-01000	Schools are already overflowing and under funded - this will cause difficulties for staff and children already there as resources will be more stretched.
1.13	East of Breaston	School Capacity	Mrs M Rigby	Response-00808	Schools already overcrowded.
1.13	East of Breaston	School Capacity	Nicholas Trueman	Response-01879	I understand that the village primary school is already close to full capacity and lacks both indoor and outdoor space. Secondary schools are also experiencing capacity issues. Any increase in child population will only exacerbate these issues and could lead to children being offered places outside of the immediate locality.
1.13	East of Breaston	School Capacity	Nicola Connell	Response-00731	The village primary school and surrounding secondary schools are at or near capacity. The primary school in particular struggles with limited space and a lack of outdoor facilities already. An increase in population will add unsustainable pressure, likely forcing families to seek school places further afield.
1.13	East of Breaston	School Capacity	Pauline Wilcox	Response-00839	Is there sufficient capacity in the local schools to accept more pupils?
1.13	East of Breaston	School Capacity	Paul Wells	Response-00284	Can Firfield support a few dozen additional children? If not, how will this be planned for?
1.13	East of Breaston	School Capacity	Rafik Fanous	Response-01161	Schools are already at capacity and no room for further increases
1.13	East of Breaston	School Capacity	Samantha Honeybell	Response-01815	The village primary school and surrounding secondary schools are at or near capacity. Firfield primary school is oversubscribed every year and has limited space and no development area to increase teaching space. I have been on the Parent Teacher Association for 11 years, recently raising funds to purchase outdoor buildings to provide the school with suitable reading space. This would not be necessary if the school had adequate internal space and an increase in local population will add unsustainable pressure. Again, there does not appear to be any consideration of the impact this proposal will have.
1.13	East of Breaston	School Capacity	S M Corcoran	Response-01319	Currently the local schools (nursery, primary and secondary) are already over subscribed and the addition of 50 houses in the Breaston area will only increase pressure on the education system in the area (which is operating "over- capacity" already).
1.13	East of Breaston	School Capacity	Stacey lester	Response-01239	Local school already full. My children Al live in Breaston had to go to a school in long Eaton because Firfield was full
1.13	East of Breaston	School Capacity	Susan Holliday	Response-01577	We live on Holly Avenue and can't get our two primary aged children into the local school (Firfield): the village is already over it's workable capacity and this development will make the situation worse. Are there any plans to increase capacity at the school?
1.13	East of Breaston	School Capacity	Sylva jolliffe	Response-01512	The nearby schools do not have capacity for more children
1.13	East of Breaston	School Capacity	Terence Corcoran	Response-00318	Currently the local schools are already over subscribed and the addition of 50 houses in the Breaston area will only increase pressure on the education system in the area (which is operating "over- capacity" already)
1.13	East of Breaston	Traffic Congestion	Beverley Ann Ratcliffe	Response-01098	Using Heath Garden as an accessible road. The road into Heath Gardens is barely accessible for one vehicle at a time. Should there be two cars wanting to pass, then one vehicle has to reverse backwards to their own drives or to the side of the garage and mount the pavement to enable people to pass. Should a vehicle like a bin lorry, or any other sizeable vehicle come down the gardens, then you have to wait for it to leave before you can exist the Gardens, causing congestion. If drivers of larger vehicles are unaware of the narrowness of the road, they will have difficulty in managing to exist the cul-de-sac as there is limited space to turn around. There is no pavement apart from the top of Heath Gardens by the petrol station. There is also a double dog leg at the entrance to the cul-de-sac which a vehicle similar to a bin lorry which cannot navigate unless it mounts the kurb. The above would all be a Health & Safety risk for all residents due to limited access and no pavements in the cul de sac.
1.13	East of Breaston	Traffic Congestion	Caroline Okeowo	Response-01814	The village road network is not equipped to handle additional traffic volumes. Increased congestion, parking problems, and road safety risks would result in a marked decline in quality of life for both residents and commuters.
1.13	East of Breaston	Traffic Congestion	Chantelle croft	Response-01483	To much traffic already 😞
1.13	East of Breaston	Traffic Congestion	Christopher Baddiley	Response-01132	Breaston's roads are not designed to accommodate additional traffic. 50 new homes will bring approximately 100 extra vehicles into the village, as most households have at least two cars nowadays. Increased congestion, parking issues, and safety concerns would negatively affect residents nearby.
1.13	East of Breaston	Traffic Congestion	Claire Cherry	Response-01817	Breaston's roads are not designed to accommodate additional traffic. Increased congestion, parking issues, and safety concerns would negatively affect both residents and commuters. Breaston Village roads are already damaged to such an extent they are at points impassable. Adding in building and delivery transport and then subsequent further residential traffic would substantially worsen the current situation.
1.13	East of Breaston	Traffic Congestion	D A Wood	Response-01885	Access even now at times to the roadway is that it is a narrow and distorted, creating a major problem in bypassing other vehicles, especially commercial transports. At morning rush hours, school times, and shopping routes, considering 50 new houses with a possible 100 plus travellers would be in chaos especially when the population increases over time.
1.13	East of Breaston	Traffic Congestion	Dean Corcoran	Response-00798	The A6005 is already an extremely busy road especially at peak times , it's already difficult to exit Heath Gardens- adding to the use of this road will only increase the potential for further traffic issues especially for individuals wanting to turn right from Heath Gardens - not helped by the close proximity of the Jet petrol station
1.13	East of Breaston	Traffic Congestion	Debbie Hunt	Response-01803	Traffic and transport: The village road network is not equipped to handle additional traffic volumes. Increased congestion, parking problems, and road safety risks would result in a marked decline in quality of life for both residents and commuters.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.13	East of Breaston	Traffic Congestion	Diane Corsham	Response-00225	This will cause a lot more traffic congestion on a road that is not used to traffic congestion and is likely to cause congestion further round the roads leading out of the village which in turn is going to have a knock on effect which is unfair to the people who live there!
1.13	East of Breaston	Traffic Congestion	Ed Huntley	Response-01120	50 households and their cars will increase congestion around the Wilsthorpe roundabout and J25 of the M1.
1.13	East of Breaston	Traffic Congestion	Graham Elliott	Response-00413	We bought our ?new build? Bungalow in Heath Gardens in 1984 due to its quiet location, no through traffic and rural setting in the protected Green Belt. This change to EBC Core Strategy to extend the road and build a further 50 Dwellings goes against everything we cherish and likely to result in the devaluation of our property. Highways Issues ? a) This development would increase the traffic on the road by at least four-fold, with the majority now passing the front of our house, massively increasing noise disturbance and air pollution. b) The access to the potential new development between the land on houses Nos. 10 and 13 is only one vehicle wide, necessitating the purchase of land from the householders to widen it. c) The rest of Heath Gardens is barely wide enough for 2 cars to pass each other, particularly around the ?chicane? in the road and hence totally unsuitable, if not impossible, for regular access for Builders, Commercial or Emergency vehicles. For example, the ?Refuge Collection Lorry? currently has to reverse down the street as there is not enough room for it to turn round.
1.13	East of Breaston	Traffic Congestion	Greg Cherry	Response-01818	Breaston's roads are not designed to accommodate additional traffic. Increased congestion, parking issues, and safety concerns would negatively affect both residents and commuters. Breaston Village roads are already damaged to such an extent they are at points impassable. Adding in building and delivery transport and then subsequent further residential traffic would make all of the above concerns substantially worse.
1.13	East of Breaston	Traffic Congestion	Hilary M McCullagh	Response-00804	Breaston?s roads are not designed to accommodate additional traffic. Increased congestion, parking issues, and safety concerns would negatively affect both residents and commuters. Long queues already occur regularly approaching the Wilsthorpe roundabout and on Longmoor Lane.
1.13	East of Breaston	Traffic Congestion	Ian Burton	Response-00194	Heath gardens is not suitable for this large vehicles.
1.13	East of Breaston	Traffic Congestion	Jack Collins	Response-00908	The village road network is not equipped to handle additional traffic volumes. Increased congestion, parking problems, and road safety risks would result in a marked decline in quality of life for both residents and commuters.
1.13	East of Breaston	Traffic Congestion	Jessica Collins	Response-00899	Traffic congestion in the area is an ongoing issue, and additional housing will only exacerbate the problem. The village?s road network was not designed to accommodate the additional traffic that this development would bring. It would lead to increased congestion, parking problems, and a decline in road safety for both residents and commuters.
1.13	East of Breaston	Traffic Congestion	Joanne Parkin	Response-01163	The local roads are already far too busy with impatient road users.
1.13	East of Breaston	Traffic Congestion	Judith Ratcliffe	Response-00490	Heath Gardens is a narrow cut-de-sac. It cannot accommodate traffic for additional 50 houses to utilise its narrow road -which is currently for a small number of bungalows. There is not enough room for 2 cars to pass each way.
1.13	East of Breaston	Traffic Congestion	Judy Arcy	Response-01167	Traffic in that area will be bad- and the parking in the village centre is chaotic now with limited parking spots
1.13	East of Breaston	Traffic Congestion	Julie Yelland and Ed Huntley	Response-00904	In addition are worried about the possibility that Holly Avenue or Heath Gardens will be the entrance to the new housing. This will cause either one of the quiet streets to be ruined by construction traffic. Holly Avenue and Heath Gardens are both lovely, quiet cul-de-sacs and we object to the way that construction and accessing of more houses would alter them.
1.13	East of Breaston	Traffic Congestion	KARL BARROW	Response-00793	As proposed entry to this new development will be through Heath Gardens. This is completely inappropriate due to congestion in future because the existing road is very narrow and it is very difficult already for vehicles passing in opposite directions to pass without slowing almost to a standstill. Furthermore on entering Heath Gardens there are no footpaths so pedestrians have to avoid moving vehicles and vice versa. The only way this could be solved would be for a completely new access road to be provided using the track through the adjacent field to loop round to the rear of Heath Gardens. This would also provide users of the field with safer access than is presently the case from Wilsthorpe Road.
1.13	East of Breaston	Traffic Congestion	Kevin Hopkinson	Response-01126	Whilst I appreciate that additional infrastructure will be part of the works which may address the issue in the immediate vicinity of the development, i am more concerned about how the increase traffic flow is diversifised on the current roads which will not necessarily be upgraded as part of the work. This increase in traffic on existing narrow roads is a serious health and safety issue and one that must be taken in to consideration when determining the outcome of the review.
1.13	East of Breaston	Traffic Congestion	Lauren Davis	Response-00474	Traffic and parking are already a big problem here in Breaston. There are lots of potholes to be fixed and lots of off street parking making it dangerous to cross roads
1.13	East of Breaston	Traffic Congestion	Lee Hargreaves	Response-01184	Whichever way the access roads approach will cause traffic disruption as roads are already not maintained well enough
1.13	East of Breaston	Traffic Congestion	Linda Shaw	Response-00511	The development will cause a substantial increase in traffic congestion at the junction of Heath Gardens and the A6005, an already very busy and dangerous junction due to its proximity with the hidden lane to the horse field and the heavily used petrol station with its constant egress and ingress of vehicles. It is highly likely that there would be frequent queuing of traffic on the main A6005 causing further potential for accidents due to blind spots on the motorway bridge. When there are wider vehicles on the street e.g. refuse lorries, emergency vehicles and delivery lorries, the road is already impassable due to its narrowness and further development would hugely exacerbate the danger. The narrow road and its increased use by large vehicles would greatly restrict access for emergency vehicles.
1.13	East of Breaston	Traffic Congestion	Lindsey Trueman	Response-01878	Whatever access point is finally decided, be it Heath Gardens as specified ,or alternative existing access via Longmoor Lane, the additional traffic from residents of 50 new houses will give rise to increased traffic volumes when entering or leaving the proposed development site. Both access points named above have obvious individual constraints - e.g. narrow access road. Existing roads were not designed to accommodate such a concentration of additional traffic leading to congestion, parking, and safety concerns.
			Lisa Patrick	Response-00085	The roads in that area especially Heath Gardens is not suitable

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.13	East of Breaston	Traffic Congestion	Lucy Corcoran	Response-00097	Access from Heath Gardens into Wilsthorpe Road is already congested more so at peak times to the roundabout at Eaton Farm island which links to roads to Long Eaton, Sawley and the motorway. Turning right the visibility is not great due to the motorway bridge.
1.13	East of Breaston	Traffic Congestion	Lynette Ratcliffe	Response-00779	Heath Gardens is not a standard road - it is NOT adequate for access for additional cars for 50 houses. Heath Gardens does not have room for more than 2 cars to pass at the same time - not an issue for only 12 Bungalows but cannot be allowed for access to a new housing estate for safety reasons. In addition to this you cannot allow commercial/industrial vehicles to use Heath Gardens for access -this would be extremely dangerous.
1.13	East of Breaston	Traffic Congestion	Matt Tovey	Response-00840	Roads are already horrendously congested in the mornings and evenings (rush hour). Taking 20 mins to travel up Boston's lane currently. Building far too many houses will make this even worse.
1.13	East of Breaston	Traffic Congestion	Melvin Clive Shaw	Response-00513	The development will cause a substantial increase in traffic congestion at the junction of Heath Gardens and the A6005, an already very busy and dangerous junction due to its proximity with the hidden lane to the horse field and the heavily used petrol station with its constant egress and ingress of vehicles. It is highly likely that there would be frequent queuing of traffic on the main A6005 causing further potential for accidents due to blind spots on the motorway bridge. When there are wider vehicles on the street e.g. refuse lorries, emergency vehicles and delivery lorries, the road is already impassable due to its narrowness and further development would hugely exacerbate the danger. The narrow road and its increased use by large vehicles would greatly restrict access for emergency vehicles.
1.13	East of Breaston	Traffic Congestion	Michael Sidebottom	Response-01807	Traffic and transport: The village road network is not equipped to handle additional traffic volumes. Increased congestion, parking problems, and road safety risks would result in a marked decline in quality of life for both residents and commuters. The authorities struggle to main the roads they are currently responsible for is evident all around the area. Why we should want more roads and encourage more traffic to an already failing road system is ludicrous.
1.13	East of Breaston	Traffic Congestion	Mr and Mrs S E Taylor	Response-01888	The access from Wilsthorpe Road is not fit for purpose of access to Heath Gardens for heavy builders traffic! Even the bin lorry has to come in backwards to negotiate the narrow dog leg section just past the first bungalow! No cars can get out until they have finished the whole road? It would probably be prudent to choose an alternative access to said land, or choose a more readily accessible site! 50 houses could generate potentially between 100/150 cars, vans etc! in and out at peak times I think not, the refuse truck alone, stops any flow in or out, now!
1.13	East of Breaston	Traffic Congestion	Mr s e Taylor mrs j p tayloe	Response-01288	Road not wide enough for through traffic.so unsuitable for builders vehicles.
1.13	East of Breaston	Traffic Congestion	MRS JULIE ROWLINSON	Response-01000	Wilsthorpe road is already extremely busy and any access from it to the new houses will be just over the bridge and the garage which is going to mean more speeding and more accidents.
1.13	East of Breaston	Traffic Congestion	Mrs M Rigby	Response-00808	It will cause more traffic congestion on the road that I live on
1.13	East of Breaston	Traffic Congestion	Nicholas Trueman	Response-01879	Whatever access point is finally decided, be it Heath Gardens as specified ,or alternative existing access via Longmoor Lane, the additional traffic from residents of 50 new houses will give rise to increased traffic volumes when entering or leaving the proposed development site. Both access points named above have obvious individual constraints - e.g. narrow access road. Existing roads were not designed to accommodate such a concentration of additional traffic leading to congestion, parking, and safety concerns.
1.13	East of Breaston	Traffic Congestion	Nicola Connell	Response-00731	Breaston's roads are not designed to accommodate additional traffic. Increased congestion, parking issues, and safety concerns would negatively affect both residents and commuters.
1.13	East of Breaston	Traffic Congestion	Oliver Lowe	Response-01162	Already a busy village
1.13	East of Breaston	Traffic Congestion	O'Connor	Response-01514	Struggling now with traffic congestion, air quality
1.13	East of Breaston	Traffic Congestion	Pauline Wilcox	Response-00839	There is already far too much traffic around Long Eaton, especially during rush hours.
1.13	East of Breaston	Traffic Congestion	Rachel Lacey	Response-00784	This is already a busy area and will drive even more traffic into this area.
1.13	East of Breaston	Traffic Congestion	Rafik Fanous	Response-01161	Increased traffic congestion on roads already worn out and riddled with pot holes
1.13	East of Breaston	Traffic Congestion	Roger and Iris Woodward	Response-00302	The proposed development would generate increasing traffic levels affecting Wilsthorpe Road which is already an extremely busy road. Where currently we enjoy peace and quiet the proposed development would result in more traffic noise from resident's vehicles, delivery vehicles, utility vehicles etc.
1.13	East of Breaston	Traffic Congestion	Roger Day	Response-00027	Wilsmore Island is already a bottle neck and likewise the small island where Petersham Rd, Longmoor Lane and Bostocks Lane meet. Building on this site would potentially increase traffic on these roads and into Long Eaton where long queues are often formed leading to pollution and wasted time.
1.13	East of Breaston	Traffic Congestion	Samantha Honeybell	Response-01815	Breaston's roads are not designed to accommodate additional traffic. The proposal will increase congestion, parking issues, and safety concerns that would negatively affect both residents and commuters.
1.13	East of Breaston	Traffic Congestion	Simon Hartopp	Response-01201	Having lived on Heath Gardens for 42+ years, I can say that the width and shape of the road is not suitable for more than one car to go up or down the road at a time. If you meet another car on the part leading from the main road, or on the double bends, one of you has to either reverse to a dropped kerb or drive up the full kerb onto the pavement so you can pass each other without collision. In the past weeks I was a passenger in a friend's car going out towards the main road when a car turned off the main road onto Heath Gardens. Even though both cars slowed right down to pass each other, the wing mirrors collided with each other causing some damage to both. With potentially 5 times the amount of vehicles using the road, this kind of problem will only get worse with possibly more serious accidents as a result.
1.13	East of Breaston	Traffic Congestion	S M Corcoran	Response-01319	The A6005 (Derby Road) is already significantly busy, and the addition of 50 houses will increase traffic volume, impacting road safety and increasing the risk of accidents. A transport assessment needs to be undertaken, particularly for the residents opposite and garage adjoining the proposed site entrance.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.13	East of Breaston	Traffic Congestion	Stacey lester	Response-01239	Traffic in the area already a concern
1.13	East of Breaston	Traffic Congestion	Stephen Hooley	Response-00774	The width of road on Heath Gardens requires drivers to take great care when passing on coming traffic. This becomes more challenging when vehicles are parked on the road, especially commercial vehicles. An ageing residency live in the cul-De-Sac of Heath Gardens who rely on medical care vehicles, supermarket and commercial delivery vans. One resident at times can have up to three care professions attending of which two of their vehicles only have road parking options only. Weekly refuse vehicles will add to traffic congestion times! There are two ninety degree bends at the southern end of the Cul-De-Sac within 24 meters (approx) of each other, which should be deemed highly unsuitable for heavy construction vehicles, especially if on low loaders to safely navigate (without mounting residential driveways or front gardens) access to the proposed building site. It is fact that large and heavy construction traffic will seriously impact Heath Gardens Residents peace of mind and considerably impact on their daily routines. The Cut-De-Sac as an 'access road' for the proposed 'East of Breaston' development of 50 new houses, would bring between 50 to 75 (approx) additional vehicles plus commercial vehicles servicing the new properties. This situation would seriously add to traffic congestion throughout the day and air quality surely being impacted.
1.13	East of Breaston	Traffic Congestion	Stephen Lacey	Response-00785	Current road network is not equipped for the increase in traffic.
1.13	East of Breaston	Traffic Congestion	Sylva jolliffe	Response-01512	This will cause congestion as the queue for the petrol station and the upgraded road will block wilsthorpe road
1.13	East of Breaston	Type of Housing	Dean Corcoran	Response-00798	Houses on Holly Avenue which border the fields proposed for development are 1.5 feet above the level of the field ( to ensure we do not flood) it also means that we will be looking down into peoples homes causing a lack of privacy for both existing residents and the proposed houses.
1.13	East of Breaston	Type of Housing	Diane Corsham	Response-00225	You say that it is going to be affordable housing but I can't see that it is affordable housing in Breaston an area where affordable housing would not fit in as you have the likes of Poplar Road and Holly Avenue which would not fit the criteria!
1.13	East of Breaston	Type of Housing	Graham Elliott	Response-00413	40% of Affordable Houses - Any housing in this Village is unlikely to be 'affordable' no matter how its constructed. No comment until detail of the location and type of housing is known.
1.13	East of Breaston	Type of Housing	Judith Ratcliffe	Response-00490	Heath Gardens is a small cut-de-sac of Bungalows - of which all the occupants are retired and/or Elderly. At least one of the bungalows has to have carers attend daily. You will absolutely spoil the quiet living and community of Heath Gardens - you cannot allow a new residential area for 50 houses to have access via Heath Gardens and allow a through-road. This is unacceptable to the current residents of Heath gardens - which is a bungalow development and the nature of the cul-de-sac means they are elderly residents and live there because it is peaceful and quiet. Heath Gardens is not a proper road and does not allow 2 cars to pass side by side - the road will become absolute chaos if family housing is given access via this current quiet and peaceful cut-de-sac.
1.13	East of Breaston	Type of Housing	Judy Arcy	Response-01167	Affordable housing will devalue the prices of the properties that already exists
1.13	East of Breaston	Type of Housing	KARL BARROW	Response-00793	Any housing approved on this development should be built to the highest standards of sustainability, energy efficiency and biodiversity conservation.(ie exceeding Future Homes Standard) This is particularly the case for social housing where energy costs are a significant drain on householder's budgets. All dwellings should be provided with off street parking for at least two vehicles and future proofed with two EV charge points per dwelling. Grid infrastructure should be installed sufficient to meet the increased electrical demand for both EV chargers and air source heat pumps in each dwelling.
1.13	East of Breaston	Type of Housing	Kevin Hopkinson	Response-01126	The proposed development appears to be significantly higher than the minimum government figure.
1.13	East of Breaston	Type of Housing	Linda Shaw	Response-00511	Heath Gardens is an area of bungalows only. A potential housing development is unlikely to be in keeping with the prevailing character of the existing area, causing a detrimental impact. Taller buildings on a potential new estate could adversely affect the light to some bungalows and present an imposing aspect to the existing bungalows and the outlook of the cul de sac, completely changing the aesthetics of the area.
1.13	East of Breaston	Type of Housing	Lindsey Trueman	Response-01878	As a resident of Holly Avenue backing immediately onto the proposed development site, our garden is approximately 8 metres in depth. Any housing will severely affect our current outlook.
1.13	East of Breaston	Type of Housing	Lucy Corcoran	Response-00097	The homes on Holly Avenue are built above ground level, some 1.5ft above the level of the land proposed for development. These homes will be looking down into prospective gardens or living space so lacking in privacy for both. Proposed houses will obstruct any remaining view.
1.13	East of Breaston	Type of Housing	Lynette Ratcliffe	Response-00779	Heath Gardens is a small cut-de-sac of Bungalows occupied by mostly elderly/retired people. Extending Heath Gardens to a housing estate will completely destroy the living conditions of those currently living in Heath Gardens
1.13	East of Breaston	Type of Housing	Melvin Clive Shaw	Response-00513	Heath Gardens is an area of bungalows only. A potential housing development is unlikely to be in keeping with the prevailing character of the existing area, causing a detrimental impact. Taller buildings on a potential new estate could adversely affect the light to some bungalows and present an imposing aspect to the existing bungalows and the outlook of the cul de sac, completely changing the aesthetics of the area.
1.13	East of Breaston	Type of Housing	Mr s e Taylor mrs j p tayloe	Response-01288	Heath gardens are all bungalows. So if it comes to pass they need to be the same. Heath gardens is not a through route.
1.13	East of Breaston	Type of Housing	Nicholas Trueman	Response-01879	As a resident of Holly Avenue backing immediately onto the proposed development site, our garden is approximately 8 metres in depth. Any housing will severely affect our current outlook.
1.13	East of Breaston	Type of Housing	S M Corcoran	Response-01319	The proposed 40% affordable housing within the development is not in keeping with the surrounding housing, particularly the houses along Derby Road . Careful consideration must be given to ensure similar housing is developed to maintain the neighbourhood and village character.
1.13	East of Breaston	Type of Housing	Stacey lester	Response-01239	Type housing and who it will bring to the area

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.13	East of Breaston	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Andrea Valentine	Response-01525	The destruction of natural habitats in this area would contribute to habitat loss & environmental degradation. Green Belt land plays a crucial role in flood prevention, air quality, and local biodiversity, all of which would be compromised by unnecessary urban sprawl.
1.13	East of Breaston	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Beverley Ann Ratcliffe	Response-01098	There will be implications, felling of trees, loss of habitat for wildlife including foxes, rabbits, birds and all the smaller species due to this being a natural area for their habitat. This has always been a green belt, with no pollution, which has allowed the animals, trees and flora to develop and grow naturally. Also there is a high risk of flooding on this land which is proposed to build on.
1.13	East of Breaston	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Caroline Okeowo	Response-01814	The land in question is designated Green Belt, protected to limit urban sprawl, safeguard the countryside, and preserve biodiversity. Development here would lead to the permanent loss of vital green space and the destruction of natural habitats supporting a variety of wildlife, including birds, bats, and small mammals. Once developed, this ecological value cannot be restored.
1.13	East of Breaston	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Chantelle croft	Response-01483	We do not want any more houses build we are losing fields and trees the wild life will be come extinct
1.13	East of Breaston	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Charlotte Fennemore	Response-01536	It is important to keep greenbelt land to allow wildlife to thrive
1.13	East of Breaston	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Christopher Baddiley	Response-01132	LOSS OF TREES / HEDGEROWS AND NATURE CONSERVATION This green belt is home to a diverse array of wildlife including: foxes, rabbits, birds, butterflies, bees and bats, all of which enrich the environment and enhance the quality of life for residents of Holly Avenue. The presence of such wildlife is indicative of a healthy ecosystem which must be preserved, not built upon. Developing on this land would result in the destruction of vital wildlife habitats. This land also serves as a necessary buffer zone from the noise and pollution generated by the (recently widened) M1 motorway.
1.13	East of Breaston	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Christopher Baddiley	Response-01816	This green belt is home to a diverse array of wildlife including: foxes, rabbits, birds, butterflies, bees and bats, all of which enrich the environment and enhance the quality of life for residents of Holly Avenue. The presence of such wildlife is indicative of a healthy ecosystem which must be preserved, not built upon. Developing on this land would result in the destruction of vital wildlife habitats.
1.13	East of Breaston	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Claire Cherry	Response-01817	The proposed site lies within designated Green Belt land, which is protected to prevent urban sprawl, safeguard the countryside, and preserve natural habitats. Developing this land would result in the irreversible destruction of vital wildlife habitats, negatively affecting local species such as birds, bats, and small mammals. Once lost, these green spaces and their ecological value cannot be replaced. The proposal also conflicts with the UK's Climate Change Act 2008 and Environment Act 2021, undermining efforts to reduce carbon emissions and achieve the legally required 10% Biodiversity Net Gain.
1.13	East of Breaston	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Dean Corcoran	Response-00798	The land in question has for many years supported a wide variety of wildlife with foxes seen almost everyday (den in the overgrowth at side of field) with fox cubs often seen playing in the sun around the field, bats use the fields to hunt for prey ( again seen regularly at dusk) as well as numerous birds including birds of prey and European green woodpecker, rabbits live in numerous burrows at various points at the sides of the field as well as trees ( including oak trees ) that support a number of squirrels all of which would be lost if this proposal were to go ahead
1.13	East of Breaston	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Debbie Hunt	Response-01803	The land in question is designated Green Belt, protected to limit urban sprawl, safeguard the countryside, and preserve biodiversity. Development here would lead to the permanent loss of vital green space and the destruction of natural habitats supporting a variety of wildlife, including birds, bats, and small mammals. Once developed, this ecological value cannot be restored. As our house backs onto the field in question, we know there is a fox family and rabbits that live in that field. The development also runs counter to the Climate Change Act 2008 and the Environment Act 2021, undermining national commitments to reduce carbon emissions and meet the 10% Biodiversity Net Gain requirement.
1.13	East of Breaston	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Diane Corsham	Response-00225	In an area where wildlife is in abundance as I see plenty of foxes, bats flying up and down Holly Avenue! I think it would have a detrimental effect on the wildlife environment on those fields and I don't think that it is at all fair of the council to expect wildlife to just up sticks and move on to pastures new as where will they go as all potential habitats are being destroyed and developed for mankind!
1.13	East of Breaston	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Ed Huntley	Response-01120	Old hedges and trees are threatened by this proposed development.
1.13	East of Breaston	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Graham Elliott	Response-00413	The development would lead to a tragic loss of trees and shrubland ideal for the current wildlife. I've counted potentially 250 mature trees that would have to be removed, completely against Erewash and the Governments policy to plant millions of trees. Families of Foxes, Rabbits and Hedgehogs, plus a Badger and numerous species of Birds and Ducks have been seen on and around Heath Gardens.
1.13	East of Breaston	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Greg Cherry	Response-01818	The proposed site lies within designated Green Belt land, which is protected to prevent urban sprawl, safeguard the countryside, and preserve natural habitats. Developing this land would result in the irreversible destruction of vital wildlife habitats, negatively affecting local species such as birds, bats, and small mammals. Once lost, these green spaces and their ecological value cannot be replaced. The proposal also conflicts with the UK's Climate Change Act 2008 and Environment Act 2021, undermining efforts to reduce carbon emissions and achieve the legally required 10% Biodiversity Net Gain.
1.13	East of Breaston	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Ian Burton	Response-00194	Wildlife including badgers are on this site.
1.13	East of Breaston	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jack Collins	Response-00908	Development here would lead to the permanent loss of vital green space and the destruction of natural habitats supporting a variety of wildlife, including birds, bats, and small mammals. Once developed, this ecological value cannot be restored. The development also runs counter to the Climate Change Act 2008 and the Environment Act 2021, undermining national commitments to reduce carbon emissions and meet the 10% Biodiversity Net Gain requirement.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.13	East of Breaston	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jessica Collins	Response-00899	Allowing development here would result in the permanent loss of valuable green space, irreversibly disrupting wildlife habitats and the biodiversity they support, including birds, bats, and small mammals. The land earmarked for development is home to a variety of wildlife which we regularly see from our home. In recent months, we have witnessed the destruction of trees and hedgerows during periods when such work should not be taking place, demonstrating a clear disregard for environmental protections and the local community. This proposal also contradicts the Climate Change Act 2008 and Environment Act 2021, undermining national efforts to reduce carbon emissions and fulfil the legal requirements for a 10% Biodiversity Net Gain.
1.13	East of Breaston	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Judith Ratcliffe	Response-00490	Removing more Green-belt? - not a good thing
1.13	East of Breaston	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Julie Yelland and Ed Huntley	Response-00904	We are residents of Breaston and live on Holly Avenue. We enjoy living in a quiet cul-de-sac with beautiful old trees between our house and the motorway. We are concerned that the trees will be removed if the planned housing goes ahead. It is an excellent area of fields for wildlife and it seems shortsighted to build there. Please give us reassurance that the trees will remain.
1.13	East of Breaston	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Kelly Steed	Response-00444	The proposed development will result in the irreversible loss of greenfield land, which provides important biodiversity, supports wildlife habitats, and contributes to carbon capture. Preserving green space is essential for climate resilience and community wellbeing.
1.13	East of Breaston	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Kevin Hopkinson	Response-01126	The development of housing on existing green belt land will eradicate the flora and fauna which has taken many years to become established and once lost, is irreplaceable. Given the current government led initiatives to drive down our carbon footprint, the loss of a significant amount of established natural regenerative flora should not be taken lightly. The biodiversity of the green belt has developed and established over several decades and is irreplaceable in our lifetime.
1.13	East of Breaston	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Lauren Davis	Response-00474	Very important issue. Wildlife homes are already in short supply so by building here on a protected green belt area we are putting them at risk even further damaging our countryside and its ecosystem
1.13	East of Breaston	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Lee Hargreaves	Response-01184	Trees are already being cut down unnecessarily
1.13	East of Breaston	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Linda Shaw	Response-00511	The removal of trees and the replacement of a green area with a new housing estate would have a massive impact on the local area with the destruction of habitats for wildlife local to the Breaston area ? badgers, hedgehogs, bats, birds, butterflies, bees etc., and for many already vulnerable species. This clearly has a wider impact on general biodiversity.
1.13	East of Breaston	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Linda Sheppard	Response-01321	There are a number of established hedgerows and mature trees in the field. I would hope that any development would be made to leave these in place
1.13	East of Breaston	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Lindsey Trueman	Response-01878	Development of the two fields will lead to irreversible loss of a thriving natural habitat for both natural trees and vegetation that supports a diverse range of wildlife. This includes foxes, rabbits and small mammals and bats. Birdlife includes woodpeckers, hawks, owls and even egrets when the field is flooded.
1.13	East of Breaston	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Lisa Patrick	Response-00085	This area currently has many bird, animals etc
1.13	East of Breaston	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Lucy Corcoran	Response-00097	Bats have been sited by numerous residents of Holly Avenue using the land in question as their feeding territory. The land houses wildlife including foxes, rabbits returning species of birds for nesting and birds of prey, butterflies, insects and bees all support the biodiversity of this land.
1.13	East of Breaston	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Lynette Ratcliffe	Response-00779	Its greenbelt land - loss of trees, shrub land etc The area is also home to rabbits/foxes/hedgehogs etc
1.13	East of Breaston	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Melvin Clive Shaw	Response-00513	The removal of trees and the replacement of a green area with a new housing estate would have a massive impact on the local area with the destruction of habitats for wildlife local to the Breaston area ? badgers, hedgehogs, bats, birds, butterflies, bees etc., and for many already vulnerable species. This clearly has a wider impact on general biodiversity.
1.13	East of Breaston	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Michael Sidebottom	Response-01807	The land provides environments for an abundance of wildlife currently taking advantage of its natural state. Again, I witness this with my own eyes every single day. Once this has gone we can never get it back and the ecological value is lost forever. The development also runs counter to the Climate Change Act 2008 and the Environment Act 2021, undermining national commitments to reduce carbon emissions and meet the 10% Biodiversity Net Gain requirement.
1.13	East of Breaston	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Molly Allison	Response-01528	This is a green belt and shouldn't be built on, we need to preserve the few green areas
1.13	East of Breaston	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mr s e Taylor mrs j p tayloe	Response-01288	We bought our property 3.5 years ago on the assurance it was green belt. It's a pleasure we enjoy the birds and wild life.
1.13	East of Breaston	Wildlife / Biodiversity	MRS JULIE ROWLINSON	Response-01000	This area is a haven for wildlife as it is not a general public area and so wildlife can live undisturbed. It is long grass and trees that are vital for creatures, especially so close to the motorway which has already take up large amounts of land.
1.13	East of Breaston	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mrs M Rigby	Response-00808	It will upset the wildlife.
1.13	East of Breaston	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Nicholas Trueman	Response-01879	Development of the two fields will lead to irreversible loss of a thriving natural habitat for both natural trees and vegetation that supports a diverse range of wildlife. This includes foxes, rabbits and small mammals and bats. Birdlife includes woodpeckers, hawks, owls and even egrets when the field is flooded.
1.13	East of Breaston	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Nicola Connell	Response-00731	Developing this land would result in the irreversible destruction of vital wildlife habitats, negatively affecting local species such as birds, bats, and small mammals. The proposal conflicts with the UK's Environment Act 2021, undermining efforts to achieve the legally required 10% Biodiversity Net Gain.
1.13	East of Breaston	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Pauline Wilcox	Response-00839	The suggested area is green belt which seems to be totally ignored these days. There is an abundance of wildlife in the area including bats and most certainly great crested newts?
1.13	East of Breaston	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Rachel Lacey	Response-00784	The area is known for bats and other wildlife. These will be wiped out by the development.
1.13	East of Breaston	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Rafik Fanous	Response-01161	Significant reduction in green belt land and direct effect on wildlife and biodiversity
1.13	East of Breaston	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Roger and Iris Woodward	Response-00302	Apart from the horses using the greenbelt the land is a haven for all wildlife and any potential residential development would decimate the animal population.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.13	East of Breaston	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Roger Day	Response-00027	Loosing green fields will always mean a loss of habitat. This less farmed land must contain large numbers of invertebrates good for the environment. Concrete and tiles do not support such life.
1.13	East of Breaston	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Samantha Honeybell	Response-01815	? The proposal also conflicts with the UK's Climate Change Act 2008 and Environment Act 2021, undermining efforts to reduce carbon emissions and achieve the legally required 10% Biodiversity Net Gain.
1.13	East of Breaston	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Simon Hartopp	Response-01201	The land in question is full of wildlife and is used by startlings Nov-February for roosting. The murmurations are spectacular and get bigger every year. Badgers are frequently seen using the brooks that lead to the area of land as well as weasels. The loss of habitat for all this wildlife would be detrimental to the level of biodiversity in the local area!
1.13	East of Breaston	Wildlife / Biodiversity	S M Corcoran	Response-01319	The trees on the site are a mixture of species and "maturity" and, with the rough grassland in the area, offer both shelter and food to a wide variety of insects, birds and mammals that currently reside in this area. This includes a number of bats which are currently a protected species. Loss of this Green Land Belt land would have a devastating affect on the wild life that use it and would be detrimental / against the Green policy that the District council have and reduce the air quality in general. Also the appropriate landscaped buffer between the site and the cemetery what does this mean the wildlife required ?rough? land to provide the mixture of habitats needed.
1.13	East of Breaston	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Stacey lester	Response-01239	The potential harm of wildlife in the area
1.13	East of Breaston	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Stephen Hooley	Response-00774	The development will result in a significant habitat loss, particularly the number of trees adversely affecting local wildlife. The site of the proposed development serves as a crucial buffer between exsiting residential areas and the M1 motorway, and its loss would have considerable biodiversity impacts, increasing noise disturbance and as previously referenced, air pollution.
1.13	East of Breaston	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Stephen Lacey	Response-00785	The targeted site is green belt land with many species including bats. These will be destroyed.
1.13	East of Breaston	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Susan Holliday	Response-01577	We live on Holly avenue and our house backs onto this greenbelt land. We see fabulous wildlife and would hate to see its habitat destroyed. We should be building on brownfield sites, not taking the easy, cheap option of green belt which serves only to line pockets and destroy our planet. We strongly object to this development.
1.13	East of Breaston	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Terence Corcoran	Response-00318	The trees on the site are a mixture of species and "maturity" and, with the rough grassland in the area, offer both shelter and food to a wide variety of insects, birds and mammals that currently reside in this area. This includes a number of bats which are currently a protected species. Loss of this Green Land Belt land would have a devastating affect on the wild life that use it and would be detrimental / against the Green policy that the District council have and reduce the air quality in general.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Alison Thirlwall	Response-01390	The increased number of vehicles in the area being driven by the additional residents and deliveries once the work is complete will negatively affect the air quality, and as a result, people with respiratory issue will suffer.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Anthony Bradley	Response-01442	The air quality with be compromised during the build making dust and noise for residents, then the extra vehicles from new home owner will make more pollution
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Anthony Walsh	Response-00992	If granted there will be a massive increase on the carbon footprint building and habitation via gas and electricity along with transport exhaust pollution
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Ben Marshall	Response-01212	Air quality is already poor due to the large amount of traffic on Derby road. An increase in traffic will only add to this, alongside the huge amount of dust and debris that will inevitably occur from sustained building works.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Bradley Peace	Response-01348	Noise from the construction (including vehicle movements) and operational phases of the proposed development have not been adequately addressed. 5 2 An environment noise assessment needs to be carried out, particularly for the residents directly opposite the site entrance; but also the whole route that the construction traffic will take. This passes through Draycott, Borrow ash and Beaston villages. Passing busy junctions, Doctor?s surgeries, public car parks, Primary schools, local cricket clubs as well as numerous resident?s homes. 6 3 Require the submission of an environmental noise assessment, prior to development works commencing, to rate and assess operational sound from all fixed installations comprising mechanical and electrical plant and equipment, with a scheme of mitigation measures where necessary; that all site preparation and construction to comply with specified working hours and limits to noise and dust emissions, waste disposal and lighting; and the submission of proposals, including the design and operating times, of any permanent external lighting on site. 7 4 Access and egress to the proposed housing development on Derby Road raises several issues relating to highway and pedestrian safety, ease of access and disruption from increased traffic. 8 5 The use of long/heavy goods vehicles should be prohibited due to the significant amount of Grade I and II listed buildings in the vicinity of the proposed development on land south west of Draycott. This will include Nooning Lane Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1417622 and Hopwell Road Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1087963. 9 6 Noise and Vibration consultation to be undertaken to consider impacts during construction on nearby noise sensitive properties and ongoing management of a solar farm and the impact of noise and disturbance.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Colin & Cynthia Green	Response-00922	Additional vehicles on road for 190 + new builds affect air quality.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Dale Longmuir	Response-01543	Reduce greenery and wildlife will change the quality of the air, more traffic and pollution from cars will also reduce air quality, this area is a nice peaceful village with a lot of greenery around you cant change that. People wont have as many areas to go for walks to enjoy their local area and to clear their minds
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	David and Nicala O'Leary	Response-00822	Adding 190 homes could introduce over 380 additional vehicles to local roads, significantly increasing air pollution
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	David Webster	Response-01113	The increased road and traffic to the area will have a detrimental impact to the local environment when considering the close proximity of Green Belt land, the Erewash River and the Derby Road to Draycott canal and footpath. These areas contain a magnitude of nature and local habitat that will be negatively impacted by increased population density, carbon footprint and does not align to the NPPFs sustainable location assessment.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Dexter Codrington	Response-00986	the additional pollution due to almost 1000 homes by the time the safeguarded land is used up will be terrible. The carbon that would have been absorbed by the trees, grassland and hedgerows will no longer happen as the houses will have been built over and across this valuable greenbelt resource. Testing of the car volumes, the cumulative impact and estimates of the increase in pollution must take place
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Diane Webster	Response-01177	The increased road and traffic to the area will have a detrimental impact to the local environment when considering the close proximity of Green Belt land, the Erewash River and the Derby Road to Draycott canal and footpath. These areas contain a magnitude of nature and local habitat that will be negatively impacted by increased population density, carbon footprint and does not align to the NPPF sustainable location assessment. "NPPF 20. States that strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and design quality of places and make sufficient provision for infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, security, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat). The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic."
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Donna Peace	Response-01344	1 Noise from the construction (including vehicle movements) and operational phases of the proposed development have not been adequately addressed. 5 2 An environment noise assessment needs to be carried out, particularly for the residents directly opposite the site entrance; but also the whole route that the construction traffic will take. This passes through Draycott, Borrow ash and Beaston villages. Passing busy junctions, Doctor's surgeries, public car parks, Primary schools, local cricket clubs as well as numerous resident's homes. 6 3 Require the submission of an environmental noise assessment, prior to development works commencing, to rate and assess operational sound from all fixed installations comprising mechanical and electrical plant and equipment, with a scheme of mitigation measures where necessary; that all site preparation and construction to comply with specified working hours and limits to noise and dust emissions, waste disposal and lighting; and the submission of proposals, including the design and operating times, of any permanent external lighting on site. 7 4 Access and egress to the proposed housing development on Derby Road raises several issues relating to highway and pedestrian safety, ease of access and disruption from increased traffic. 8 5 The use of long/heavy goods vehicles should be prohibited due to the significant amount of Grade I and II listed buildings in the vicinity of the proposed development on land south west of Draycott. This will include Nooning Lane Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1417622 and Hopwell Road Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1087963. 9 6 Noise and Vibration consultation to be undertaken to consider impacts during construction on nearby noise sensitive properties and ongoing management of a solar farm and the impact of noise and disturbance.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Gail Holdsworth	Response-00937	Draycott is a small village.concern about traffic pollution especially as school in centre of village in the main road.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Garry Hickton	Response-01473	More vehicles will increase pollution to the air from exhaust fumes.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Gary Siddall	Response-01237	No doubt the air quality is going to suffer during the construction stages of such an big development, But afterwards, the increased traffic will undoubtedly have an lasting effect on the air quality too.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Gemma Woolnough	Response-01394	The new housing development would negatively impact air quality in the village due to an increase in traffic due to an increase in vehicles passing through the village. The development work would require the use of heavy machinery which would likely lead to lots of dust & debris negatively impacting the air quality in the village.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Gerri Hickton	Response-01472	Additional traffic will obviously have a detrimental impact upon air quality increasing the risk of higher emissions and the associated health implications If there are 190 homes - many homes are a minimum of 2car families- the impact will be significant
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Gill Trickitt	Response-01157	More traffic, more pollution, idling cars, roadworks, construction, increased congestion and the loss of greenbelt countryside all amounts to a negative impact on air quality. We live in a village for a reason. If people want to live in a busy town or city that's fine - build more houses on the edge of these areas.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Gordon Dahill	Response-00690	Is going to cause significant air and noise pollution problems
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Graham Wakeling	Response-01238	Air quality will decrease, There will be many more cars and trucks on the roads around Draycott, And new build houses with log burning stoves, garden fires.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Hannah Pritchard	Response-01399	Additional traffic resulting from the development will lead to increased emissions, worsening local air quality. This is particularly concerning near schools and homes where vulnerable populations reside. With national targets to reduce pollution, this development would run counter to environmental and public health goals, particularly in a rural area that currently benefits from relatively clean air.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	James Hargreaves	Response-01315	Increased vehicle use will degrade air quality, affecting the Green Belt, the Erewash River, and surrounding ecosystems. Traffic congestion contributes significantly to pollution.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Jonathan Fletcher	Response-01463	Obviously the introduction of many more new homes will severely increase already poor air quality with many new cars and vehicles coming to the area.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Judith Boyle	Response-01418	I strongly do not believe these plans are in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, and the Erewash Borough Councils (EBC) Local Plan 2022. I also do not believe that adequate consultation has been undertaken by EBC with the Draycott Local Parish Council or residents on these plans, and the impact they will have on the local community, wider village and amenity. Furthermore, the development plans plus the proposed National Grids pylon corridor which has been identified as only being circa 600 meters away from this development, will mean the south west of Draycott will be unrealistically overburdened with development impacting Green Belt land.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Juliet Macve	Response-01572	As per my comments regarding traffic congestion, any increase in that will obviously lead to reduced air quality and further threats to people's health.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Kerry Naylor	Response-00993	The change in air quality with in excess of possibly 150 vehicles in the area. This cannot be acceptable . What about asthmatic people, children?
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Laura Charier	Response-01218	The additional traffic, destruction of green and natural spaces will have a detrimental effect on our children and vulnerable people. The development will negatively impact the air quality and health of the residents.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Lee	Response-00742	1. Pollution - this will introduce hundreds of extra cars to the village and locally. How can enabling large estate and introducing more polluting cars whilst removing greenbelt be of any environmental benefit? 2. It doesn't have to be built here a Greener Policy would be to re-use brown belt sites. Why destroy what is not essential to destroy.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Lee Bunday	Response-00028	I am writing to formally object to the Core Strategy Review on the basis of its failure to adequately address the serious and growing issue of air quality within the area. The strategy's emphasis on large-scale development ? of the increased housing ? poses a significant risk to local air quality. Increased traffic volumes, construction activity, and population density will contribute directly to higher emissions of nitrogen dioxide (NO?), particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5), and other pollutants. The review lacks a clear air quality impact assessment for the proposed developments and fails to set out enforceable mitigation measures. There is also insufficient integration between the strategy and local Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAS), which are already struggling to meet national and EU standards. Poor air quality is a well-documented public health hazard, contributing to respiratory illnesses, cardiovascular disease, and premature deaths. It is particularly harmful to children, the elderly, and vulnerable populations. Without a meaningful, evidence-based plan to monitor, manage, and reduce emissions, the strategy risks undermining both public health and environmental sustainability. At a minimum, it should include: Comprehensive air quality modelling for all major development zones. Clear limits on emissions and pollution linked to construction and traffic. Investment in green infrastructure and sustainable transport alternatives. Alignment with national targets for net-zero emissions. I urge the council to pause the adoption of the Core Strategy Review until these concerns are properly addressed and the long-term health and well-being of residents is prioritised.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Louise Burnell	Response-00262	Increased traffic and houses will increase the local carbon footprint.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Luke Hatch	Response-00160	More cars mean more emissions. For a small village like Draycott, air quality can get worse quickly, especially near schools and bus stops where people are already exposed.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Maggie Murphy	Response-00833	The increased traffic to the area will have a detrimental impact to the local environment when considering the close proximity of Green Belt land, the Erewash River and the Derby Road to Draycott canal and footpath. These areas contain a magnitude of nature and local habitat that will be negatively impacted by increased population density, carbon footprint and does not align to the NPPFs sustainable location assessment. The air quality with the additional 700 homes using the main Derby road from Borrowwash to Breaston will be directly impacted with additional pollution. This can be seen by the backlog of cars and trucks that sit with their engines running every time we have roadworks or an accident. It is detrimental to health and bad for the environment
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Martin Kilcoyne	Response-01460	Derby Road is already a busy throw ghost route between Derby and Nottingham. At peak times the ait quality drops such that we have to close our front windows to avoid the smell of vehicle fumes. The additional houses will only make this worse and result in poorer health conditions for all residents on the main road.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Melanie Wilson	Response-00974	Increase in traffic / construction processes will have a negative impact on the air quality
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Michelle Marks	Response-00924	Air and noise pollution ? Increased construction and traffic will contribute to rising pollution levels, further harming local air quality and diminishing residents? quality of life
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Mr R Sykes	Response-00412	Can only make it worse.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Mrs Maria E Hardy	Response-00614	Reason we moved to Draycott was for better air quality . Increase in asthma
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Nat	Response-00158	Increased pollution levels due to more traffic
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Nigel morton	Response-01351	The building works will affect the air quality dramatically, as an asthmatic I really worry for my health ,as I am close to the proposed site
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Nikki Riches	Response-00950	I object to the proposed development, air quality will be ultimately be adversely affected by the increase traffic not only from the proposed new development in Draycott but also those in Borrowwash and Breaston.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Pauline Marks	Response-00927	The development will bring more traffic and construction activity, leading to higher levels of air and noise pollution?damaging both public health and local quality of life. Inadequate Infrastructure for Population Growth
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Peter Sutton	Response-00409	It would be expected that an additional 190 cars and likely many more will be on the proposed site. At peak times where these vehicles will be queing to join the main road will increase exhaust gases in the area.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	R Fazackerley	Response-01415	Thr development and it's associated traffic will reduce local air quality
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Richard Keith Hanbury	Response-01087	We currently enjoy healthy air. With the increased houses both here and on Cole lane there could be an increase in global warming that will make the temperature increase. How many trees will be planted?
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Richard Syson	Response-01317	The proposed addition of 190 homes + a potential further 70 homes would add c. 500 cars to an already very busy main road - Derby Road (A6005). This would inevitably worsen air quality / increase pollution in the village. This is in addition to the general emissions / pollution from what I would estimate to be a minimum 20% increase in housing
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Ricky fisher	Response-00048	Air quality is going to be affected heavily with the flattening of trees and plants
			Robert Alan Duncanson	Response-00855	MORE TRAFFIC WOULD MEAN WORSE AIR QUALITY

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Roger Brown	Response-00999	Unless the new homes are truly green with solar panels, heat pumps etc. there will inevitably be additional air pollution from a development at the western extreme of the village with prevailing westerly winds carrying this pollution over the remainder of the village. The electrical infrastructure of this area is already strained, power cuts are not infrequent so any such development would require significant improvements in its provision given that they should be running heat pumps and not gas heating. Noise pollution will go hand in hand with increases in residency.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Sarah Hargreaves	Response-01314	Increased traffic will negatively impact the local environment, including Green Belt land, the Erewash River, and local habitats. Air quality deteriorates when traffic builds up due to congestion.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Scott Gardner	Response-01554	The environmental consequences of this development are deeply troubling. This development will contribute to increased nitrous oxide (N <sub>2</sub> O) emissions. Emissions will arise from construction activities and increased residential presence, whilst (N <sub>2</sub> O) levels are falling in Erewash, it should be noted the levels are above national averages.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Sean Peace	Response-01347	1 Noise from the construction (including vehicle movements) and operational phases of the proposed development have not been adequately addressed. 5 2 An environment noise assessment needs to be carried out, particularly for the residents directly opposite the site entrance; but also the whole route that the construction traffic will take. This passes through Draycott, Borrow ash and Beaston villages. Passing busy junctions, Doctor's surgeries, public car parks, Primary schools, local cricket clubs as well as numerous resident's homes. 6 3 Require the submission of an environmental noise assessment, prior to development works commencing, to rate and assess operational sound from all fixed installations comprising mechanical and electrical plant and equipment, with a scheme of mitigation measures where necessary; that all site preparation and construction to comply with specified working hours and limits to noise and dust emissions, waste disposal and lighting; and the submission of proposals, including the design and operating times, of any permanent external lighting on site. 7 4 Access and egress to the proposed housing development on Derby Road raises several issues relating to highway and pedestrian safety, ease of access and disruption from increased traffic. 8 5 The use of long/heavy goods vehicles should be prohibited due to the significant amount of Grade I and II listed buildings in the vicinity of the proposed development on land south west of Draycott. This will include Nooning Lane Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1417622 and Hopwell Road Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1087963. 9 6 Noise and Vibration consultation to be undertaken to consider impacts during construction on nearby noise sensitive properties and ongoing management of a solar farm and the impact of noise and disturbance.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Simon Jenkins	Response-01287	Again, obviously it will be affected . I realize new homes are now being built as airtight as possible, but the amount of extra cars is bound to lead to higher vehicle emissions, potentially impacting air quality.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Susan Baker	Response-01316	More traffic means more pollution. It's not just about inconvenience?it's about the air we breathe, the health of our children, and the wellbeing of our local environment, including the Green Belt and the Erewash River.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Susan Foster	Response-00824	Health and well being is constantly preached to us all, fresh air, being able to walk in the fresh air is essential for good mental health. We do not want doctor's surgeries full of people who have breathing difficulties because the air they breathe is polluted.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Teresa Batchelor	Response-01240	Its common sense that increased traffic, as would undoubtedly be generated by the new housing, is going to create more air pollution and noise pollution.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Teresa Shaw	Response-01309	1. Pollution - this will introduce hundreds of extra cars to the villages and locally. How can enabling large estate and introducing more polluting cars whilst removing greenbelt be of any environmental benefit? Planting trees elsewhere does not benefit the locals breathing in more toxic fumes. 2. It doesn't have to be built in the proposed plot a Greener Policy would be to re-use brown belt sites. Why destroy what is not essential to destroy its double polluting.
			Tim Hawkins	Response-00661	Increase in population? Decrease in air quality.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Tracey Morton	Response-00968	1 Air quality will be affected by increased traffic 2 Air quality will be effected by construction traffic ie dust and fumes from construction vehicles 3 Will impact people's health especially people with breathing issues 4 residents closest will be effected more by pollution from increased traffic and construction itself
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	T Shields	Response-00570	We need more housing. With that comes an increase in car use. However, the houses can be built each with their own EV charging point to increase greater uptake so as to minimise carbon based fuels.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	Wilfred Boone	Response-01424	The increased road and traffic to the area will have a detrimental impact to the local environment when considering the close proximity of Green Belt land, the Erewash River and the Derby Road to Draycott canal and footpath. These areas contain a magnitude of nature and local habitat that will be negatively impacted by increased population density, carbon footprint and does not align to the NPPF sustainable location assessment. "NPPF 20. States that strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and design quality of places and make sufficient provision for infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, security, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat). The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Beaston and Borrowash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic."
1.14	South West of Draycott	Air Quality	William Batchelor	Response-01210	extra traffic will cause more pollution, not everyone will have new electric cars, highly unlikely with 40% of housing being for affordable and most properties will have two cars (or more) meaning potentially nearly 400 extra cars on roads
1.14	South West of Draycott	Bus Services	adrian leeming	Response-01249	It is also a Government ambition to reduce unnecessary/extra vehicle journeys. By building substantial numbers of houses miles away from commercial centres and supermarkets this will encourage more journeys. Draycott does have a bus service but the reality is that most of the 190 new families will jump in the car rather than catch a bus because that's the society we now live in.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Bus Services	Alison Thirlwall	Response-01390	Currently, the bus service is well used and will be insufficient to support the large number of additional residents. It is also expensive to use.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Bus Services	Andrew and Jane Gilmour	Response-01329	The Indigo, the bus service serving Draycott is often full even outside the normal "rush-hours". This is a service widely used by many of the more elderly population of Draycott and provides their only access to shopping and healthcare appointments as well as social engagements. The addition of people living in this proposed development would severely affect the availability of such services. The bus stop proposed for use by the new development does not have a bus shelter and the pavement in place is single track and the queuing of more than one or two people would prevent the route of people walking into Draycott to either shops or schools,
1.14	South West of Draycott	Bus Services	Anthony Walsh	Response-00992	Busses are currently few and far between
1.14	South West of Draycott	Bus Services	Bradley Peace	Response-01348	public transport, which are already overstretched. No adequate plans have been provided to mitigate these concerns.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Bus Services	Colin & Cynthia Green	Response-00922	Trent Barton run bus service to Nottingham & Derby, plus school buses to local nearby schools eg Friesland, etc. crossing this busy road with additional vehicles will mean it unsafe for pedestrians to get to use buses for which I am a concessionary bus pass holder & my husband too. Turning in & out onto this stretch of road where bus stops are pose hazards & unsafe.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Bus Services	David Webster	Response-01113	The use of the bus services is provided by Trent Barton which runs every 20 minutes which at peak times i.e morning and between school leaving at 15 00 hours are normally restricted to standing only for me and my wife both over 70 at the moment any additional traffic in people and children could lead to use waiting for the next bus.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Bus Services	Dexter Codrington	Response-00986	More buses on the road will lead to more pollution and more traffic chaos. There is a good bus service now it does not need changing
1.14	South West of Draycott	Bus Services	Diane Webster	Response-01177	Has a survey been carried out to any addition requirement that will be required during the peak times 8.00 - 9.30 and 15.00 - 17.30
1.14	South West of Draycott	Bus Services	Donna Peace	Response-01344	public transport, which are already overstretched. No adequate plans have been provided to mitigate these concerns.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Bus Services	Francis Ian Scott	Response-01535	The occupants of the 190 houses to be built (with a further 70 houses being built on the identified land adjacent), will undoubtedly put a strain on the current bus services through Draycott - which will not be able to cope with the additional customers.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Bus Services	Gail Holdsworth	Response-00937	I do not drive and rely on this bus service. One bus all the way from Nottingham . Unreliable and not a pleasant experience now . This will not be able to cope with such a large potential rise in population. A lical bus is desperately needed.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Bus Services	Gary Siddall	Response-01237	Draycott currently has an efficient bus service between Nottingham and Derby along the A6005.... this, I expect, *should* be ok - UNLESS you're going to want to start diverting busses down/around the "proposed new housing estate" (which doesn't really happen anywhere else along that route), so that will undoubtedly slow everything down. But even if the busses will stay on the main road, I expect there will have to be a new/additional Bus Stop for the "proposed new estate" with so many new houses to serve... In which case, it needs to be one that is a lay-by type, OFF the road and MUST be carefully assessed for road safety in that area !!!
1.14	South West of Draycott	Bus Services	Gemma Woolnough	Response-01394	Currently there is only one bus service in the village which is already busy at peak times. If the housing development were to go ahead additional buses would be needed to meet demand.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Bus Services	Graham Wakeling	Response-01238	as a sometime(s) bus user the increase in population to the village would make the services busier, less likely to be able to be seated. Also an increase in parking will occur around Draycott, as new residents leave cars on streets, to avoid city parking costs, taking to the buses instead.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Bus Services	Hannah Pritchard	Response-01399	Draycott currently has a very limited and unreliable bus service (Indigo) that are infrequent and not well connected to major employment centres. Without substantial investment in reliable and frequent public transport, new residents will be car-dependent, further worsening congestion and pollution. The development does not appear to include any commitment to improve public transport provision or access.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Bus Services	James Hargreaves	Response-01315	Already limited
1.14	South West of Draycott	Bus Services	Jonathan Fletcher	Response-01463	Will the council be introducing many new extra bus services to cope with the influx of heightened population ? I very much doubt this!
1.14	South West of Draycott	Bus Services	Karla Williams	Response-00077	Buses are regular.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Bus Services	Kayleigh Bonallie	Response-01375	There is one bus service through draycott It is irregular, unreliable and they already removed the I4 and ZOOM services that used to run. Public transport is limited
1.14	South West of Draycott	Bus Services	Lee	Response-00742	1. Schools - will extra buses be put on for transportation to local schools?
1.14	South West of Draycott	Bus Services	Luke Hatch	Response-00160	Public transport in the area is patchy. If the bus service isn't improved alongside the development, new residents will depend entirely on cars, putting more pressure on roads and parking. I'm all for using public transport, but right now it is not affordable and takes an hour to get to Nottingham. Nobody uses it for that reason. Therefore, more people = more cars = more congestion and nothing I have seen so far indicates that it is a concern being taken seriously. It seems the developers has the Council over a barrel and we just take what scraps they give us.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Bus Services	Maggie Murphy	Response-00833	An increase in Bus journeys will increase traffic and pollution negatively
1.14	South West of Draycott	Bus Services	Michael Thirlwall	Response-01196	Existing bus services would not be adequate to cater for the additional journeys of 190 extra households.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Bus Services	Michelle Marks	Response-00924	There is also no evidence of improved public transport provision, making this development wholly unsustainable.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Bus Services	Mr R Sykes	Response-00412	A heavily used service between Villages.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Bus Services	Mrs Maria E Hardy	Response-00614	My daughter attends the bus for secondary school and already leave early in the morning and struggle with traffic
1.14	South West of Draycott	Bus Services	Nigel morton	Response-01351	We have limited bus services ,they were recently cut back ,which means more people will use there cars etc
1.14	South West of Draycott	Bus Services	Pauline Marks	Response-00927	Draycott's existing infrastructure is already under strain and is not equipped to support such a substantial increase in populatio
1.14	South West of Draycott	Bus Services	Richard Keith Hanbury	Response-01087	When I don't cycle I catch the bus. The disruption could make me late for work. Causing stress and anxiety.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Bus Services	Richard Syson	Response-01317	The Trent Barton Indigo bus service would inevitably suffer from overcrowding at peak times
1.14	South West of Draycott	Bus Services	Rick Howden	Response-01421	Access and egress to the proposed housing development on Derby Road raises several issues relating to highway and pedestrian safety, ease of access and disruption from increased traffic.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Bus Services	Sarah	Response-01541	Many being missed or cancelled because lack of drivers so many only standing room or sometimes even too full to stop.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Bus Services	Sean Peace	Response-01347	public transport, which are already overstretched. No adequate plans have been provided to mitigate these concerns.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Bus Services	Simon Jenkins	Response-01287	Should not cause a major issue, other than being busier and needing extra buses.
	South West of Draycott	Bus Services	Susan Baker	Response-01316	The buses are already busy and I struggle to get a seat. Going to Nottingham is far too long a journey for a commuter
1.14	South West of Draycott	Bus Services	Susan Foster	Response-00824	Service is adequate at the moment but who knows how long that will last.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Bus Services	Teresa Shaw	Response-01309	1. Schools - will extra buses be put on for transportation to local schools & the alleged 2000 children?
1.14	South West of Draycott	Bus Services	Tim Hawkins	Response-00661	In the unlikely event that the new residents use the 4 times an hour bus service to Derby (30 minutes) or Nottingham (1 hour) I doubt that this will have too much of an impact. The truth is that it's unlikely to encourage further capacity.
	South West of Draycott	Bus Services	Tom	Response-01477	There is only one bus service that comes through Draycott once every 20 minutes, the buses are already packed as it is.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Bus Services	Tracey Morton	Response-00968	Bus services have not long been reduced and development would increase road traffic volume significantly
	South West of Draycott		T Shields	Response-00570	An increase in residents in Draycott will help support the use of buses and the economic viability of such public transport.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	adrian leeming	Response-01249	It's common knowledge that this site floods regularly. As such it seems a wholly unsuitable site for residential development. The developers will attempt to mitigate this however nature has a habit of besting them, especially as our climate changes and flooding becomes more of a risk so no doubt these new homes will flood and established houses will also be adversely affected as the water is re-directed to them. If this happens we will be seeking redress from the Council as we have highlighted that the new development will be the cause. From the correspondence received from the EBC which was in answer to an FOI request. We can see that minimal liaison has been undertaken by the EBC planning team with Severn Trent when appraising the prospective Draycott site drainage and water management arrangements, and only four quite generic questions were asked by EBC in January 2025. It is clear from this evidence that EBC is not taking seriously the flood issues that Draycott residents experience annually with the houses on Lime Grove that back onto the land south west of Draycott experiencing significant flooding which impacts gardens and foul sewerage networks. More investigation needs to be undertaken by EBC as to why this site is not suitable for development. NPPF 162. States that the planning system should support the transition to net zero by 2050 and take full account of all climate impacts including overheating, water scarcity, storm and flood risks and coastal change. It should help to: shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimise vulnerability and improve resilience; encourage the reuse of existing resources, including the conversion of existing buildings; and support renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure. The development of 190 houses on land south west of Draycott totally contradicts this statement as this land was previously within flood risk 1 zone, and experiences significant flooding throughout the year. This development will further compound these issues. NPPF 173. States that a sequential risk-based approach should also be taken to individual applications in areas known to be at risk now or in future from any form of flooding, by following the steps set out below. Can the EBC advise why on the eve of the original consultation meeting held on 27th March 2025 by EBC, it was advised that the flood risk zone for the land south west of Draycott had been reclassified and the information within the public domain, e.g. EA Flood Risk Plan, was out of date. Was this a coincidence and can the EBC advise why the risk zone for this land has now changed when the land still floods. NPPF 174. States that within this context the aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding. The strategic flood risk assessment will provide the basis for applying this test. Yet the land south west of Draycott was recently within a Flood Risk Zone.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Alastair Dundas	Response-01200	There is already a risk of flooding in the area, and the erosion of soil and plants will increase the risk of flooding and I live very near to this, so concerns me greatly.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Alison Bowley	Response-01174	Draycott's proposed building site is adjacent to the River Derwent's flood plain, as is well known to anyone who lives here knows and has seen all the surface flooding that occurs regularly each year. Where will all the excess surface water which will undoubtedly accrue, go to? Even more flooding down Lime Grove, Wilne Rd, to begin with, I would suggest.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Alison Thirlwall	Response-01390	Increase flooding risk to the area. The houses that back onto the land South-West of Draycott have experienced significant flooding and this development will further compound this flooding. There is already a risk of flooding in the area and the erosion of soil and plants will increase the risk of floods to other areas in the local community. In line with the National Planning Policy Framework, a Flood Risk Assessment may be required for development which falls within a Flood Zone. Building on a flood plain that has trees, grass & plants that naturally help absorb water via roots systems when removed will have a huge impact. When considering the Environment Agency's flood risk survey for the area the development of the 190 houses will be built next to high to medium risk flood and risks compounding the flood risk in the area.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Andrew and Jane Gilmour	Response-01329	It would seem that EBC have had little if any communication with Severn Trent. the gardens in Lime Grove adjacent to the proposed development annually flood leading to water ingress to gardens and potentially the drainage system. The field where the proposed development is planned also floods annually leading to the farmer only using this field for grazing for 6 months of the year. We can see on national media the threat of global warming will increase flooding risk. The houses on Lime Grove that back onto the land South West of Draycott have experienced significant flooding, the River Derwent lies just a couple of hundred metres away and land to the north of it borders the proposed development site and currently ranks as flood zone risk level 2/3. Given there is already a risk of flooding in the area the removal of soil, trees and plants will increase the risk of floods to other areas in the local community. Although the proposed development falls outside of a Flood Risk Zone the topology of the site indicates that the runoff from both of the sites will add to the already present flood risk areas within the Environment Agency flood risk zone. When considering the Environment Agency's flood risk survey for the area the development of the 190 houses will be built on neighbouring high to medium risk flood and risks compounding the flood risk in the area. NPPF 162. States that the planning system should support the transition to net zero by 2050 and take full account of all climate impacts including overheating, water scarcity, storm and flood risks and coastal change. It should help to: shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimise vulnerability and improve resilience; encourage the reuse of existing resources, including the conversion of existing buildings; and support renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure. The development of 190 houses on land south west of Draycott totally contradicts this statement as this land was previously within flood risk 1 zone, and experiences significant flooding throughout the year. This development will further compound this issues. "NPPF 170. States that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future). Where development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Yet the land south west of Draycott experiences significant flooding throughout the year with many residents on Lime Grove not able to obtain flood risk damage cover as a consequence. NPPF 173. States that a sequential risk-based approach should also be taken to individual applications in areas known to be at risk now or in future from any form of flooding, by following the steps set out below. Can the EBC advise why on the eve of the original consultation meeting held on 27th March 2025 by EBC, it was advised that the flood risk zone for the land south west of Draycott had been reclassified and the information within the public domain, e.g. Environment Agency Flood Risk Plan, was out of date. Was this a coincidence and can the EBC advise why the risk zone for this land has now changed when the land still floods. NPPF 174. States that within this context the aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source. Development should
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Andrew and Jane Gilmour	Response-01329	not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding. The strategic flood risk assessment will provide the basis for applying this test. Yet the land south west of Draycott was recently within a Flood Risk Zone 3.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	A Northeast	Response-01848	Minimal liaison has been undertaken by EBC with Severn Trent regarding drainage and water management arrangements for the Draycott site. Draycott residents experience multiyear flooding events, and this development will further compound flooding issues. More investigation is needed to determine why this known flood location site is suitable for development. A Flood Risk Assessment should be requested for developments within a Flood Zone.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Anthony Bradley	Response-01442	Too many house would flooding worse in the village, these field fields are already flood yearly
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Anthony Walsh	Response-00992	Increase flooding risk to the area. The houses that back onto the land South West of Draycott have experienced significant flooding and this development will further compound this flooding. Building on a flood plain that has trees, grass & plants that naturally help absorb water via roots systems when removed will have a huge impact. NPPF 162. States that the planning system should support the transition to net zero by 2050 and take full account of all climate impacts including overheating, water scarcity, storm and flood risks and coastal change. It should help to: shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimise vulnerability and improve resilience; encourage the reuse of existing resources, including the conversion of existing buildings; and support renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure. The development of 190 houses on land south west of Draycott totally contradicts this statement as this land was previously within flood risk 1 zone, and experiences significant flooding throughout the year. This development will further compound this issues.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Avice Boyle	Response-01427	NPPF 162. States that the planning system should support the transition to net zero by 2050 and take full account of all climate impacts including overheating, water scarcity, storm and flood risks and coastal change. It should help to: shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimise vulnerability and improve resilience; encourage the reuse of existing resources, including the conversion of existing buildings; and support renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure. The development of 190 houses on land south west of Draycott totally contradicts this statement as this land was previously within flood risk 1 zone, and experiences significant flooding throughout the year. This development will further compound this issues. NPPF states that infrastructure must come first, yet the outline ideas to provide infrastructure are either not in place or are no timeline in advance of the proposed developments. There are currently no plans to develop new healthcare or improved infrastructure with these significant scale extensions of population. The area south of the proposed land suffers from flooding and this will only be compounded by the development of 190 new homes. "NPPF 170. States that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future). Where 50 development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Yet the land south west of Draycott experiences significant flooding throughout the year with many residents on Lime Grove not able to obtain flood risk damage cover as a consequence. "NPPF 174. States that within this context the aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding. The strategic flood risk assessment will provide the basis for applying this test. Yet the land south west of Draycott was recently within a Flood Risk Zone.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Barbara Crane	Response-00268	This area is already liable to flooding. Gardens on Lime Grove have been underwater in past years. Additional building on these fields will create further problems. The railway line is frequently flooded just beyond the bridge. Surely the Environment Agency cannot support this development. I would like to view their report.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Ben Kassoul	Response-01024	Draycott sits on a flood plane and regularly floods at the proposed site. The local flood map for planning from gov.uk is conveniently linear along the border to the proposed housing estate which raises questions. The installation of 190 homes will adversely affect the percentage of impermeable area (PIMP) and the catchment areas for the existing surface water drainage and combined sewer running through the village which is only 225mm in diameter. By constructing these homes, the ability for ground infiltration of flooding events will be drastically reduced and cause a dramatic increase to surface water flooding within the village. The combined sewer overflow (CSO) which serves both the Draycott and Breaston Severn Trent sewer system (Draycott sewage pumping station - emergence overflow - [UID 916]) will undoubtedly spill to the River Derwent more frequently as a result of the construction of the new housing estate. This CSO has spilled as recently as 20:26 on Thursday 8th May despite the prolonged dry weather experienced in Derbyshire this month.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Ben Marshall	Response-01212	From the correspondence received from the EBC which was in answer to an FOI request. We can see that minimal liaison has been undertaken by the EBC planning team with Severn Trent when appraising the prospective Draycott site drainage and water management arrangements, and only four quite generic questions were asked by EBC in January 2025. It is clear from this evidence that EBC is not taking seriously the flood issues that Draycott residents experience annually with the houses on Lime Grove that back onto the land south west of Draycott experiencing significant flooding which impacts gardens and foul sewerage networks. More investigation needs to be undertaken by EBC as to why this site is not suitable for development. The houses that back onto the land South West of Draycott have experienced significant flooding and this development will further compound this flooding. There is already a risk of flooding in the area and the erosion of soil and plants will increase the risk of floods to other areas in the local community. Building on a flood plain that has trees, grass & plants that naturally help absorb water via roots systems when removed will have a huge impact.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Bernadette Rothwell	Response-00998	Draycott has experienced significant, damaging, flooding to both residential and commercial properties. These houses are very close to the flood plain. This is not going to ease the problem - quite the opposite. There are no details to indicate how this will be managed, for both the new houses as well as those already prone to flooding.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Bev Marvell	Response-01892	The newly revised Environment Agency flood plan map for planning, 2025, flood assessment looks less severe than its 2012 map (The Draycott and Church Wilne History Group keeps copies of such maps). 1 cannot see why it should have changed. Draycott is very close to the river Derwent and is low lying on gravel. It is renowned for flooding, flood waters regularly rising quickly (up to 3 times a year) to close proximity of residential homes on the south side of Draycott. We have very old flood banks in place to try to alleviate flooding. Bank Field House, at the centre of this development proposal, sits on the top of bank fields (fields along here have the old name 'Bank Fields' - for a reason). Immediately to the south of the house fields flood, they are particularly prone because the course of the river used to be even closer than it is today, this is evidenced on maps by the line of the parish boundary following the old river line. The house and other fields are on the bank, they do not flood as deeply, but do become sodden, an attempt to drain them uses water courses running around the west side of the wooded area. 'Safeguarded land' is also shown on the proposal. I believe this is land earmarked by the Council which may be required to serve development needs in the longer term? I also believe it is required that it 'should be genuinely capable of development when needed' - but as it is within the flood plain it would never be suitable for development. This safeguarded land is not viable.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Bradley Peace	Response-01348	From the correspondence received from the EBC which was in answer to an FOI request. We can see that minimal liaison has been undertaken by the EBC planning team with Severn Trent when appraising the prospective Draycott site drainage and water management arrangements, and only four quite generic questions were asked by EBC in January 2025. It is clear from this evidence that EBC is not taking seriously the flood issues that Draycott residents experience annually with the houses on Lime Grove that back onto the land south west of Draycott experiencing significant flooding which impacts gardens and foul sewerage networks. More investigation needs to be undertaken by EBC as to why this site is not suitable for development. 5 2 Increase flooding risk to the area. The houses that back onto the land South West of Draycott have experienced significant flooding and this development will further compound this flooding. 6 3 There is already a risk of flooding in the area and the erosion of soil and plants will increase the risk of floods to other areas in the local community. 7 4 In line with the National Planning Policy Framework, a Flood Risk Assessment may be required for development which falls within a Flood Zone. 8 5 NPPF states that infrastructure must come first, yet the outline ideas to provide infrastructure are either not in place or are no timeline in advance of the proposed developments. There are currently no plans to develop new healthcare or improved infrastructure with these significant scale extensions of population. The area south of the proposed land suffers from flooding and this will only be compounded by the development of 190 new homes. 9 6 Although the relevant now falls outside of a Flood Risk Zone the topology of the site indicates that the runoff from both of the sites will add to the already present flood risk areas within the Environment Agency flood risk zone. 10 7 Building on a flood plain that has trees, grass & plants that naturally help absorb water via roots systems when removed will have a huge impact. 11 8 When considering the Environment Agency's flood risk survey for the area the development of the 190 houses will be built on neighbouring high to medium risk flood and risks compounding the flood risk in the area. 12 9 NPPF 162. States that the planning system should support the transition to net zero by 2050 and take full account of all climate impacts including overheating, water scarcity, storm and flood risks and coastal change. It should help to: shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimise vulnerability and improve resilience; encourage the reuse of existing resources, including the conversion of existing buildings; and support renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure. The development of 190 houses on land south west of Draycott totally contradicts this statement as this land was previously within flood risk 1 zone, and experiences significant flooding throughout the year. This development will further compound this issues. 13 10 NPPF 170. States that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future). Where development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Yet the land south west of Draycott experiences significant flooding throughout
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Bradley Peace	Response-01348	the year with many residents on Lime Grove not able to obtain flood risk damage cover as a consequence. 14 11 NPPF 173. States that a sequential risk-based approach should also be taken to individual applications in areas known to be at risk now or in future from any form of flooding, by following the steps set out below. Can the EBC advise why on the eve of the original consultation meeting held on 27th March 2025 by EBC, it was advised that the flood risk zone for the land south west of Draycott had been reclassified and the information within the public domain, e.g. EA Flood Risk Plan, was out of date. Was this a coincidence and can the EBC advise why the risk zone for this land has now changed when the land still floods. 15 12 NPPF 174. States that within this context the aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding. The strategic flood risk assessment will provide the basis for applying this test. Yet the land south west of Draycott was recently within a Flood Risk Zone.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Caroline and John Thirwell	Response-01001	The land around Draycott is very susceptible to flooding. In times of high rainfall we can watch the water filtering across the fields adjacent to us and, although it has never breached the road, it is of great concern that the impact of extra housing in this particular area will cause more influx of water (after all water has to go somewhere) when diverted from the surrounding fields. A more detailed assessment is needed before we are subjected to the annual stress of flooding impact, as happens in many other parts of the country, We are very very concerned about this.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Charlotte Brennan	Response-00931	Increase flooding risk to the area. The houses that back onto the land South West of Draycott have experienced significant flooding and this development will further compound this flooding.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Colin & Cynthia Green	Response-00922	Standing water/flooding over years at certain times of course, drainage & sewerage affected by this scheme of new builds. I believe Severn Trent will or should confirm this.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Dale Longmuir	Response-01543	This land is apart of our flood fields, the newly built houses will suffer devastating floods as well as the concrete and housing will make it so that the ground cant prevent the water from getting to other houses which shouldn't flood, roads will be closed, this will have a massive affect on so many homes and roads influengin traffic and quality of life.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	David and Mary Murden	Response-01898	Another cause of confusion is our understanding that the flood risk boundaries have been amended in recent months. No reason has been given to us for this change of boundary. There certainly has been no flood prevention measures in the area, the River Derwent has not changed its course, the weather has been wetter than ever (apart from this past winter) so I would be grateful if someone could explain the reasoning behind this decision. In the past we have had notification that our house, in Lime Grove, backing onto the 'Safeguarded' area of the development, was in the flood zone. We were given information about where to obtain sand bags if needed, and several times have received automated telephone calls giving us advance warning of flooding in this area. The last such call we received was during the night in October 2023. As far as we can see the circumstances in this area have not changed since then. We see first hand how wet this field behind our house gets. Indeed, when we first lived here (we came in 1973) the most regular crop was winter wheat, sown in the autumn and grown on for a summer harvest. This has not been possible for a good few years now as the field is inaccessible for the farmer during the autumn and winter. Nowadays the stubble of last seasons crop is left in the ground until it dries out in April, or sometimes even May, and then a crop such as Spring Barley is sown. This does not seem a very suitable basis for building homes. In fact, Tim Barker (farmer now deceased) once said to us that he would like to have houses on the land but he knew that it would not be possible 'at our end' because of the water on the land.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	David and Nicala O'Leary	Response-00822	The site in question also plays a critical role in flood resilience. It lies close to the River Derwent and is prone to frequent flooding, as witnessed during the storms of late 2023 and early 2024. Local residents have documented flooding on the proposed site, which acts as a natural soakaway. Paving over this land would only increase surface water runoff and elevate the flood risk to existing homes. As residents with long-standing knowledge of the river, the O'Leary family have resided at 20 Cleveland Avenue since 1958 and can confirm that flooding encroaches far closer to homes than recent flood maps suggest. These lived experiences should not be dismissed in favour of overly optimistic modelling.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	David Atchison	Response-01247	From the correspondence received from the EBC which was in answer to an FOI request. We can see that minimal liaison has been undertaken by the EBC planning team with Severn Trent when appraising the prospective Draycott site drainage and water management arrangements, and only four quite generic questions were asked by EBC in January 2025. It is clear from this evidence that EBC is not taking seriously the flood issues that Draycott residents experience annually with the houses on Lime Grove that back onto the land south west of Draycott experiencing significant flooding which impacts gardens and foul sewerage networks. More investigation needs to be undertaken by EBC as to why this site is not suitable for development. Building on a flood plain that has trees, grass & plants that naturally help absorb water via roots systems when removed will have a huge impact. NPPF 174. States that within this context the aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding. The strategic flood risk assessment will provide the basis for applying this test. Yet the land south west of Draycott was recently within a Flood Risk Zone.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	David Boyle	Response-01426	NPPF 174. States that within this context the aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding. The strategic flood risk assessment will provide the basis for applying this test. Yet the land south west of Draycott was recently within a Flood Risk Zone. Although the relevant now falls outside of a Flood Risk Zone the topology of the site indicates that the runoff from both of the sites will add to the already present flood risk areas within the Environment Agency flood risk zone. NPPF states that infrastructure must come first, yet the outline ideas to provide infrastructure are either not in place or are no timeline in advance of the proposed developments. There are currently no plans to develop new healthcare or improved infrastructure with these significant scale extensions of population. The area south of the proposed land suffers from flooding and this will only be compounded by the development of 190 new homes.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	David G York	Response-01843	Minimal liaison has been undertaken by EBC with Severn Trent regarding drainage and water management arrangements for the Draycott site. Draycott residents experience multiyear flooding events, and this development will further compound flooding issues. More investigation is needed to determine why this known flood location site is suitable for development. A Flood Risk Assessment should be requested for developments within a Flood Zone.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	David Thompson	Response-00654	Flooding has been an issue to the south of Draycott for years. Adding the development of housing will add impermeable hard surfacing that will create additional surface water run-off and increased flows into surface water drainage, all with the potential to add to the flooding.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	David Thurgood	Response-01195	Although the relevant now falls outside of a Flood Risk Zone the topology of the site indicates that the runoff from both of the sites will add to the already present flood risk areas within the Environment Agency flood risk zone.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	David Webster	Response-01113	From the correspondence received from the EBC which was in answer to an FOI request. We can see that minimal liaison has been undertaken by the EBC planning team with Severn Trent when appraising the prospective Draycott site drainage and water management arrangements, and only four quite generic questions were asked by EBC in January 2025. It is clear from this evidence that EBC is not taking seriously the flood issues that Draycott residents experience annually with the houses on Lime Grove that back onto the land south west of Draycott experiencing significant flooding which impacts gardens and foul sewerage networks. More investigation needs to be undertaken by EBC as to why this site is not suitable for development. Increase flooding risk to the area. The houses that back onto the land South West of Draycott have experienced significant flooding and this development will further compound this flooding. There is already a risk of flooding in the area and the erosion of soil and plants will increase the risk of floods to other areas in the local community. In line with the National Planning Policy Framework, a Flood Risk Assessment may be required for development which falls within a Flood Zone. NPPF states that infrastructure must come first, yet the outline ideas to provide infrastructure are either not in place or are no timeline in advance of the proposed developments. There are currently no plans to develop new healthcare or improved infrastructure with these significant scale extensions of population. The area south of the proposed land suffers from flooding and this will only be compounded by the development of 190 new homes. Although the relevant now falls outside of a Flood Risk Zone the topology of the site indicates that the runoff from both of the sites will add to the already present flood risk areas within the Environment Agency flood risk zone. Building on a flood plain that has trees, grass & plants that naturally help absorb water via roots systems when removed will have a huge impact. When considering the Environment Agency's flood risk survey for the area the development of the 190 houses will be built on neighbouring high to medium risk flood and risks compounding the flood risk in the area. NPPF 162. States that the planning system should support the transition to net zero by 2050 and take full account of all climate impacts including overheating, water scarcity, storm and flood risks and coastal change. It should help to: shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimise vulnerability and improve resilience; encourage the reuse of existing resources, including the conversion of existing buildings; and support renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure. The development of 190 houses on land south west of Draycott totally contradicts this statement as this land was previously within flood risk 1 zone, and experiences significant flooding throughout the year. This development will further compound this issues. "NPPF 170. States that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future). Where 50 development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Yet the land south west of Draycott experiences significant flooding throughout the year with many residents on Lime Gr
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	David Webster	Response-01113	ove not able to obtain flood risk damage cover as a consequence. " NPPF 173. States that a sequential risk-based approach should also be taken to individual applications in areas known to be at risk now or in future from any form of flooding, by following the steps set out below. Can the EBC advise why on the eve of the original consultation meeting held on 27th March 2025 by EBC, it was advised that the flood risk zone for the land south west of Draycott had been reclassified and the information within the public domain, e.g. EA Flood Risk Plan, was out of date. Was this a coincidence and can the EBC advise why the risk zone for this land has now changed when the land still floods. NPPF 174. States that within this context the aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding. The strategic flood risk assessment will provide the basis for applying this test. Yet the land south west of Draycott was recently within a Flood Risk Zone.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Dexter Codrington	Response-00986	The services for this development all come from the Main Derby Road. This is regularly being pumped out by the environment agency as the Victorian sewage system can not cope today. How ill it cope with the additional 600 toilets and 6-700 showers and sinks etc. Flooding The proposed site is within a flood Zone, I understand this has now been downgraded but unsure on what basis noting the floods we experienced in 2023/4. If we fill this location with concrete the water will have to go somewhere which will exacerbate the current flooding in residents gardens. Minimal liaison has been undertaken by EBC with Severn Trent regarding drainage and water management arrangements for the Draycott site. Draycott residents experience multiyear flooding events, and this development will further compound flooding issues. More investigation is needed to determine why this known flood location site is suitable for development. A Flood Risk Assessment should be requested for developments within a Flood Zone

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Diane Webster	Response-01177	Increase flooding risk to the area. The houses that back onto the land South West of Draycott have experienced significant flooding and this development will further compound this flooding. There is already a risk of flooding in the area and the erosion of soil and plants will increase the risk of floods to other areas in the local community. In line with the National Planning Policy Framework, a Flood Risk Assessment may be required for development which falls within a Flood Zone. NPPF states that infrastructure must come first, yet the outline ideas to provide infrastructure are either not in place or are no timeline in advance of the proposed developments. There are currently no plans to develop new healthcare or improved infrastructure with these significant scale extensions of population. The area south of the proposed land suffers from flooding and this will only be compounded by the development of 190 new homes. Although the relevant now falls outside of a Flood Risk Zone the topology of the site indicates that the runoff from both of the sites will add to the already present flood risk areas within the Environment Agency flood risk zone. Building on a flood plain that has trees, grass & plants that naturally help absorb water via roots systems when removed will have a huge impact. When considering the Environment Agency's flood risk survey for the area the development of the 190 houses will be built on neighbouring high to medium risk flood and risks compounding the flood risk in the area. NPPF 162. States that the planning system should support the transition to net zero by 2050 and take full account of all climate impacts including overheating, water scarcity, storm and flood risks and coastal change. It should help to: shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimise vulnerability and improve resilience; encourage the reuse of existing resources, including the conversion of existing buildings; and support renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure. The development of 190 houses on land south west of Draycott totally contradicts this statement as this land was previously within flood risk 1 zone, and experiences significant flooding throughout the year. This development will further compound this issues. "NPPF 170. States that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future). Where 50 development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Yet the land south west of Draycott experiences significant flooding throughout the year with many residents on Lime Grove not able to obtain flood risk damage cover as a consequence. " NPPF 173. States that a sequential risk-based approach should also be taken to individual applications in areas known to be at risk now or in future from any form of flooding, by following the steps set out below. Can the EBC advise why on the eve of the original consultation meeting held on 27th March 2025 by EBC, it was advised that the flood risk zone for the land south west of Draycott had been reclassified and the information within the public domain, e.g. EA Flood Risk Plan, was out of date. Was this a coincidence and can the EBC advise why the risk zone for this land has now changed when the land still floods. NPPF 174. States that within this context
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Diane Webster	Response-01177	the aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding. The strategic flood risk assessment will provide the basis for applying this test. Yet the land south west of Draycott was recently within a Flood Risk Zone.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Donna Butcher	Response-01155	From the correspondence received from the EBC which was in answer to an FOI request. We can see that minimal liaison has been undertaken by the EBC planning team with Severn Trent when appraising the prospective Draycott site drainage and water management arrangements, and only four quite generic was questions was asked by EBC in January 2025. It is clear from this evidence that EBC is not taking seriously the flood issues that Draycott residents experience annually with the houses on Lime Grove that back onto the land south west of Draycott experiencing significant flooding which impacts gardens and foul sewerage networks. More investigation needs to be undertaken by EBC as to why this site is not suitable for development. Increase flooding risk to the area. The houses that back onto the land South West of Draycott have experienced significant flooding and this development will further compound this flooding. In line with the National Planning Policy Framework, a Flood Risk Assessment may be required for development which falls within a Flood Zone. NPPF 173. States that a sequential risk-based approach should also be taken to individual applications in areas known to be at risk now or in future from any form of flooding, by following the steps set out below. Can the EBC advise why on the eve of the original consultation meeting held on 27th March 2025 by EBC, it was advised that the flood risk zone for the land south west of Draycott had been reclassified and the information within the public domain, e.g. EA Flood Risk Plan, was out of date. Was this a coincidence and can the EBC advise why the risk zone for this land has now changed when the land still floods. NPPF 174. States that within this context the aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding. The strategic flood risk assessment will provide the basis for applying this test. Yet the land south west of Draycott was recently within a Flood Risk Zone.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Donna Peace	Response-01344	<p>1 From the correspondence received from the EBC which was in answer to an FOI request. We can see that minimal liaison has been undertaken by the EBC planning team with Severn Trent when appraising the prospective Draycott site drainage and water management arrangements, and only four quite generic questions were asked by EBC in January 2025. It is clear from this evidence that EBC is not taking seriously the flood issues that Draycott residents experience annually with the houses on Lime Grove that back onto the land south west of Draycott experiencing significant flooding which impacts gardens and foul sewerage networks. More investigation needs to be undertaken by EBC as to why this site is not suitable for development. 5 2 Increase flooding risk to the area. The houses that back onto the land South West of Draycott have experienced significant flooding and this development will further compound this flooding. 6 3 There is already a risk of flooding in the area and the erosion of soil and plants will increase the risk of floods to other areas in the local community. 7 4 In line with the National Planning Policy Framework, a Flood Risk Assessment may be required for development which falls within a Flood Zone. 8 5 NPPF states that infrastructure must come first, yet the outline ideas to provide infrastructure are either not in place or are no timeline in advance of the proposed developments. There are currently no plans to develop new healthcare or improved infrastructure with these significant scale extensions of population. The area south of the proposed land suffers from flooding and this will only be compounded by the development of 190 new homes. 9 6 Although the relevant now falls outside of a Flood Risk Zone the topology of the site indicates that the runoff from both of the sites will add to the already present flood risk areas within the Environment Agency flood risk zone. 10 7 Building on a flood plain that has trees, grass &amp; plants that naturally help absorb water via roots systems when removed will have a huge impact. 11 8 When considering the Environment Agency's flood risk survey for the area the development of the 190 houses will be built on neighbouring high to medium risk flood and risks compounding the flood risk in the area. 12 9 NPPF 162. States that the planning system should support the transition to net zero by 2050 and take full account of all climate impacts including overheating, water scarcity, storm and flood risks and coastal change. It should help to: shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimise vulnerability and improve resilience; encourage the reuse of existing resources, including the conversion of existing buildings; and support renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure. The development of 190 houses on land south west of Draycott totally contradicts this statement as this land was previously within flood risk 1 zone, and experiences significant flooding throughout the year. This development will further compound this issues. 13 10 NPPF 170. States that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future). Where 50 development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Yet the land south west of Draycott experiences significant flooding througho</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Donna Peace	Response-01344	<p>ut the year with many residents on Lime Grove not able to obtain flood risk damage cover as a consequence. 14 11 NPPF 173. States that a sequential risk-based approach should also be taken to individual applications in areas known to be at risk now or in future from any form of flooding, by following the steps set out below. Can the EBC advise why on the eve of the original consultation meeting held on 27th March 2025 by EBC, it was advised that the flood risk zone for the land south west of Draycott had been reclassified and the information within the public domain, e.g. EA Flood Risk Plan, was out of date. Was this a coincidence and can the EBC advise why the risk zone for this land has now changed when the land still floods. 15 12 NPPF 174. States that within this context the aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding. The strategic flood risk assessment will provide the basis for applying this test. Yet the land south west of Draycott was recently within a Flood Risk Zone.</p>

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Douglas Walker	Response-00994	From the correspondence received from the EBC which was in answer to an FOI request. We can see that minimal liaison has been undertaken by the EBC planning team with Severn Trent when appraising the prospective Draycott site drainage and water management arrangements, and only four quite generic questions were asked by EBC in January 2025. It is clear from this evidence that EBC is not taking seriously the flood issues that Draycott residents experience annually with the houses on Lime Grove that back onto the land south west of Draycott experiencing significant flooding which impacts gardens and foul sewerage networks. More investigation needs to be undertaken by EBC as to why this site is not suitable for development. There is already a risk of flooding in the area and the erosion of soil and plants will increase the risk of floods to other areas in the local community. In line with the National Planning Policy Framework, a Flood Risk Assessment may be required for development which falls within a Flood Zone. The NPPF states that infrastructure must come first, yet the outline ideas to provide infrastructure are either not in place or are no timeline in advance of the proposed developments. There are currently no plans to develop new healthcare or improved infrastructure with these significant scale extensions of population. The area south of the proposed land suffers from flooding and this will only be compounded by the development of 190 new homes. NPPF 162. States that the planning system should support the transition to net zero by 2050 and take full account of all climate impacts including overheating, water scarcity, storm and flood risks and coastal change. It should help to: shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimise vulnerability and improve resilience; encourage the reuse of existing resources, including the conversion of existing buildings; and support renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure. The development of 190 houses on land south west of Draycott totally contradicts this statement as this land was previously within flood risk 1 zone, and experiences significant flooding throughout the year. This development will further compound this issues. NPPF 170. States that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future). Where 50 development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Yet the land south west of Draycott experiences significant flooding throughout the year with many residents on Lime Grove not able to obtain flood risk damage cover as a consequence. NPPF 173. States that a sequential risk-based approach should also be taken to individual applications in areas known to be at risk now or in future from any form of flooding, by following the steps set out below. Can the EBC advise why on the eve of the original consultation meeting held on 27th March 2025 by EBC, it was advised that the flood risk zone for the land south west of Draycott had been reclassified and the information within the public domain, e.g. EA Flood Risk Plan, was out of date. Was this a coincidence and can the EBC advise why the risk zone for this land has now changed when the land still floods. NPPF 174. States that within this context the aim of the sequential test is to steer ne
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Douglas Walker	Response-00994	w development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding. The strategic flood risk assessment will provide the basis for applying this test. Yet the land south west of Draycott was recently within a Flood Risk Zone.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Dr CJ Marvell	Response-01901	Flooding in general. Draycott is highly prone to flooding. The previous Environment Agency flood map designated parts of the proposed development site as flood zone 2 or 3.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Dr CJ Marvell	Response-01901	This has rather conveniently been re-designated in the latest EA flood map (2025) as being free of flooding. Any resident of Draycott will tell you that the area behind Lime Grove does suffer flooding, but mainly by surface water. Once again it appears politically expedient to re-designate this land. The effect of Surface Water. The gardens and occasionally some of the houses on Lime Grove adjacent to the proposed development suffer regular flooding. The Derwent burst its banks seven times in 2024 with the water covering varying amounts of land to the south of Lime Grove, Cleveland Avenue, Derwent Street and South Street. This was not the direct cause of flooding to housing in Draycott as the river floods here are well understood. Much less well understood is the effect of heavy local rainfall on the water table as the river rises and the excess water can no longer be carried away by the river. The water table may rise several metres under these conditions and combined with surface water runoff, this does regularly cause flooding in some gardens and properties in Draycott. The building of the proposed development will exacerbate this problem by increasing surface runoff due to the increase in hard paved areas; the effect on the immediate water table is difficult to determine. Special measures taken to protect the new houses may well save them from flooding but the effect on existing houses, mainly on Lime Grove will be increased.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Dr Shelagh Brown	Response-01158	The area is a flood plain. I have lived in Draycott for 35 years and flooding has become more frequent and severe during this time. Any building on flood plain at the edge of the village must inevitably put the centre of the village at increased flood risk.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Dudley Medhurst	Response-01180	The drains cannot cope now so what will another 200 plus houses do to our system along with approx another 400 people adding to the drainage/sewage systems that are struggling now! Many houses are unable to get home insurance.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Francis Ian Scott	Response-01535	From the correspondence received from the EBC which was in answer to an FOI request. We can see that minimal liaison has been undertaken by the EBC planning team with Severn Trent when appraising the prospective Draycott site drainage and water management arrangements, and only four quite generic questions were asked by EBC in January 2025. It is clear from this evidence that EBC is not taking seriously the flood issues that Draycott residents experience annually with the houses on Lime Grove that back onto the land south west of Draycott experiencing significant flooding which impacts gardens and foul sewerage networks. More investigation needs to be undertaken by EBC as to why this site is not suitable for development. Increase flooding risk to the area. The houses that back onto the land South West of Draycott have experienced significant flooding and this development will further compound this flooding. There is already a risk of flooding in the area and the erosion of soil and plants will increase the risk of floods to other areas in the local community. In line with the National Planning Policy Framework, a Flood Risk Assessment may be required for development which falls within a Flood Zone. NPPF states that infrastructure must come first, yet the outline ideas to provide infrastructure are either not in place or are no timeline in advance of the proposed developments. There are currently no plans to develop new healthcare or improved infrastructure with these significant scale extensions of population. The area south of the proposed land suffers from flooding and this will only be compounded by the development of 190 new homes. Although the relevant now falls outside of a Flood Risk Zone the topology of the site indicates that the runoff from both of the sites will add to the already present flood risk areas within the Environment Agency flood risk zone. Building on a flood plain that has trees, grass & plants that naturally help absorb water via roots systems when removed will have a huge impact. When considering the Environment Agency's flood risk survey for the area the development of the 190 houses will be built on neighbouring high to medium risk flood and risks compounding the flood risk in the area. NPPF 162. States that the planning system should support the transition to net zero by 2050 and take full account of all climate impacts including overheating, water scarcity, storm and flood risks and coastal change. It should help to: shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimise vulnerability and improve resilience; encourage the reuse of existing resources, including the conversion of existing buildings; and support renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure. The development of 190 houses on land south west of Draycott totally contradicts this statement as this land was previously within flood risk 1 zone, and experiences significant flooding throughout the year. This development will further compound this issues. "NPPF 170. States that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future). Where 50 development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Yet the land south west of Draycott experiences significant flooding throughout the year with many residents on Lime Gr
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Francis Ian Scott	Response-01535	ove not able to obtain flood risk damage cover as a consequence. " NPPF 173. States that a sequential risk-based approach should also be taken to individual applications in areas known to be at risk now or in future from any form of flooding, by following the steps set out below. Can the EBC advise why on the eve of the original consultation meeting held on 27th March 2025 by EBC, it was advised that the flood risk zone for the land south west of Draycott had been reclassified and the information within the public domain, e.g. EA Flood Risk Plan, was out of date. Was this a coincidence and can the EBC advise why the risk zone for this land has now changed when the land still floods. NPPF 174. States that within this context the aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding. The strategic flood risk assessment will provide the basis for applying this test. Yet the land south west of Draycott was recently within a Flood Risk Zone.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Gail Holdsworth	Response-00937	Five minutes walk from my house I can be by the river. Any surveys done in houses in this area say ?flood risk? . Residents near the proposed site often have flooded gardens. If there are any thoughts of trying to divert this risk from the proposed building site it will possibly just divert to the middle of Draycott in the future.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Garry Hickton	Response-01473	This area floods and water even backs up into gardens and toilets on Lime Grove
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Gary Siddall	Response-01237	This is probably the main issue which YOU really should be the most concerned about from a legal standpoint - flooding ! Is this site really "fit for purpose", I ask?? Be under no illusions - the fields for the proposed housing in Draycott, they FLOOD - and flood regularly. I don't care what any of your so-called reports might say - if you live here, you know - the residents of Lime Grove are aware of this all too well ! Virtually every year there are photos documented on social media of the flooding in this area and other places all around Draycott, it's no secret ! Also the fact that Flood Risk Zone for these areas has suddenly and miraculously been downgraded as this building proposal is being pushed through, is highly suspicious. .... But it doesn't matter what risk number you call it, IT WILL FLOOD. Just a few days ago, it was reported that the Association of British Insurers (ABI) are warning that, as part of the Government's project to build 1.5 million new houses, houses built on/near flood plains may be deemed uninsurable ! Conveniently downgrading the Flood Risk "on paper" does not stop flooding. There seems to have been the bare minimum of liaison with Severn Trent on such matters, but even if strenuous efforts ARE undertaken to stop a new housing development in this area from flooding, where will all this water go ?? The mere fact that the removal of all the trees and grasses/plants, etc. will mean massively less root systems to help absorb water.... This could easily make *other* areas of the village newly susceptible to flooding, as the "excess" water is forced elsewhere. I do not believe that anywhere near enough investigative work has been done on this aspect, which quite rightly worries existing village residents in case their family homes potentially become newly at risk of flooding. Building here is almost reckless !

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Gemma Woolnough	Response-01394	The proposed land for this development is directly on a flood plain which often floods during time of heavy rainfall. For many months the land is water logged which if built on would likely lead to an increased levels of surface water run off. This would increase the flood risk of the whole village including the residents of the proposed new homes. As the effects of global warming increase, we will likely experience wetter weather conditions which if this vital flood plain is built upon will increase the flood risk to the rest of the village. Many homes in the village already experience the effects of flood water and the risk to homes being flooded in the future will be significantly more if the land is built upon.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	George Foster	Response-01199	From the correspondence received from the EBC which was in answer to an FOI request. We can see that minimal liaison has been undertaken by the EBC planning team with Severn Trent when appraising the prospective Draycott site drainage and water management arrangements, and only four quite generic questions were asked by EBC in January 2025. It is clear from this evidence that EBC is not taking seriously the flood issues that Draycott residents experience annually with the houses on Lime Grove that back onto the land south west of Draycott experiencing significant flooding which impacts gardens and foul sewerage networks. More investigation needs to be undertaken by EBC as to why this site is not suitable for development. Increase flooding risk to the area. The houses that back onto the land South West of Draycott have experienced significant flooding and this development will further compound this flooding. There is already a risk of flooding in the area and the erosion of soil and plants will increase the risk of floods to other areas in the local community. In line with the National Planning Policy Framework, a Flood Risk Assessment may be required for development which falls within a Flood Zone. NPPF states that infrastructure must come first, yet the outline ideas to provide infrastructure are either not in place or are no timeline in advance of the proposed developments. There are currently no plans to develop new healthcare or improved infrastructure with these significant scale extensions of population. The area south of the proposed land suffers from flooding and this will only be compounded by the development of 190 new homes. Although the relevant now falls outside of a Flood Risk Zone the topology of the site indicates that the runoff from both of the sites will add to the already present flood risk areas within the Environment Agency flood risk zone. Building on a flood plain that has trees, grass & plants that naturally help absorb water via roots systems when removed will have a huge impact. When considering the Environment Agency's flood risk survey for the area the development of the 190 houses will be built on neighbouring high to medium risk flood and risks compounding the flood risk in the area. NPPF 162. States that the planning system should support the transition to net zero by 2050 and take full account of all climate impacts including overheating, water scarcity, storm and flood risks and coastal change. It should help to: shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimise vulnerability and improve resilience; encourage the reuse of existing resources, including the conversion of existing buildings; and support renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure. The development of 190 houses on land south west of Draycott totally contradicts this statement as this land was previously within flood risk 1 zone, and experiences significant flooding throughout the year. This development will further compound this issue. NPPF 170. States that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future). Where 50 development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Yet the land south west of Draycott experiences significant flooding throughout the year with many residents on Lime Gro
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	George Foster	Response-01199	we not able to obtain flood risk damage cover as a consequence. NPPF 173. States that a sequential risk-based approach should also be taken to individual applications in areas known to be at risk now or in future from any form of flooding, by following the steps set out below. Can the EBC advise why on the eve of the original consultation meeting held on 27th March 2025 by EBC, it was advised that the flood risk zone for the land south west of Draycott had been reclassified and the information within the public domain, e.g. EA Flood Risk Plan, was out of date. Was this a coincidence and can the EBC advise why the risk zone for this land has now changed when the land still floods. NPPF 174. States that within this context the aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding. The strategic flood risk assessment will provide the basis for applying this test. Yet the land south west of Draycott was recently within a Flood Risk Zone.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Gerri Hickton	Response-01472	The area is already a significant flood risk and the railway lines flood regularly. With the loss of land for water to soak into, this water will have no place to go, exacerbating the problem and causing significantly higher levels of flooding
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Gill Trickitt	Response-01157	Draycott floods. Period. We have a river. Houses are flooded. Fields are flooded. Gardens are often underwater. If you build on greenbelt or any surrounding fields - which this development would be, the water will be displaced and just move somewhere else, threatening to flood more of the village.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Gordon Dahill	Response-00690	THE fields in question and the surrounding area flood regularly every year causing damage access and inconvenience. WE and other residents in LIME GROVE get regular texts in the early morning from the environment agency warning of flooding. Is it a COINCIDENCE that the flood plane area was CONVENIENTLY CHANGED just a FEW DAYS before the plans were announced As far as we can tell weather river and climate factors have not suddenly changed. What could make things worse, is the possibility by Derby City to start flood control in the city. The result of this would be a greater flow of water down river to Draycott. Extra houses and concrete bases for huge pylons are all going to raise the chance of increased flooding also the water table is only a few inches below the surface. the removal of trees and hedges which help to absorb water, will not help the possibility of flooding.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Graham Wakeling	Response-01238	the proposed builds are on flood plain areas, this development will increase flood risk to Draycott and other surrounding villages.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Hannah McMaster	Response-01381	Flooding has increased in severity year on year in Draycott, building on farmland and increasing the surface run off will exacerbate the situation, pushing the flooding further in to homes within the village. The land earmarked for building has flooded and will continue to flood.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Hannah Pritchard	Response-01399	The proposed development site is known locally to suffer from significant surface flooding during periods of rainfall. Building on this land will increase impermeable surfaces, worsen drainage, and heighten the risk of flooding not only on the site itself but in surrounding areas. This poses a serious risk to property, safety, and insurance premiums for both new and existing residents. The use of attenuation tanks would not be appropriate as these are designed for 1 in 100-year flood events not for areas of consistent flooding.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	James Hargreaves	Response-01315	1. Flood-Prone Area: The land near Lime Grove is known for flooding. New development will worsen the situation, affecting homes and sewer systems. 2. Lack of Coordination: There has been minimal engagement with Severn Trent on drainage. Only four generic questions were asked by EBC in January 2025, showing a lack of serious planning. 3. Flood Risk Reclassification: Although the area is no longer officially in a flood zone, its topography suggests runoff will still increase flood risk. The timing of the reclassification?just before consultation?raises concerns. 4. Sequential Test Ignored: NPPF 174 requires developments to be located in areas with the lowest flood risk. This site was recently in a flood zone, and its selection contradicts national guidance. 5. Climate Resilience: NPPF 162 calls for planning to support net zero and address climate risks. Building on flood-prone land undermines this goal and increases vulnerability to extreme weather.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	James Whyman	Response-01551	1 From the correspondence received from the EBC which was in answer to an FOI request. We can see that minimal liaison has been undertaken by the EBC planning team with Severn Trent when appraising the prospective Draycott site drainage and water management arrangements, and only four quite generic was questions was asked by EBC in January 2025. It is clear from this evidence that EBC is not taking seriously the flood issues that Draycott residents experience annually with the houses on Lime Grove that back onto the land south west of Draycott experiencing significant flooding which impacts gardens and foul sewerage networks. More investigation needs to be undertaken by EBC as to why this site is not suitable for development. 2 Increase flooding risk to the area. The houses that back onto the land South West of Draycott have experienced significant flooding and this development will further compound this flooding. 3 There is already a risk of flooding in the area and the erosion of soil and plants will increase the risk of floods to other areas in the local community. 4 In line with the National Planning Policy Framework, a Flood Risk Assessment may be required for development which falls within a Flood Zone. 5 NPPF states that infrastructure must come first, yet the outline ideas to provide infrastructure are either not in place or are no timeline in advance of the proposed developments. There are currently no plans to develop new healthcare or improved infrastructure with these significant scale extensions of population. The area south of the proposed land suffers from flooding and this will only be compounded by the development of 190 new homes. 6 Although the relevant now falls outside of a Flood Risk Zone the topology of the site indicates that the runoff from both of the sites will add to the already present flood risk areas within the Environment Agency flood risk zone. 7 Building on a flood plain that has trees, grass & plants that naturally help absorb water via roots systems when removed will have a huge impact. 8 When considering the Environment Agency's flood risk survey for the area the development of the 190 houses will be built on neighbouring high to medium risk flood and risks compounding the flood risk in the area. 9 NPPF 162. States that the planning system should support the transition to net zero by 2050 and take full account of all climate impacts including overheating, water scarcity, storm and flood risks and coastal change. It should help to: shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimise vulnerability and improve resilience; encourage the reuse of existing resources, including the conversion of existing buildings; and support renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure. The development of 190 houses on land south west of Draycott totally contradicts this statement as this land was previously within flood risk 1 zone, and experiences significant flooding throughout the year. This development will further compound this issues. 10 NPPF 170. States that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future). Where 50 development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Yet the land south west of Draycott experiences significant flooding throughout the year with many
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	James Whyman	Response-01551	residents on Lime Grove not able to obtain flood risk damage cover as a consequence. 11 NPPF 173. States that a sequential risk-based approach should also be taken to individual applications in areas known to be at risk now or in future from any form of flooding, by following the steps set out below. Can the EBC advise why on the eve of the original consultation meeting held on 27th March 2025 by EBC, it was advised that the flood risk zone for the land south west of Draycott had been reclassified and the information within the public domain, e.g. EA Flood Risk Plan, was out of date. Was this a coincidence and can the EBC advise why the risk zone for this land has now changed when the land still floods. 12 NPPF 174. States that within this context the aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding. The strategic flood risk assessment will provide the basis for applying this test. Yet the land south west of Draycott was recently within a Flood Risk Zone.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Jane Barker	Response-01178	Flooding is a big problem in Draycott and this should be considered as a grave concern for any future developments in the village. The current dwellings surrounding the proposed site also already suffer with surface water not draining away and this will be made much much worse by another 190 plus houses trying to join the system. Many homes are unable to obtain home insurance due to this.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	J Morgan	Response-01847	Minimal liaison has been undertaken by EBC with Severn Trent regarding drainage and water management arrangements for the Draycott site. Draycott residents experience multiyear flooding events, and this development will further compound flooding issues. More investigation is needed to determine why this known flood location site is suitable for development. A Flood Risk Assessment should be requested for developments within a Flood Zone.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	John Brayshaw	Response-01379	I have worked close many schemes involving flood protection areas with Severn Trent, The NRA and The Environmental agency. In my experience none have been a success! But developers have made short time profits and left any aftermath to public services and insurance companies. So I would say to the council, get ready to pay our own money down the line for problems you create with this development. We have had an increase in flooding and road closures over recent years and this will only get worse! The problem will only be past downstream to areas already at risk and overloaded multiple times a year I see nothing proposed that would significantly reduce or eliminate this flooding and it's associated cost to the public, businesses and individuals. The flood designs are there for a reason please do not make the mistake often made for short term gain!
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Jonathan Childs	Response-01117	From the correspondence received from the EBC which was in answer to an FOI request. We can see that minimal liaison has been undertaken by the EBC planning team with Severn Trent when appraising the prospective Draycott site drainage and water management arrangements, and only four quite generic questions were asked by EBC in January 2025. It is clear from this evidence that EBC is not taking seriously the flood issues that Draycott residents experience annually with the houses on Lime Grove that back onto the land south west of Draycott experiencing significant flooding which impacts gardens and foul sewerage networks. More investigation needs to be undertaken by EBC as to why this site is not suitable for development. In line with the National Planning Policy Framework, a Flood Risk Assessment may be required for development which falls within a Flood Zone. NPPF states that infrastructure must come first, yet the outline ideas to provide infrastructure are either not in place or have no timeline in advance of the proposed developments. There are currently no plans to develop new healthcare or improved infrastructure with these significant scale extensions of population. This development presents as little more than a convenient 'box ticking' exercise with little consideration beyond the political and commercial aspects. Although the relevant now falls outside of a Flood Risk Zone (following the recent and laughable 'regrading' by the EA) the topology of the site indicates that the runoff from both of the sites will add to the already present flood risk areas within the Environment Agency flood risk zone. With 22 years residence and direct experience of these issues, I can state with full confidence that flooding between Lime Grove and the farm drive has become considerably worse in recent years and certainly not better! Any 'hard' development on this land will inevitably exacerbate the already difficult situation which prevails for the greater portion of the calendar year. NPPF 162. States that the planning system should support the transition to net zero by 2050 and take full account of all climate impacts including overheating, water scarcity, storm and flood risks and coastal change. It should help to: shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimise vulnerability and improve resilience; encourage the reuse of existing resources, including the conversion of existing buildings; and support renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure. The development of 190 houses on land south west of Draycott totally contradicts this statement as this land was previously within flood risk 1 zone, and experiences significant flooding throughout the year. This development will further compound this issue. NPPF 170. States that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future). Where 50 development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Yet the land south west of Draycott experiences significant flooding throughout the year with many residents on Lime Grove not able to obtain flood risk damage cover as a consequence. NPPF 173. States that a sequential risk-based approach should also be taken to individual applications in areas known to be at risk now or in future from any form of flooding, by
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Jonathan Childs	Response-01117	following the steps set out below. Can the EBC advise why on the eve of the original consultation meeting held on 27th March 2025 by EBC, it was advised that the flood risk zone for the land south west of Draycott had been reclassified and the information within the public domain, e.g. EA Flood Risk Plan, was out of date. Was this a coincidence and can the EBC advise why the risk zone for this land has now changed when the land still floods. NPPF 174. States that within this context the aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding. The strategic flood risk assessment will provide the basis for applying this test, yet the land south west of Draycott was (and in practice remains) within a Flood Risk Zone. Historically, the area has a long history of issues with a lack of drainage capacity - both natural and man-made - and during my residence, I have seen no action taken to address or mitigate this so how will the apparently already overloaded system accommodate the proposed new development?
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Judith Boyle	Response-01418	NPPF states that infrastructure must come first, yet the outline ideas to provide infrastructure are either not in place or are no timeline in advance of the proposed developments. There are currently no plans to develop new healthcare or improved infrastructure with these significant scale extensions of population. The area south of the proposed land suffers from flooding and this will only be compounded by the development of 190 new homes. NPPF 173. States that a sequential risk-based approach should also be taken to individual applications in areas known to be at risk now or in future from any form of flooding, by following the steps set out below. Can the EBC advise why on the eve of the original consultation meeting held on 27th March 2025 by EBC, it was advised that the flood risk zone for the land south west of Draycott had been reclassified and the information within the public domain, e.g. EA Flood Risk Plan, was out of date. Was this a coincidence and can the EBC advise why the risk zone for this land has now changed when the land still floods.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Julie Pleass	Response-01526	Increase flooding risk to the area. The houses that back onto the land South West of Draycott have experienced significant flooding and this development will further compound this flooding. Building on a flood plain that has trees, grass & plants that naturally help absorb water via roots systems when removed will have a huge impact. When considering the Environment Agency's flood risk survey for the area the development of the 190 houses will be built on neighbouring high to medium risk flood and risks compounding the flood risk in the area. From the correspondence received from the EBC which was in answer to an FOI request. We can see that minimal liaison has been undertaken by the EBC planning team with Severn Trent when appraising the prospective Draycott site drainage and water management arrangements, and only four quite generic was questions was asked by EBC in January 2025. It is clear from this evidence that EBC is not taking seriously the flood issues that Draycott residents experience annually with the houses on Lime Grove that back onto the land south west of Draycott experiencing significant flooding which impacts gardens and foul sewerage networks. More investigation needs to be undertaken by EBC as to why this site is not suitable for development
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Juliet Macve	Response-01572	This land is entirely unsuitable for development due to the flooding which happens each year, yet it appears that EBC is not taking this risk at all seriously. There are numerous photos and videos of drone footage available online, showing the scale of the problem. To build on this land would be absolutely ludicrous. The field behind Lime Grove was constantly under water for months at a time during 2024. In fact, a little egret (a wetland bird) was present in the field every day for at least two weeks at some point in that year. Not only is it highly likely that new houses will flood, but the loss of green fields and trees will increase the risk to existing properties. Again, principles in the NPPF are not being adhered to in proposing the change from green belt and housing development. It is vital that flood risk assessments are carried out.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Justine Murrin	Response-01478	This area is already under high flood risk, so adding more foundations in this area will raise the water levels and increase the flooding even more. There are numerous brown sites that could be used instead of filling up green site soil, which is needed to help drainage in the area
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Karen Doxey	Response-01236	Increase flooding risk to the area. The houses that back onto the land South West of Draycott have experienced significant flooding and this development will further compound this flooding. There is already a risk of flooding in the area and the erosion of soil and plants will increase the risk of floods to other areas in the local community. Building on a flood plain that has trees, grass & plants that naturally help absorb water via roots systems when removed will have a huge impact.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Karen Smith	Response-01484	I'm concerned about the lack of infrastructure to support the proposed development. The village doesn't have capacity to support 200+ houses. That area already floods during heavy rain. What additional drainage is being bought in to support the existing systems?
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Katie May	Response-01518	From the correspondence received from the EBC which was in answer to an FOI request. We can see that minimal liaison has been undertaken by the EBC planning team with Severn Trent when appraising the prospective Draycott site drainage and water management arrangements, and only four quite generic was questions was asked by EBC in January 2025. It is clear from this evidence that EBC is not taking seriously the flood issues that Draycott residents experience annually with the houses on Lime Grove that back onto the land south west of Draycott experiencing significant flooding which impacts gardens and foul sewerage networks. More investigation needs to be undertaken by EBC as to why this site is not suitable for development. Increase flooding risk to the area. The houses that back onto the land South West of Draycott have experienced significant flooding and this development will further compound this flooding. There is already a risk of flooding in the area and the erosion of soil and plants will increase the risk of floods to other areas in the local community. In line with the National Planning Policy Framework, a Flood Risk Assessment may be required for development which falls within a Flood Zone. NPPF states that infrastructure must come first, yet the outline ideas to provide infrastructure are either not in place or are no timeline in advance of the proposed developments. There are currently no plans to develop new healthcare or improved infrastructure with these significant scale extensions of population. The area south of the proposed land suffers from flooding and this will only be compounded by the development of 190 new homes. Although the relevant now falls outside of a Flood Risk Zone the topology of the site indicates that the runoff from both of the sites will add to the already present flood risk areas within the Environment Agency flood risk zone. Building on a flood plain that has trees, grass & plants that naturally help absorb water via roots systems when removed will have a huge impact. When considering the Environment Agency's flood risk survey for the area the development of the 190 houses will be built on neighbouring high to medium risk flood and risks compounding the flood risk in the area. NPPF 162. States that the planning system should support the transition to net zero by 2050 and take full account of all climate impacts including overheating, water scarcity, storm and flood risks and coastal change. It should help to: shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimise vulnerability and improve resilience; encourage the reuse of existing resources, including the conversion of existing buildings; and support renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure. The development of 190 houses on land south west of Draycott totally contradicts this statement as this land was previously within flood risk 1 zone, and experiences significant flooding throughout the year. This development will further compound this issues. "NPPF 170. States that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future). Where 50 development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Yet the land south west of Draycott experiences significant flooding throughout the year with many residents on Lime Gr

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Site May	Response-01518	ove not able to obtain flood risk damage cover as a consequence. " NPPF 173. States that a sequential risk-based approach should also be taken to individual applications in areas known to be at risk now or in future from any form of flooding, by following the steps set out below. Can the EBC advise why on the eve of the original consultation meeting held on 27th March 2025 by EBC, it was advised that the flood risk zone for the land south west of Draycott had been reclassified and the information within the public domain, e.g. EA Flood Risk Plan, was out of date. Was this a coincidence and can the EBC advise why the risk zone for this land has now changed when the land still floods. NPPF 174. States that within this context the aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding. The strategic flood risk assessment will provide the basis for applying this test. Yet the land south west of Draycott was recently within a Flood Risk Zone.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Kelly Walker	Response-00911	From the correspondence received from the EBC which was in answer to an FOI request. We can see that minimal liaison has been undertaken by the EBC planning team with Severn Trent when appraising the prospective Draycott site drainage and water management arrangements, and only four quite generic was questions was asked by EBC in January 2025. It is clear from this evidence that EBC is not taking seriously the flood issues that Draycott residents experience annually with the houses on Lime Grove that back onto the land south west of Draycott experiencing significant flooding which impacts gardens and foul sewerage networks. More investigation needs to be undertaken by EBC as to why this site is not suitable for development. There is already a risk of flooding in the area and the erosion of soil and plants will increase the risk of floods to other areas in the local community. NPPF states that infrastructure must come first, yet the outline ideas to provide infrastructure are either not in place or are no timeline in advance of the proposed developments. There are currently no plans to develop new healthcare or improved infrastructure with these significant scale extensions of population. The area south of the proposed land suffers from flooding and this will only be compounded by the development of 190 new homes. Although the relevant now falls outside of a Flood Risk Zone the topology of the site indicates that the runoff from both of the sites will add to the already present flood risk areas within the Environment Agency flood risk zone. When considering the Environment Agency's flood risk survey for the area the development of the 190 houses will be built on neighbouring high to medium risk flood and risks compounding the flood risk in the area. NPPF 162. States that the planning system should support the transition to net zero by 2050 and take full account of all climate impacts including overheating, water scarcity, storm and flood risks and coastal change. It should help to: shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimise vulnerability and improve resilience; encourage the reuse of existing resources, including the conversion of existing buildings; and support renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure. The development of 190 houses on land south west of Draycott totally contradicts this statement as this land was previously within flood risk 1 zone, and experiences significant flooding throughout the year. This development will further compound this issues. NPPF 170. States that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future). Where 50 development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Yet the land south west of Draycott experiences significant flooding throughout the year with many residents on Lime Grove not able to obtain flood risk damage cover as a consequence. NPPF 173. States that a sequential risk-based approach should also be taken to individual applications in areas known to be at risk now or in future from any form of flooding, by following the steps set out below. Can the EBC advise why on the eve of the original consultation meeting held on 27th March 2025 by EBC, it was advised that the flood risk zone for the land south west of Draycott had been reclassified
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Kelly Walker	Response-00911	and the information within the public domain, e.g. EA Flood Risk Plan, was out of date. Was this a coincidence and can the EBC advise why the risk zone for this land has now changed when the land still floods.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Kerry Naylor	Response-00993	Banksfield farm land has become a flood plain over the last 20 years. The past two years especially, the field backing Lime Grove has become a lake. Ducks and other water birds have made it their home during wet times. Photographic evidence is held by residence of Lime Grove. Where will the water go. Water can only be diverted not stopped. The water from the field, especially if the houses were built higher than Lime Grove residence home, would means homes being flooded. Gardens are already under water for up to two months in wet months, this will only get worse. What reassurances can be made that Lime Grove gardens/property will not be impacted by a new development? Every year, STWA have to pump the drains on the Main Derby Road, so the drains on Lime Grove can run freely. This is already a worry.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Laura Charier	Response-01218	From the correspondence received from the EBC which was in answer to an FOI request. We can see that minimal liaison has been undertaken by the EBC planning team with Severn Trent when appraising the prospective Draycott site drainage and water management arrangements, and only four quite generic was questions was asked by EBC in January 2025. It is clear from this evidence that EBC is not taking seriously the flood issues that Draycott residents experience annually with the houses on Lime Grove that back onto the land south west of Draycott experiencing significant flooding which impacts gardens and foul sewerage networks. More investigation needs to be undertaken by EBC as to why this site is not suitable for development. There is already a risk of flooding in the area and the erosion of soil and plants will increase the risk of floods to other areas in the local community.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Laura Roffey	Response-01479	This a such a major point, especially into today's climate change. Many areas of Draycott experience flooding - the houses in Lime Grove behind the planned houses are one of them. Where will this water go? Into the existing houses, or into the new house as well. Where will this water go if you build on the land? This planned housing estate poses a very real threat of flooding to the surrounding houses and streets.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Lee	Response-00742	1. The site will flood - that is a fact no matter what the latest reports suddenly state. You can see the massive lake like puddles when it rains heavily. Affordably, cheap and quickly made houses on unsuitable land is a risk. Why is flooding be dismissed when it's a serious consideration and problem? 2. Severn Trent are continually out fixing burst pipes and local water issues. They are constantly in the news and have little credibility. What insurance's & checks will be done to check they are not cutting corners and can support this infrastructure upgrade. 3. It close to a River what precautions have been taken to ensure residence children don't drown? The council claimed / alleged this is essential as 2,000 kids are on the Erewash register awaiting housing?
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Lee Bunday	Response-00028	The proposed developments?of large-scale housing here and across the allocations at Borrowash and Breaston?will increase the amount of impermeable surfaces, leading to greater surface water runoff. This presents a serious risk in this area, which is already susceptible to flooding and has experience issues with the existing drainage systems. Recent years have shown an increase in the frequency and severity of flood events, likely linked to climate change. Yet, the strategy lacks a clear plan to strengthen local flood resilience, modernise drainage systems, or ensure that new developments incorporate sustainable drainage solutions (SuDS). Major concerns include: Insufficient reference to updated flood risk assessments, especially in vulnerable zones. Lack of detailed strategy for upgrading drainage infrastructure. No guarantees that developers will implement and maintain long-term flood mitigation measures. Risk of increased insurance costs and property damage for current and future residents. Any strategy that plans for significant growth must prioritise resilience to environmental hazards. I strongly urge the council to review and amend the Core Strategy to include: Robust flood risk modelling based on latest climate data. Enforceable requirements for SuDS in all new developments. Collaboration with the Environment Agency and local water authorities. Clear investment plans for improving drainage networks. The protection of people, homes, and the natural environment must be at the heart of any long-term planning decisions.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Linda Jane Jenkins	Response-01007	As I said 93 Derby road, my house lies along side the first field. During the time I have lived here the farmer rents the field to horse owners. The horses are only on this field 6 months of the year because it floods. So it is not good enough for horses but it is good enough for housing for humans? That does not make sense. Just because you have changed the flood status does not mean you are correct. If the build goes ahead and the houses are build up the water has to go somewhere. If it comes to our property we will be looking for redress at your door.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Louise and Shane Foster	Response-01219	Flooding is a regular problem in the area of the proposed development. Derby Road (A6005) is subject to flooding, as is the development site itself. Surely a Flood Risk Assessment is necessary before developing a known local flood zone?
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Louise Burnell	Response-00262	Increases surface runoff from extensive saved areas will exacerbate flood risk and potentially pollute local watercourses.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Luke Harper	Response-00898	The greenbelt absorbs rainwater but concrete does not.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Luke Hatch	Response-00160	This land has historically been part of the River Derwent floodplain. With more extreme weather due to climate change, this should be a red flag. Paving over green space only increases flood risk for the site itself and the surrounding area. It also seems suspicious that it is only now being reclassified, or so I have heard, as no longer a flood plain, right when something needs to be built there. The developers will build and in 3-5 years time, we'll get flooded and the developers will be in Marbella forgetting it ever happened.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Lynne Dundas	Response-01198	As I live close to the site, I see year on year the water flooding from the River Derwent as it appears to creep ever closer to the home.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Maggie Murphy	Response-00833	We can see that minimal liaison has been undertaken by the EBC planning team with Severn Trent when appraising the prospective Draycott site in regards to drainage and water management arrangements, and only four quite generic questions were asked by EBC in January 2025. It is clear from this evidence that EBC are not taking the flood issues seriously. Draycott residents experience multiyear flooding events with the houses on Lime Grove, that back onto the land south west of Draycott experiencing significant flooding which impacts gardens and foul sewerage networks. More investigation needs to be undertaken by EBC as to why this known flood location site is suitable for development. 2. The houses that back onto the land South West of Draycott have experienced significant flooding in the past and this development will further compound this flooding with the erosion of grassland and plants, leading to soil erosion. The water displacement caused by this development must go somewhere and further flooding will occur. 3. In line with the National Planning Policy Framework, we request a Flood Risk Assessment for developments which fall within a Flood Zone.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Martin Fawcett	Response-01077	Common sense should overrule greed. Everybody knows how much floodwater already appears in this area in bad weather and filling land with concrete and bricks will surely only worsen the issue as water won't naturally drain effectively

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Martin Kilcoyne	Response-01460	From the correspondence received from the EBC which was in answer to an FOI request. We can see that minimal liaison has been undertaken by the EBC planning team with Severn Trent when appraising the prospective Draycott site drainage and water management arrangements, and only four quite generic questions were asked by EBC in January 2025. It is clear from this evidence that EBC is not taking seriously the flood issues that Draycott residents experience annually with the houses on Lime Grove that back onto the land south west of Draycott experiencing significant flooding which impacts gardens and foul sewerage networks. More investigation needs to be undertaken by EBC as to why this site is not suitable for development. Increase flooding risk to the area. The houses that back onto the land South West of Draycott have experienced significant flooding and this development will further compound this flooding. There is already a risk of flooding in the area and the erosion of soil and plants will increase the risk of floods to other areas in the local community. In line with the National Planning Policy Framework, a Flood Risk Assessment may be required for development which falls within a Flood Zone. NPPF states that infrastructure must come first, yet the outline ideas to provide infrastructure are either not in place or are no timeline in advance of the proposed developments. There are currently no plans to develop new healthcare or improved infrastructure with these significant scale extensions of population. The area south of the proposed land suffers from flooding and this will only be compounded by the development of 190 new homes. Although the relevant now falls outside of a Flood Risk Zone the topology of the site indicates that the runoff from both of the sites will add to the already present flood risk areas within the Environment Agency flood risk zone. Building on a flood plain that has trees, grass & plants that naturally help absorb water via roots systems when removed will have a huge impact. When considering the Environment Agency's flood risk survey for the area the development of the 190 houses will be built on neighbouring high to medium risk flood and risks compounding the flood risk in the area. NPPF 162. States that the planning system should support the transition to net zero by 2050 and take full account of all climate impacts including overheating, water scarcity, storm and flood risks and coastal change. It should help to: shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimise vulnerability and improve resilience; encourage the reuse of existing resources, including the conversion of existing buildings; and support renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure. The development of 190 houses on land south west of Draycott totally contradicts this statement as this land was previously within flood risk 1 zone, and experiences significant flooding throughout the year. This development will further compound this issue. "NPPF 170. States that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future). Where 50 development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Yet the land south west of Draycott experiences significant flooding throughout the year with many residents on Lime Gr
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Martin Kilcoyne	Response-01460	ove not able to obtain flood risk damage cover as a consequence. " NPPF 173. States that a sequential risk-based approach should also be taken to individual applications in areas known to be at risk now or in future from any form of flooding, by following the steps set out below. Can the EBC advise why on the eve of the original consultation meeting held on 27th March 2025 by EBC, it was advised that the flood risk zone for the land south west of Draycott had been reclassified and the information within the public domain, e.g. EA Flood Risk Plan, was out of date. Was this a coincidence and can the EBC advise why the risk zone for this land has now changed when the land still floods. NPPF 174. States that within this context the aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding. The strategic flood risk assessment will provide the basis for applying this test. Yet the land south west of Draycott was recently within a Flood Risk Zone.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Mary Walsh	Response-01197	From the correspondence received from the EBC which was in answer to an FOI request. We can see that minimal liaison has been undertaken by the EBC planning team with Severn Trent when appraising the prospective Draycott site drainage and water management arrangements, and only four quite generic questions were asked by EBC in January 2025. It is clear from this evidence that EBC is not taking seriously the flood issues that Draycott residents experience annually with the houses on Lime Grove that back onto the land south west of Draycott experiencing significant flooding which impacts gardens and foul sewerage networks. More investigation needs to be undertaken by EBC as to why this site is not suitable for development. Building on a flood plain that has trees, grass & plants that naturally help absorb water via roots systems when removed will have a huge impact. When considering the Environment Agency's flood risk survey for the area the development of the 190 houses will be built on neighbouring high to medium risk flood and risks compounding the flood risk in the area. NPPF 170. States that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future). Where 50 development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Yet the land south west of Draycott experiences significant flooding throughout the year with many residents on Lime Grove not able to obtain flood risk damage cover as a consequence.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Matthew Walker	Response-01313	<p>From the correspondence received from the EBC which was in answer to an FOI request. We can see that minimal liaison has been undertaken by the EBC planning team with Severn Trent when appraising the prospective Draycott site drainage and water management arrangements, and only four quite generic questions were asked by EBC in January 2025. It is clear from this evidence that EBC is not taking seriously the flood issues that Draycott residents experience annually with the houses on Lime Grove that back onto the land south west of Draycott experiencing significant flooding which impacts gardens and foul sewerage networks. More investigation needs to be undertaken by EBC as to why this site is not suitable for development. Until recently, where the EBCs amended Core Strategy was voted to go forward for public consultation on the 27th March the area was largely within FZ1. When questions, Head of Planning (Steven Birkenshaw) advised that the flood zone attribution had recently been removed and reclassified as FZ2. This was a shock to many of the Draycott residents within the EBC chamber, yet it was still on the Severn Trent website maps for some time after this which indicates that the planning work was undertaken in the knowledge at that time that the land was prone to the risk of fluvial flooding. Despite repeated efforts we have been provided with no evidence that any mitigating actions would be employed should development go ahead. Much of the lands surrounding Draycott suffer from surface water flooding, this patch of land is no exception. Given the low-lying nature of the flat lands which are barely above river level the draining of these lands can take some considerable time, often months as the water slowly percolates through to the river. The removal of the land to act as a slow-release of these waters will exacerbate problems elsewhere in the village to the detriment of other residents and road users. The village has been completely isolated from all other surrounding villages by road and rail during periods of exceptionally wet weather for several days at a time, this was almost unheard of until 3-4 years ago. However, the main line rail does appear to have 24hr or more closures at least once a year requiring Network Rail to install 2 large pumps which run continuously for extended periods to alleviate these flooding problems. Therefore, I strongly raise that in line with the National Planning Policy Framework, a Flood Risk Assessment is undertaken before this development is approved to establish the actual facts and viability of the scheme. If this did result in the area being reclassified as not within a flood zone this would be useful for the large number of residents on Lime Grove that are currently not able to take out flood damage cover. NPPF states that infrastructure must come first, yet the outline ideas to provide infrastructure are either not in place or are no timeline in advance of the proposed developments. There are currently no plans to develop new healthcare or improved infrastructure with these significant scale extensions of population. The area south of the proposed land suffers from flooding and this will only be compounded by the development of 190 new homes and whilst the site now according to EBC falls outside of a Flood Risk Zone the topology of the site indicates that the runoff from both of the sites will add to the already present flood risk areas within the Environment Agency flood risk zone. NPPF 1</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Matthew Walker	Response-01313	<p>62. States that the planning system should support the transition to net zero by 2050 and take full account of all climate impacts including overheating, water scarcity, storm and flood risks and coastal change. It should help to: shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimise vulnerability and improve resilience; encourage the reuse of existing resources, including the conversion of existing buildings; and support renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure. The development of 190 houses on land south west of Draycott totally contradicts this statement as this land was previously within flood risk 1 zone, and experiences significant flooding throughout the year. This development will further compound these issues. NPPF 170. States that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future). Where development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Yet the land south west of Draycott experiences significant flooding throughout the year with many residents on Lime Grove not able to obtain flood risk damage cover as a consequence. NPPF 173. States that a sequential risk-based approach should also be taken to individual applications in areas known to be at risk now or in future from any form of flooding, by following the steps set out below. Can the EBC advise why on the eve of the original consultation meeting held on 27th March 2025 by EBC, it was advised that the flood risk zone for the land south west of Draycott had been reclassified and the information within the public domain, e.g. EA Flood Risk Plan, was out of date. Was this a coincidence and can the EBC advise why the risk zone for this land has now changed when the land still floods. NPPF 174. States that within this context the aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding. The strategic flood risk assessment will provide the basis for applying this test. Yet the land south west of Draycott was recently within a Flood Risk Zone. The Parish Council instructed Michael Evans &amp; Associates Ltd to undertake a Flood Risk and Drainage review. Some of the advice given included that the site is shown on the Environment Agency's Flood Map for Planning to be located predominantly within Flood Zone 1, an area with low risk of Fluvial Flooding (less than the 0.1% chance of flooding in any given year). A very small area along the southern boundary of the site is shown to be at medium and high risk of flooding (between 0.1 and 1% chance of flooding and greater than 1% chance of flooding). In Flood Risk terms, Flood Zone 1 areas are suitable for residential development. Flood Zone 3 areas would not be suitable for residential development, and Flood Zone 2 areas would only be suitable for residential development if mitigation measures are put in place. Therefore, from an initial review of the flood maps the majority of the site is likely to be acceptable for residential development, however, the Local Planning Authority any future developer should be aware that parts of the site are unlikely to be suitable for development.</p>

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Matthew Walker	Response-01313	nt and the housing allocations should be adjusted accordingly. Surface water flooding is also shown to affect parts of the site, which mapping suggests is localised ponding within the site, which is mainly confined to the site boundary, but with some offsite connectivity to the south and east of the site. Care will need to be taken within any development layout to ensure that this flooding is mitigated and not exacerbated, particularly to the east of the site where surface water flooding is already shown to impact on the neighbouring properties fronting Lime Grove. Local residents have reported that the fields which make up the site, and the fields between the site and the River Derwent have flooded in recent years. Photographs were provided from 2022, 2023 and 2024 which showed fluvial flooding of the River Derwent. The flood extents are very similar to the mapped Environment Agency 1 in 100 year (Flood Zone 3) mapped extents. Based on this information, it is suggested that the modelled extents would provide a fairly accurate depiction of fluvial flood extents in the area. Michael Evans & Associates Ltd go onto advise that, they understand that the local residents have some significant concerns regarding the potential impact of any development at the site on the existing drainage infrastructure which serve the local area. It is understood that there have been flooding incidents in the past related to insufficient capacity within the existing public sewer network. This has caused flooding of the manholes/sewers within Lime Grove, to the west of the site, as well as to other areas downstream of the site. The majority of Draycott is drained via a public combined sewer network, taking both foul and surface water drainage, so during times of heavy or prolonged rainfall the network is sometimes unable to cope with the flows. Severn Trent Water have responded to the Local Planning Authority and to the Parish Council to confirm that there is capacity within the downstream pumping station and the Wastewater Treatment Works to accommodate the flows from any future development at the site, but it is unclear if the existing network between the site and the pumping station would be able to accommodate such flows. The Severn Trent Water response confirms that the authority has a duty to accommodate foul flows from any new development into the nearest point of connection into the public sewer. Therefore, it is anticipated that a connection would be provided into the sewer network within Derby Road, to the north of the site. Based on the local topography and the depth of the sewers within Derby Road (approximately 1.6m deep), it is likely that flows from the development would need to be pumped to the point of connection. This would, obviously, add cost to any proposed development as well as land take, which would need to be factored into the overall cost of developing the site. Whilst it would be the responsibility of Severn Trent Water to provide upgrades to the network, if required, the timescale for any such required upgrades could not be guaranteed and could affect the deliverability of the site in the short to medium term. In conclusion, from a thorough review we have undertaken of the information provided by EBC and Severn Trent, it is clear the required flood and drainage assessments/appraisals have not been undertaken when making such a significant decision as to whether the land south west of Draycott is feasible for development. The reviews
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Matthew Walker	Response-01313	undertaken to date by the EBC and Severn Trent can be at best called generic and light touch. This is also compounded by the EBCs Sustainability Assessment which also mirrors this where the land south west of Draycott (CSR00040) has been scored disproportionately high using assumptions rather than facts.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Maureen Pinchbeck	Response-00041	This land often floods. I have a friend on Lime Grove near to proposed development and her garden frequently floods.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Melanie Wilson	Response-00974	The surrounding land already floods , protecting the majority of the houses in Draycott any removal of greenspace will increase the risk of flooding in the village. A comprehensive flood risk assessment should be undertaken before any decision is made.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Michael Atkin	Response-01872	My main objection is that this land is susceptible to flooding, I can confirm this with photographs of my garden underwater. For 3 months 2023-2024 and again in January 2025 which has caused £100s in trees and shrubs and several of my neighbours also flooded. The Victorian sewer system is currently at maximum and certainly could not cope with the extra volume.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Michael Thirtwall	Response-01196	When considering the Environment Agency's flood risk survey for the area the development of the 190 houses will be built on neighbouring high to medium risk flood and risks compounding the flood risk in the area.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Michelle Marks	Response-00924	The environmental impact of this development would be devastating: Green Belt land plays a crucial role in natural water absorption and flood prevention. The replacement of permeable land with concrete and tarmac will exacerbate surface water runoff, increasing the risk of flooding in Draycott and surrounding areas.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Miss Ella Meredith	Response-01850	Minimal liaison has been undertaken by EBC with Severn Trent regarding drainage and water management arrangements for the Draycott site. Draycott residents experience multiyear flooding events, and this development will further compound flooding issues. More investigation is needed to determine why this known flood location site is suitable for development. A Flood Risk Assessment should be requested for developments within a Flood Zone.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Miss Natalie Walsh	Response-01846	Minimal liaison has been undertaken by EBC with Severn Trent regarding drainage and water management arrangements for the Draycott site. Draycott residents experience multiyear flooding events, and this development will further compound flooding issues. More investigation is needed to determine why this known flood location site is suitable for development. A Flood Risk Assessment should be requested for developments within a Flood Zone.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Miss Paige Murray	Response-01842	Minimal liaison has been undertaken by EBC with Severn Trent regarding drainage and water management arrangements for the Draycott site. Draycott residents experience multiyear flooding events, and this development will further compound flooding issues. More investigation is needed to determine why this known flood location site is suitable for development. A Flood Risk Assessment should be requested for developments within a Flood Zone.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Mr Graham Bingham and Mrs Kristine Bingham	Response-01302	Minimal liaison has been undertaken by EBC with Severn Trent Water regarding drainage and water management arrangements for the Draycott site. Draycott residents living adjacent to the proposed site experience multiyear flooding events, and this development would further compound the flooding issues. more investigation is needed to determine why this known flood location site is suitable for development. A flood risk assessment should be carried out for developments within a known flood zone.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Mr R Sykes	Response-00412	Flooding in the area is severe through out the year.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Mr Scott Walsh	Response-01844	Minimal liaison has been undertaken by EBC with Severn Trent regarding drainage and water management arrangements for the Draycott site. Draycott residents experience multiyear flooding events, and this development will further compound flooding issues. More investigation is needed to determine why this known flood location site is suitable for development. A Flood Risk Assessment should be requested for developments within a Flood Zone.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Mrs Elizabeth White	Response-00060	This area is very close to a river and flood alleviation area so there is a risk of flooding in the area if stress is put on the land.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Mrs Maria E Hardy	Response-00614	Redirecting flood areas. A huge worry for where we live. Could make us in risk of flooding.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Mrs Mary Walsh	Response-01845	Minimal liaison has been undertaken by EBC with Severn Trent regarding drainage and water management arrangements for the Draycott site. Draycott residents experience multiyear flooding events, and this development will further compound flooding issues. More investigation is needed to determine why this known flood location site is suitable for development. A Flood Risk Assessment should be requested for developments within a Flood Zone.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Mrs Patricia L Tacey	Response-00283	The area designated for housing has a gravel base which enables the land to drain quickly during periods of flooding of the river Derwent. By building on the land this will create problems further down the river.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Mrs V Atkin	Response-01871	I understand that more housing is needed but the site EBC have chosen is not fit for purpose. Our property backs onto this site and for the last few years we have had severe flooding. There must be other sites that are more suitable.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Mr Tony Walsh	Response-01849	Minimal liaison has been undertaken by EBC with Severn Trent regarding drainage and water management arrangements for the Draycott site. Draycott residents experience multiyear flooding events, and this development will further compound flooding issues. More investigation is needed to determine why this known flood location site is suitable for development. A Flood Risk Assessment should be requested for developments within a Flood Zone.
			Nat	Response-00158	The increased volume of people will create more issues with flooding and drainage
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Nigel morton	Response-01351	It's a flood plain and shouldn't be built on, it will create massive problems around the area, the environment agency saying its downgraded the risk does mean they are right, in my opinion having lived opposite since 1989, this year has been worse than ever. its flood zone 2-3, that speaks for itself. Drainage is another issue we have on derby Road too, major work would need undertaking for this development
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Nikki Riches	Response-00950	? As a resident of Draycott, I am extremely worried about the future impact of the new housing estate on flood risk to the area, my home and neighbours. Being a victim of flooding is a devastating thing to experience and can cause risk to peoples safety, their mental health and home security as well as financially. The proposed area is already at risk of flooding, building in the vicinity will only increase the risk to the local area as the flood water has to go somewhere. The proposed 190 houses will be built on neighbouring high to medium risk flood and risks compounding the flood risk in the area. ? This proposal will exacerbate the flood risk to the area, before future climate change is even considered. ? From the correspondence received from the EBC which was in answer to an FOI request. We can see that minimal liaison has been undertaken by the EBC planning team with Severn Trent when appraising the prospective Draycott site drainage and water management arrangements, and only four quite generic questions were asked by EBC in January 2025. It is clear from this evidence that EBC is not taking seriously the flood issues that Draycott residents experience annually with the houses on Lime Grove that back onto the land south west of Draycott experiencing significant flooding which impacts gardens and foul sewerage networks. More investigation needs to be undertaken by EBC as to why this site is not suitable for development. ? Increase flooding risk to the area. The houses that back onto the land South West of Draycott have experienced significant flooding and this development will further compound this flooding. ? There is already a risk of flooding in the area and the erosion of soil and plants will increase the risk of floods to other areas in the local community. ? In line with the National Planning Policy Framework, a Flood Risk Assessment may be required for development which falls within a Flood Zone. ? NPPF states that infrastructure must come first, yet the outline ideas to provide infrastructure are either not in place or are no timeline in advance of the proposed developments. There are currently no plans to develop new healthcare or improved infrastructure with these significant scale extensions of population. The area south of the proposed land suffers from flooding and this will only be compounded by the development of 190 new homes. ? Although the relevant area now falls outside of a Flood Risk Zone the topology of the site indicates that the runoff from both of the sites will add to the already present flood risk areas within the Environment Agency flood risk zone. ? Building on a flood plain that has trees, grass & plants that naturally help absorb water via roots systems when removed will have a huge impact. ? When considering the Environment Agency's flood risk survey for the area the development of the 190 houses will be built on neighbouring high to medium risk flood and risks compounding the flood risk in the area. ? NPPF 162. States that the planning system should support the transition to net zero by 2050 and take full account of all climate impacts including overheating, water scarcity, storm and flood risks and coastal change. It should help to: shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimise vulnerability and improve resilience; encourage the reuse of existing resources, including the conversion of existing buildings; and support renewable and low carbon energy and

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Nikki Riches	Response-00950	associated infrastructure. The development of 190 houses on land south west of Draycott totally contradicts this statement as this land was previously within flood risk 1 zone, and experiences significant flooding throughout the year. This development will further compound this issues. ? NPPF 170. States that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing ? development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future). Where 50 development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Yet the land south west of Draycott experiences significant flooding throughout the year with many residents on Lime Grove not able to obtain flood risk damage cover as a consequence. ? NPPF 173. States that a sequential risk-based approach should also be taken to individual applications in areas known to be at risk now or in future from any form of flooding, by following the steps set out below. Can the EBC advise why on the eve of the original consultation meeting held on 27th March 2025 by EBC, it was advised that the flood risk zone for the land south west of Draycott had been reclassified and the information within the public domain, e.g. EA Flood Risk Plan, was out of date. Was this a coincidence and can the EBC advise why the risk zone for this land has now changed when the land still floods. ? NPPF 174. States that within this context the aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding. The strategic flood risk assessment will provide the basis for applying this test. Yet the land south west of Draycott was recently within a Flood Risk Zone.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Oliver Kirk	Response-00569	The area south west of draycott has long been prolific as a flood plain, building on this site will cause an increase in flooding risk into the village and create animosity towards the new residents who will be perceived to have caused any flood damage when it inevitably comes.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Paul Allen	Response-01082	The site borders on and slightly encroaches on a Flood Zone 2 (GOV.UK-Flood Map) and there is no flood defence barrier around this area of Draycott. The fields to the south-west of the site regularly flood in the winter period and it is likely to become worse with global warming. Future flooding is likely to make any proposed sustainable urban drainage scheme (SUDS) ineffective and raise the risk of pollution in the nearby River Derwent.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	paul butcher	Response-01154	From the correspondence received from the EBC which was in answer to an FOI request. We can see that minimal liaison has been undertaken by the EBC planning team with Severn Trent when appraising the prospective Draycott site drainage and water management arrangements, and only four quite generic questions were asked by EBC in January 2025. It is clear from this evidence that EBC is not taking seriously the flood issues that Draycott residents experience annually with the houses on Lime Grove that back onto the land south west of Draycott experiencing significant flooding which impacts gardens and foul sewerage networks. More investigation needs to be undertaken by EBC as to why this site is not suitable for development. Increase flooding risk to the area. The houses that back onto the land South West of Draycott have experienced significant flooding and this development will further compound this flooding. In line with the National Planning Policy Framework, a Flood Risk Assessment may be required for development which falls within a Flood Zone. NPPF 173. States that a sequential risk-based approach should also be taken to individual applications in areas known to be at risk now or in future from any form of flooding, by following the steps set out below. Can the EBC advise why on the eve of the original consultation meeting held on 27th March 2025 by EBC, it was advised that the flood risk zone for the land south west of Draycott had been reclassified and the information within the public domain, e.g. EA Flood Risk Plan, was out of date. Was this a coincidence and can the EBC advise why the risk zone for this land has now changed when the land still floods. NPPF 174. States that within this context the aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding. The strategic flood risk assessment will provide the basis for applying this test. Yet the land south west of Draycott was recently within a Flood Risk Zone.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Pauline Marks	Response-00927	Green Belt land plays a crucial role in natural water absorption and flood prevention. The replacement of permeable land with concrete and tarmac will exacerbate surface water runoff, increasing the risk of flooding in Draycott and surrounding areas.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Paul Riley	Response-00029	The area in question floods every winter. If the absorbent ground is replaced with hard landscaping (roads, drives etc), then where is this flood water expected to go? That's right, further into the rest of the village. What Muppet thought this would be a sensible place to build on? They need their head examining and should not be allowed near any future planning.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Peter Sutton	Response-00409	The area is prone to flooding. It currently absorbs a large amount of rainfall which once concreted over will now flow to other areas - making flooding worse downstream - Wilne and Sawley already experience terrible flooding and this will make it worse.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	R Beresford	Response-01907	Our house Insurance costs us more as we have an additional charge as we live on a flood plane by RIAS insurance. This was only renewed in 27th February this year, so if we are no longer on flood plane why did this not come up in February upon renewal ! We often get flood warnings from the environment agency, yellow, amber, and a couple of Red warnings.... Does that mean we are no longer on a flood plane as the council has changed the map!! But the river hasn't moved!!
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	R Fazackerley	Response-01415	The proposed development is on a known flood plain for the river Derwent. The loss of the land to development poses a significant flood risk to existing properties in Draycott
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Richard Keith Hanbury	Response-01087	I believe you have changed the flood status of the field next to 93 Derby road. This field floods. How can you change the status when it floods. It beggars belief that you can do this.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Richard Syson	Response-01317	From the correspondence received from the EBC which was in answer to an FOI request. We can see that minimal liaison has been undertaken by the EBC planning team with Severn Trent when appraising the prospective Draycott site drainage and water management arrangements, and only four quite generic questions were asked by EBC in January 2025. It is clear from this evidence that EBC is not taking seriously the flood issues that Draycott residents experience annually with the houses on Lime Grove that back onto the land south west of Draycott experiencing significant flooding which impacts gardens and foul sewerage networks. More investigation needs to be undertaken by EBC as to why this site is not suitable for development. Although the relevant now falls outside of a Flood Risk Zone the topology of the site indicates that the runoff from both of the sites will add to the already present flood risk areas within the Environment Agency flood risk zone. Erewash Borough Council needs to clarify to the Draycott public why on the eve of the original consultation meeting held on 27th March 2025 by EBC, it was advised that the flood risk zone for the land south west of Draycott had been reclassified and the information within the public domain, e.g. EA Flood Risk Plan, was out of date. The land / country lane near to the River Derwent and this land still flood during longer periods of rainy weather, so these risks have not reduced NPPF 170. States that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future). Where development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Yet the land south west of Draycott experiences significant flooding throughout the year with many residents on Lime Grove not able to obtain flood risk damage cover as a consequence.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Rick Howden	Response-01421	From the correspondence received from the EBC which was in answer to an FOI request. We can see that minimal liaison has been undertaken by the EBC planning team with Severn Trent when appraising the prospective Draycott site drainage and water management arrangements, and only four quite generic questions were asked by EBC in January 2025. It is clear from this evidence that EBC is not taking seriously the flood issues that Draycott residents experience annually with the houses on Lime Grove that back onto the land south west of Draycott experiencing significant flooding which impacts gardens and foul sewerage networks. More investigation needs to be undertaken by EBC as to why this site is not suitable for development.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Ricky fisher	Response-00048	This area has got worse and worse over the years ive lived in draycott all my life and i can see it through my bedroom window getting scarily close to my house and the more land you build on the less land up river it has to go and draycott does not need more land taking for more water to travel on to draycotts houses
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Robert Alan Duncanson	Response-00855	WORRIES AND CONCERNS THAT THE RIVER, WHICH DOES FLOOD ALOT WOULD CAUSE PROBLEMS WITH THE NEW HOUSES AND SURROUNDING AREA
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Robert Mee	Response-01505	I am concerned about the flood risk at this site.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Roger Brown	Response-00999	Draycott suffers considerably from surface water run-off and fluvial flooding. The main rail line from Derby to London is shut most years for days at a time as a result of flood water (most recently this last January) and the village has been isolated for several days by all means of travel except helicopter during the last 3 or 4 winters as surface water drainage fails to cope. The proposed site has surface water visible for months at a time and local gardens have flooded numerous times, largely from surface water run-off. There are homes on Lime Grove and nearby which have had sewage backing up in downstairs lavatories and foul water pipes are known to have burst, the system is already close to or at capacity. The surrounding fields of Draycott are often littered with pools of standing water for months at a time as the water slowly seeps through the ground, removing these fields from this delicate balance will exacerbate the problems elsewhere in the village unless sufficient mitigating measures are included in the proposals.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Ruth Hawkins	Response-01277	The houses that back onto the land South West of Draycott have experienced significant flooding and this development will further compound this flooding. As there is already evidence of flooding in this locality it is probable that this will be exacerbated by the development with the erosion of soil and plants increasing the risk of floods to other areas in the local community.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Sandra Ison	Response-01897	As a resident of Lime Grove our garden has been flooded again and again. Until March 2025 this land has been designated as floodplain. Now Erewash want to use this land for housing the boundary has been changed. On the Environmental Flood Map the fields behind Lime Grove are marked as a high risk for surface water flooding. Flooding also occurs on a regular basis at Gypsy Lane and Shacklecross, closing the road completely. What measures is the Council putting in place to solve this problem. If this change of use is passed and the land is developed for housing, where will all the surface water go. At present the fields, trees and hedges soak up some of the water. The change to roads and concrete will only add to the problem. After heavy rain properties on Lime Grove have ground floor toilets overflowing due to rising water levels, proving that the current sewerage system cannot cope.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Sarah	Response-01541	This is the biggest concern as we live nearly boarder line with this development and these fields food every year which protects our house and others around. When it rains heavy we have rising water under our house/ floorboards this is only going to increase and I'm sure will flood our house!

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Sarah Hargreaves	Response-01314	1. Flood Risk: The land Southwest of Draycott experiences significant flooding, impacting residents on Lime Grove. The development will compound these issues, and more investigation is needed. The houses on Lime Grove have experienced severe flooding, affecting gardens and foul sewerage networks. This development will exacerbate these problems, leading to increased flood risk for existing and new residents. 2. Inadequate Assessment: Minimal liaison has been undertaken with Severn Trent regarding drainage and water management. Only four generic questions were asked by EBC in January 2025, indicating a lack of sincere consideration of flood issues. A comprehensive Flood Risk Assessment is required to understand the full impact of the development on local drainage and water management systems. 3. Environmental Agency Flood Risk Survey: Although the relevant area now falls outside of a Flood Risk Zone, the topology of the site indicates that runoff from the development will add to the present flood risk areas within the Environment Agency flood risk zone. Building on a flood plain that has trees, grass, and plants that naturally help absorb water via root systems will have a significant impact when removed. Furthermore, it is not clear why the land was reclassified two days before the consultation was agreed. Who agreed to reclassify this land? And on what basis? Given that recent years have seen unprecedented flooding this is inaccurate. 4. Sequential Test: NPPF 174 states that the aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding. The strategic flood risk assessment will provide the basis for applying for this test. Yet the land Southwest of Draycott was recently within a Flood Risk Zone, and again, the reclassification appears to be a coincidence timed with the consultation period. 5. Climate Change Considerations: NPPF 162 states that the planning system should support the transition to net zero by 2050 and take full account of all climate impacts, including storm and flood risks. The development of 190 houses on land Southwest of Draycott contradicts this statement, as the area experiences significant flooding throughout the year. This development will further compound these issues, increasing vulnerability to climate change impacts.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Sara Walker-Bradley	Response-01440	This area and the other fields flood every year and is getting worse yearly, building in this land would make flooding worse and effecting the roads and existing properties with the excess surface water, these field can absorb the flood water and should be left as is.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Scott Gardner	Response-01554	Councillor Scott rightly highlighted the catastrophic potential loss of our vital floodplain. Draycott has a long and painful history of flooding , and allowing development on this crucial floodplain will only exacerbate this threat, putting countless homes at even greater risk. The Council's dismissive claim that the site is not in Flood Zone 2 based on potentially flawed data is an insult to residents who have experienced the devastating reality of flooding firsthand
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Sean Peace	Response-01347	From the correspondence received from the EBC which was in answer to an FOI request. We can see that minimal liaison has been undertaken by the EBC planning team with Severn Trent when appraising the prospective Draycott site drainage and water management arrangements, and only four quite generic was questions was asked by EBC in January 2025. It is clear from this evidence that EBC is not taking seriously the flood issues that Draycott residents experience annually with the houses on Lime Grove that back onto the land south west of Draycott experiencing significant flooding which impacts gardens and foul sewerage networks. More investigation needs to be undertaken by EBC as to why this site is not suitable for development. 5 2 Increase flooding risk to the area. The houses that back onto the land South West of Draycott have experienced significant flooding and this development will further compound this flooding. 6 3 There is already a risk of flooding in the area and the erosion of soil and plants will increase the risk of floods to other areas in the local community. 7 4 In line with the National Planning Policy Framework, a Flood Risk Assessment may be required for development which falls within a Flood Zone. 8 5 NPPF states that infrastructure must come first, yet the outline ideas to provide infrastructure are either not in place or are no timeline in advance of the proposed developments. There are currently no plans to develop new healthcare or improved infrastructure with these significant scale extensions of population. The area south of the proposed land suffers from flooding and this will only be compounded by the development of 190 new homes. 9 6 Although the relevant now falls outside of a Flood Risk Zone the topology of the site indicates that the runoff from both of the sites will add to the already present flood risk areas within the Environment Agency flood risk zone. 10 7 Building on a flood plain that has trees, grass & plants that naturally help absorb water via roots systems when removed will have a huge impact. 11 8 When considering the Environment Agency's flood risk survey for the area the development of the 190 houses will be built on neighbouring high to medium risk flood and risks compounding the flood risk in the area. 12 9 NPPF 162. States that the planning system should support the transition to net zero by 2050 and take full account of all climate impacts including overheating, water scarcity, storm and flood risks and coastal change. It should help to: shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimise vulnerability and improve resilience; encourage the reuse of existing resources, including the conversion of existing buildings; and support renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure. The development of 190 houses on land south west of Draycott totally contradicts this statement as this land was previously within flood risk 1 zone, and experiences significant flooding throughout the year. This development will further compound this issues. 13 10 NPPF 170. States that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future). Where 50 development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Yet the land south west of Draycott experiences significant flooding throughout

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Sean Peace	Response-01347	the year with many residents on Lime Grove not able to obtain flood risk damage cover as a consequence. 14 11 NPPF 173. States that a sequential risk-based approach should also be taken to individual applications in areas known to be at risk now or in future from any form of flooding, by following the steps set out below. Can the EBC advise why on the eve of the original consultation meeting held on 27th March 2025 by EBC, it was advised that the flood risk zone for the land south west of Draycott had been reclassified and the information within the public domain, e.g. EA Flood Risk Plan, was out of date. Was this a coincidence and can the EBC advise why the risk zone for this land has now changed when the land still floods. 15 12 NPPF 174. States that within this context the aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding. The strategic flood risk assessment will provide the basis for applying this test. Yet the land south west of Draycott was recently within a Flood Risk Zone.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Simon Jenkins	Response-01287	The land next to us floods every winter without fail, but has not come into our land as yet. If this goes ahead, and they are built slightly above ours and we flood , our Lawyer will be knocking on your door. Some idiot at Long Eaton said it was not flood risk anymore. Come and have a look in about November, and you will see what we mean.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	S M Beresford	Response-01851	Minimal liaison has been undertaken by EBC with Severn Trent regarding drainage and water management arrangements for the Draycott site. Draycott residents experience multiyear flooding events, and this development will further compound flooding issues. More investigation is needed to determine why this known flood location site is suitable for development. A Flood Risk Assessment should be requested for developments within a Flood Zone. Our house Insurance costs us more as we have an additional charge as we live on a flood plane by RIAS insurance. This was only renewed in 27th February this year, so if we are no longer on flood plane why did this not come up in February upon renewal ! We often get flood warnings from the environment agency,yellow, amber, and a couple of Red warnings.... Does that mean we are no longer on a flood plane as the council has changed the map!! But the river hasn't moved!!
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Stephanie Ashley-Lane	Response-01380	There is lots of flooding that already affects houses around this building area. The houses built will be at risk as well as pushing the water to existing homes
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Susan Baker	Response-01316	This land floods. Always has. Residents on Lime Grove know this all too well. The development will make it worse. The council's engagement with Severn Trent has been minimal, and the reclassification of flood zones just days before consultation began is deeply suspicious. We need a proper flood risk assessment?not vague reassurances.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Susan Foster	Response-00824	The proposed site is prone to flooding and the River Derwent flood bank is there for a reason. I'm sure that the river Derwent will end up as one big sewer and all that it entails, there has been so much about contamination from various sources and pollution in the news recently, you will just be adding to it.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Teresa Batchelor	Response-01240	As this area has always been known for flooding, it is concerning that it is thought suitable for housing. I believe some residents in Draycott find it difficult, if not impossible, to get adequate insurance cover because of the flooding issues. That being the case, how are the new home owners going to get insurance? Are builders going to ensure that the homes they are building, and hopefully selling, will be insurable at a sensible premium? And if so many houses are being built, will this force the flood waters to other areas, affecting existing residents even more? This should be seriously investigated.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Teresa Shaw	Response-01309	1. The site in Breaston & Draycott will flood - that is a fact no matter what the latest reports suddenly state. You can see the massive lake like puddles when it rains heavily from Derby Road. The graves flood at Breaston cemetery. Affordably, cheap and quickly made houses on unsuitable land is a risk. Why is flooding be dismissed when it's a serious consideration and problem? 2. Severn Trent are continually out fixing burst pipes and local water issues. They are constantly in the news and have little credibility. What insurance's & checks will be done to check they are not cutting corners and can support this infrastructure upgrade. 3. Draycott's plans is close to a River what precautions have been taken to ensure residence children are safe?
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Tim Hawkins	Response-00661	The development is partially on the flood plain and in an area of high surface water, no matter how generous the various agencies reinterpret the flood zone data. If this natural flow is blocked or diverted the water will go somewhere, either in the neighbouring housing, the storm/sewage system or further down the river. Of all the places that could have been chosen around the village this is the worst, short of building it next to the river bank. Will the new houses be able to insure for flood damage? Unlikely, even existing houses nearby struggle for that type of cover.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Tony burton	Response-01382	Where will the flood water end up further down river
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Tracey Morton	Response-00968	1 The proposed site and area around it suffers from significant flooding every year, this year being the worst 2 houses on lime grove Draycott suffer heavy flooding resulting in insurance companies removing flooding cover, some having to raise there gardens 3 It's flood zone 2/3 by the foi received from the environment agency 4 removing trees and hedges for development with increase the flooding 5 Flooding will also be increased when pythons are put it 6 development and pythons will act like a damm and push flood waters somewhere else 7 planning officers tried to say risk was lower at ebc meeting on 27 th March , the review I received was ted28 th of March (2)
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	T Shields	Response-00570	The site is wholly within Flood Zone 1 (the lowest risk of flooding incidences) according to the flood risk maps available online. On that basis the site is an acceptable location.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Viv Wright	Response-00035	Our garden already floods if we have heavy rain, the greenbelt and flood plain areas are essential to reduce flooding in our area and protect properties that are Insitu.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	Wilfred Boone	Response-01424	NPPF 174. States that within this context the aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding. The strategic flood risk assessment will provide the basis for applying this test. Yet the land south west of Draycott was recently within a Flood Risk Zone. NPPF 173. States that a sequential risk-based approach should also be taken to individual applications in areas known to be at risk now or in future from any form of flooding, by following the steps set out below. Can the EBC advise why on the eve of the original consultation meeting held on 27th March 2025 by EBC, it was advised that the flood risk zone for the land south west of Draycott had been reclassified and the information within the public domain, e.g. EA Flood Risk Plan, was out of date. Was this a coincidence and can the EBC advise why the risk zone for this land has now changed when the land still floods.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	William Batchelor	Response-01210	land proposed has flooded previously (in last 10 years) and insurance is already constrained by the flood risk. Why would anyone buy a house they can't insure? if extra flood protection is added as a compulsory requirement for developers, where does the water now flood and who is impacted downstream?
1.14	South West of Draycott	Flooding / Drainage	zak butcher	Response-01156	From the correspondence received from the EBC which was in answer to an FOI request. We can see that minimal liaison has been undertaken by the EBC planning team with Severn Trent when appraising the prospective Draycott site drainage and water management arrangements, and only four quite generic questions were asked by EBC in January 2025. It is clear from this evidence that EBC is not taking seriously the flood issues that Draycott residents experience annually with the houses on Lime Grove that back onto the land south west of Draycott experiencing significant flooding which impacts gardens and foul sewerage networks. More investigation needs to be undertaken by EBC as to why this site is not suitable for development. Increase flooding risk to the area. The houses that back onto the land South West of Draycott have experienced significant flooding and this development will further compound this flooding. In line with the National Planning Policy Framework, a Flood Risk Assessment may be required for development which falls within a Flood Zone. NPPF 173. States that a sequential risk-based approach should also be taken to individual applications in areas known to be at risk now or in future from any form of flooding, by following the steps set out below. Can the EBC advise why on the eve of the original consultation meeting held on 27th March 2025 by EBC, it was advised that the flood risk zone for the land south west of Draycott had been reclassified and the information within the public domain, e.g. EA Flood Risk Plan, was out of date. Was this a coincidence and can the EBC advise why the risk zone for this land has now changed when the land still floods. NPPF 174. States that within this context the aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding. The strategic flood risk assessment will provide the basis for applying this test. Yet the land south west of Draycott was recently within a Flood Risk Zone.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	adrian leeming	Response-01249	NPPF states Green Belt serves five purposes which are to; check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another; safeguard the countryside from encroachment; preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and assist urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The land to south west of Draycott meets all of this criteria and not only prevents urban sprawl but sets to preserve the countryside's open character and the enhancement of recreational opportunities for local residents. The NPPF includes an overarching objective to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment, including making effective use of land. Therefore, existing Brownfield sites within the EBC should be prioritised first over using Green Belt land. Understand there is need for new housing but there are an abundance of brownfield, previously developed sites that the developers and council should explore before this location. Of the 109 existing Brownfield sites in the EBC 8 of these are over 1H each giving a combined total of 15.29H. The land South West of Draycott is c.8H. These 8 sites alone will allow 514 net dwelling to be built. These sites should be prioritised for development before the Greenbelt land to the south west of Draycott is considered and lost forever. It was previously thought that the land of the former Stanton Ironworks was taken out of the EBCs core strategy due to contamination that rendered the site unusable. Yet a recent Freedom of Information (FOI) request which was answered by EBC has advised the site is indeed to be utilised and has been allocated 1000 houses. Can EBC please advise if the status of the Stanton Ironworks sites and if this is included within the Core Strategy and how the planned 1000 houses impacts the Greenbelt review and use of Greenbelt land. "NPPF 2. States it has three objectives to enable sustainable development. The third of these is an environmental objective ? to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy. The EBCs proposal of reclassifying the land South West of Draycott from Greenbelt to Greybelt land does not meet this objective and will actually achieve the total opposite. NPPF 4. States that local planning authorities should approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way. They should use the full range of planning tools available, including brownfield registers and permission in principle, and work proactively with applicants to secure developments that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. EBC needs to demonstrate what appraisals have been undertaken on the 109 Brownfield sites as detailed within their own Brownfield Register, and why these sites have not been prioritised for development over the identified Green Belt land. NPPF 13. Protecting Green Belt Land:- The government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt is to keep land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. This is an inappropriate development in the Green Belt and there is NO evidence of the appraisals that have been undertaken

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Julian Leeming	Response-01249	on existing Brownfield sites within EBC which there are 109 with 8 of these giving over 51H and the opportunity to develop over 500 dwellings. NPPF 20. States that the target level of housing development within the plans should be capped in line with the capacity of Brownfield sites to accommodate it, to protect Green Belt yet these plans significantly exceed it. NPPF 143. The Green Belt serves 5 purposes: 1) To stop urban sprawl 2) To stop towns merging 3) To safeguard from encroachment onto the countryside 4) To preserve special settings, character and history 5) To ensure the recycling of derelict or Brownfield land. The proposals being made by EBC to reclassify existing Green Belt land to the south west of Draycott does not meet any of these 5 purposes and actually looks to achieve the total opposite. Furthermore, no apparent attempt has been made by EBC to demonstrate why the 109 existing Brownfield sites within EBC have not been prioritised over this Green Belt land. NPPF 144. States before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, the strategic policy-making authority should be able to demonstrate that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development. No attempt has been made by the authority to explore existing Brownfield sites or underutilised land within the EBC. NPPF 146. The applicant and authority MUST make as much use as possible of Brownfield Sites and underutilised land; AND PROVE that there is nothing left before encroaching on the Green Belt. ? There is no PROOF of the authority discussing with neighbouring authorities about whether they could accommodate some of the identified need for this development, in order not to use the Green Belt. NPPF 150. Once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity. NPPF 152. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. This application does not demonstrate any exceptional circumstances. NPPF 153. 'Very Special Circumstances'? have to be proven i.e. all other options exhausted to classify this application as a ?very special circumstance?. We cannot see any evidence that this has taken place. Therefore, it is an inappropriate application and proposal and does not demonstrate exceptional circumstances. NPPF 156. The proposed development of 190 houses to the land south west of Draycott when located in the Green Belt, must demonstrate exceptional circumstances and are inappropriate unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated. "
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Alastair Dundas	Response-01200	We need to prioritise brown field and grey belt for the development before the green belt is taken from our village.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Alison Bowley	Response-01174	I wasn't aware during the general election that Green Belt land was under threat. (My vote would have been very different if I had). Existing brownfield sites (109 within EBC), must be prioritised for future housing needs. When people deliberately choose to settle permanently in a rural area they do not expect the rules to be literally torn up and Green Belt land destroyed.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Alison Thirlwall	Response-01390	NPPF states that existing Brown Field and Grey Belt sites are to be prioritised over the development of Green Field and certainly Green Belt sites, but these plans offer up Green Belt in advance of Brown Field site development. NPPF 143. The Green Belt serves 5 purposes: 1) To stop urban sprawl 2) To stop towns merging 3) To safeguard from encroachment onto the countryside 4) To preserve special settings, character and history 5) To ensure the recycling of derelict or Brownfield land. The proposals being made by EBC to reclassify existing Green Belt land to the south west of Draycott does not meet any of these 5 purposes and actually looks to achieve the total opposite. Furthermore, no apparent attempt has been made by EBC to demonstrate why the 109 existing Brownfield sites within EBC have not been prioritised over this Green Belt land.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Andrew and Jane Gilmour	Response-01329	NPPF states that existing Brown Field and Grey Belt sites are to be prioritised over the development of Green Field and certainly Green Belt sites, but these plans offer up Green Belt in advance of Brown Field site development. NPPF states that Green Belt is to be protected and requires exceptional circumstances to be built on. There is nothing exceptional about the council's plans to build on un-spoilt, Green Belt land to meet their current housing target when existing Brownfield sites exist. NPPF states Green Belt serves five purposes which are to; check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another; safeguard the countryside from encroachment; preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and assist urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The land to south west of Draycott meets all of this criteria and not only prevents urban sprawl but sets to preserve the countryside's open character and the enhancement of recreational opportunities for local residents. The NPPF includes an overarching objective to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment, including making effective use of land. Therefore, existing Brownfield sites within the EBC should be prioritised first over using Green Belt land. "NPPF states where major development involving the provision of housing is proposed on land released from the Green Belt through plan preparation or review, or on sites in the Green Belt subject to a planning application, the following contributions (?Golden Rules?) should be made: - necessary improvements to local or national infrastructure; and - the provision of new, or improvements to existing, green spaces that are accessible to the public. New residents should be able to access good quality green spaces within a short walk of their home, whether through onsite provision or through access to offsite spaces. The proposal to remove the parcels of land as identified from Green Belt status and the development of 190 homes will mean access to green spaces for existing residents will be less accessible, and no plans or provisions have been made to improve local infrastructure. We are not aware that any discussion has been undertaken by the authority to with neighbouring authorities on whether they can accommodate the development need through existing Brown Field or Grey Belt land. " It was previously thought that the land of the former Stanton Ironworks was taken out of the EBCs core strategy due to contamination that rendered the site unusable. Yet a recent Freedom of Information (FOI) request which was answered by EBC has advised the site is indeed to be utilised and has been allocated 1000 houses. Can EBC please advise of the status of the Stanton Ironworks sites and if this is included within the Core Strategy and how the planned 1000 houses impacts the Greenbelt review and use of Greenbelt land. NPPF 153. 'Very Special Circumstances? have to be proven i.e. all other options exhausted to classify this application as a 'very special circumstance?. We cannot see any evidence that this has taken place. Therefore, it is an inappropriate application and proposal and does not demonstrate exceptional circumstances. NPPF 156. The proposed development of 190 houses to the land south west of Draycott when located in the Green Belt, must demonstrate exceptional circumstances and are inappropriate unless very special cir
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	A Northeast	Response-01848	cumstances can be demonstrated. EBC should be protecting Green Belt land. The Green Belt and green fields should remain open and safe, preserving public rights of way and access to local green spaces. The Draycott footpaths are in constant use, providing villagers easy access to a countryside environment. This land is rural in character, offering a tranquil and transitional landscape between Daycott Parish, Borrowwash, and Breaston. All these villages are impacted by the proposal to reclassify Green Belt to Grey Belt for housing development. While there is a need for housing, the NPPF states that existing Brownfield and Grey Belt sites should be prioritized over Green Belt sites. There are 109 existing Brownfield sites within EBC, equating to 81 hectares, with 103 of these having full planning permission. These sites should be prioritized for development before Green Belt land is considered. The NPPF states that Green Belt is to be protected and requires exceptional circumstances for development. There is nothing exceptional about the council plans to build on unspoilt Green Belt land to meet their housing target when existing Brownfield sites are available. The land south west of Draycott meets all the criteria for Green Belt purposes, preventing urban sprawl, preserving the countryside's open character, and enhancing recreational opportunities for local residents. Changing this land to Grey Belt and developing 190 homes will negatively impact the remaining Green Belt land with overcapacity and increased population density.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Anthony Bradley Anthony Lawton-Reeve	Response-01442 Response-00971	This is designated green belt, use the grey sites that are Erewash before compromising green belt. Protecting Green Belt land, this land should be kept open and unharmed. NPPF states that Green Belt is to be protected and requires exceptional circumstances to be built on. There is nothing exceptional about the council's plans to build on un-spoilt, Green Belt land to meet their current housing target when existing Brownfield sites exist. The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Anthony Walsh	Response-00992	Recognise the loss of the ecology in the area and the importance of the flora, fauna and wildlife. Unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape. This is a colossal development which is not appropriate for the location chosen. The development will negatively impact the ecology, wildlife and beauty of the area. The taking away of grazing/arable land and the disruption for the wildlife. These decisions are irreversible, and our children will have less open countryside to explore and play in. Losing safe connecting space between locations. This when existing and available Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised over Greenbelt. Recognise the loss of the ecology in the area and the importance of the flora, fauna and wildlife. Unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape. This is a colossal development which is not appropriate for the location chosen. The development will negatively impact the ecology, wildlife and beauty of the area. The taking away of grazing/arable land and the disruption for the wildlife. These decisions are irreversible, and our children will have less open countryside to explore and play in. Losing safe connecting space between locations. This when existing and available Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised over Greenbelt. NPPF 151. States that once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. This development will remove existing green spaces forever which residents currently have access to including footpath, walks and visual vistas and spatial openness. NPPF 192. States that to protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity. The land south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of trees and wildlife including squirrels and badgers. The development on this land will kill wildlife and destroy historic trees and wildlife in the area. This is reckless when existing Brownfield sites existing in EBC which should be used first before Green Belt. "NPPF 2. States it has three objectives to enable sustainable development. The third of these is an environmental objective ? to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy. The EBCs proposal of reclassifying the land South West of Draycott from Greenbelt to Greenbelt land does not meet this objective and will actually achieve the total opposite. "
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Avice Boyle	Response-01427	NPPF refers to Grey Belt as areas of previously developed land or other land that do not strongly contribute to Green Belt purposes, The land south west of Draycott is neither of these and strongly contributes towards Green Belt purposes as it acts as a buffer, safeguards the countryside and acts as a barrier to urban sprawl. NPPF states Green Belt serves five purposes which are to; check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another; safeguard the countryside from encroachment; preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and assist urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The land to south west of Draycott meets all of this criteria and not only prevents urban sprawl but sets to preserve the countryside?s open character and the enhancement of recreational opportunities for local residents. "NPPF states where major development involving the provision of housing is proposed on land released from the Green Belt through plan preparation or review, or on sites in the Green Belt subject to a planning application, the following contributions (?Golden Rules?) should be made: - necessary improvements to local or national infrastructure; and - the provision of new, or improvements to existing, green spaces that are accessible to the public. New residents should be able to access good quality green spaces within a short walk of their home, whether through onsite provision or through access to offsite spaces. The proposal to remove the parcels of land as identified from Green Belt status and the development of 190 homes will mean access to green spaces for existing residents will be less accessible, and no plans or provisions have been made to improve local infrastructure. We are not aware that any discussion has been undertaken by the authority to with neighbouring authorities on whether they can accommodate the development need through existing Brown Field or Grey Belt land. " Footpaths, the Amenity and enjoyment of the use of these pathways which cross through and around this site which provide an important means by which residents of the local villages can get access to the countryside with substantial benefits for their physical and mental health as well as providing means of sustainable transport. The development on the land south west of Draycott for the people of Draycott and other areas, will have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, replacing green space with 190 houses.
			Barbara Crane	Response-00268	Why is green belt being targetted? Brownfield sites should be used first.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Ben Kassoul	Response-01024	Reclassifying the green belt to a category suitable for building housing on, rather than utilising existing brownfield sites available to the council, is a permanent detriment to Draycott's biodiversity and local flora and fauna.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Ben Marshall	Response-01212	Footpaths, the Amenity and enjoyment of the use of these pathways which cross through and around this site which provide an important means by which residents of the local villages can get access to the countryside with substantial benefits for their physical and mental health as well as providing means of sustainable transport. The development on the land south west of Draycott for the people of Draycott and other areas, will have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, replacing green space with 190 houses.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Bernadette Rothwell	Response-00998	Green belt is conservation of our beautiful countryside. What brown belt sites have been looked at, these should have been first I understand?

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Bev Marvell	Response-01892	I object to this policy. This Green Belt, off Derby Road, Draycott, should not be redefined as Grey Belt in order to develop it for housing. This Green Belt is particularly valuable because it is on the immediate fringe of a significant urban area, and has helped to retain this land as open and hence a valuable resource. It offers open countryside down to the river Derwent and is publicly accessible allowing outdoor recreation for large numbers of people in urban Draycott. The Local Government Association - Planning Advisory Service says that purposes of Green Belt are: ? to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas - Yes this does. ? to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another - Yes this does. ? to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment - Yes this does. This Green Belt land does play a strong role in fulfilling its core purposes, and so is not Grey Belt.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Bradley Peace	Response-01348	Recognise the loss of the ecology in the area and the importance of the flora, fauna and wildlife. 5 2 Unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape. 6 3 This is a colossal development which is not appropriate for the location chosen. The development will negatively impact the ecology, wildlife and beauty of the area. 7 4 The taking away of grazing/arable land and the disruption for the wildlife. 8 5 These decisions are irreversible, and our children will have less open countryside to explore and play in. Losing safe connecting space between locations. This when existing and available Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised over Greenbelt. 9 6 Recognise the loss of the ecology in the area and the importance of the flora, fauna and wildlife. There is an opinion that the deer fencing would devalue the area of open farmland and public right of way. 10 7 This is a colossal development which is not appropriate for the location chosen. The development will negatively impact the ecology, wildlife and beauty of the area. 11 8 The land to the south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of wildlife from birds, foxes, hedgehogs and squirrels and the development of 190 homes will mean the death of many different animals and the destruction of this mature natural habitat. 12 9 These plans plus the plans for National Grid to install super pylons only circa 600 meters away means the south west area of Draycott, will be hugely impacted from both a conservation and natural environment perspective. This area of the village will be unrealistically overburdened with development on Green Belt and green spaces. 13 10 Following the excavation of the adjacent Derby Road to Draycott canal water voles were discovered and remedial action was taken during this work to prevent endangerment of this wildlife. When considering the adjacent development of 190 houses and the heavy and sustained construction traffic during the life cycle of the development, this will likely force this and other wildlife to relocate from the area. 14 11 Historical badger sett on part of the site to the Victorian tip at the bridge of Nooning Lane. 15 12 The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the village of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. 16 13 To safeguard and enhance biodiversity (including BAP Habitats and Species) and geodiversity and improve connectivity between, and access to, green spaces and functional habitats. This area forms a green corridor and houses a number of RED LIST species 17 14 The proposed site south west of Draycott and the second phase of the development which would mean that in addition to the initial 190 houses, the development of an additional c70 dwellings would be undertaken on the identified safeguarded land on Banksfield Farm, would result in the removal of several TPO trees which contribute to the visual amenity of the area. The removal of these trees would detri
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Bradley Peace	Response-01348	mentally impact upon Lime Grove and Derby Road character and appearance. 18 15 NPPF 151. States that once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. This development will remove existing green spaces forever which residents currently have access to including footpath, walks and visual vistas and spatial openness. 19 16 NPPF 192. States that to protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity. The land south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of trees and wildlife including squirrels and badgers. The development on this land will kill wildlife and destroy historic trees and wildlife in the area. This is reckless when existing Brownfield sites existing in EBC which should be used first before Green Belt. 20 17 NPPF 2. States it has three objectives to enable sustainable development. The third of these is an environmental objective ? to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy. The EBCs proposal of reclassifying the land South West of Draycott from Greenbelt to Greenbelt land does not meet this objective and will actually achieve the total opposite.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Caroline and John Thirwell	Response-01001	The green belt should be protected at all costs. It is our buffer between urban life and the countryside. Everyone can see that too much development between Borrowwash, Draycott, Breaston and Long Eaton will lead to an uninterrupted urban sprawl. We understand the need for housing for the young people in our community but we have been informed that there are plenty of brown field sites in the EBC's jurisdiction and that a high proportion of them already have planning permission for housing. It is surely much more in keeping with the NPPF guidelines to use these sites for housing development than destroy green belt land forever.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Charlotte Brennan	Response-00931	Green Belt serves five purposes which are to; check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another; safeguard the countryside from encroachment; preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and assist urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The land to south west of Draycott meets all of this criteria and not only prevents urban sprawl but sets to preserve the countryside?s open character and the enhancement of recreational opportunities for local residents.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Colin & Cynthia Green	Response-00922	Green belt for us council tax payers if we were to ask to extend on say, would be denied I?m sure but how come EBC/Government can do just this? Plenty of brownfield areas in Erewash area could be used but no, Greenbelt, which you now call Greybelt which has been overturned by council officials. Once greenbelt has gone, it?s gone forever. Also the proposed Pylons due to come through will be affected on this planning, madness again.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Dale Longmuir	Response-01543	The land is a key feature of draycott introducing wildlife and a clean space you will destroy so much and there is much more suitable land to build on do not ruin such a nice area! "NPPF states where major development involving the provision of housing is proposed on land released from the Green Belt through plan preparation or review, or on sites in the Green Belt subject to a planning application, the following contributions (?Golden Rules?) should be made: - necessary improvements to local or national infrastructure; and - the provision of new, or improvements to existing, green spaces that are accessible to the public. New residents should be able to access good quality green spaces within a short walk of their home, whether through onsite provision or through access to offsite spaces. The proposal to remove the parcels of land as identified from Green Belt status and the development of 190 homes will mean access to green spaces for existing residents will be less accessible, and no plans or provisions have been made to improve local infrastructure. We are not aware that any discussion has been undertaken by the authority to with neighbouring authorities on whether they can accommodate the development need through existing Brown Field or Grey Belt land. "
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	David and Mary Murden	Response-01898	We are confused and concerned about the decision to build on existing Green Belt land. We know that the government have suggested that existing Green belt which is not in agricultural use, such as car parking areas, small business sites etc should be considered re-assigning as Grey belt, but the fields that are under consideration in Draycott have continually been in agricultural use, the field behind our house having been sown with Spring Barley only this April. Food security for our country is very important and we know that it is increasingly under threat as other countries change their priorities and their marketing strategies. We understand that elsewhere, in Erewash, there are Brownfields sites and other more obvious 'Grey belt' sites which we think should be considered before encroaching on agricultural land.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	David and Nicala O'Leary	Response-00822	This proposal represents a serious and irreversible threat to our countryside, environment, infrastructure, and the identity of the village of Draycott. Once lost, Green Belt land cannot be recovered. It is vital that we protect it, not only for its environmental and recreational value, but also to prevent the unchecked urban sprawl that this development would undoubtedly accelerate. Draycott, Breaston, and Borrowash are currently distinct communities; this development risks merging them and eroding their unique character. In planning policy terms, this proposal fails to meet the criteria set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2023). Paragraph 140 makes clear that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. Paragraphs 149?150 reinforce that inappropriate development in the Green Belt should not be approved except in very special circumstances. No such circumstances have been demonstrated here. Furthermore, the Council has not shown that it has exhausted all available brownfield and non-Green Belt options, nor that it meets the required five-year housing land supply threshold necessary before Green Belt release can even be considered.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	David Atchison	Response-01247	Protecting Green Belt land, this land should be kept open and unharmed. NPPF 153. 'Very Special Circumstances? have to be proven i.e. all other options exhausted to classify this application as a ?very special circumstance?. We cannot see any evidence that this has taken place. Therefore, it is an inappropriate application and proposal and does not demonstrate exceptional circumstances. NPPF states that existing Brown Field and Grey Belt sites are to be prioritised over the development of Green Field and certainly Green Belt sites, but these plans offer up Green Belt in advance of Brown Field site development. It is the wrong model in the wrong place to deliver housing needs being of a scale that is ultimately detrimental to the local landscape and will harm the countryside, wildlife and impact irreversibly upon the area. This when there are 109 existing Brownfield sites within the EBC that should be prioritised first over Green Belt land.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	David Boyle	Response-01426	Protecting Green Belt land, this land should be kept open and unharmed Protecting public rights of way and access, a large number of footpaths would be affected NPPF states that Green Belt is to be protected and requires exceptional circumstances to be built on. There is nothing exceptional about the council's plans to build on un-spoilt, Green Belt land to meet their current housing target when existing Brownfield sites exist. Great weight should be given to the findings and recommendations of independent Landscape Quality Assessment NPPF states Green Belt serves five purposes which are to; check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another; safeguard the countryside from encroachment; preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and assist urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The land to south west of Draycott meets all of this criteria and not only prevents urban sprawl but sets to preserve the countryside?s open character and the enhancement of recreational opportunities for local residents.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	David G York	Response-01843	EBC should be protecting Green Belt land. The Green Belt and green fields should remain open and safe, preserving public rights of way and access to local green spaces. The Draycott footpaths are in constant use, providing villagers easy access to a countryside environment. This land is rural in character, offering a tranquil and transitional landscape between Draycott Parish, Borrowwash, and Breaston. All these villages are impacted by the proposal to reclassify Green Belt to Grey Belt for housing development. While there is a need for housing, the NPPF states that existing Brownfield and Grey Belt sites should be prioritized over Green Belt sites. There are 109 existing Brownfield sites within EBC, equating to 81 hectares, with 103 of these having full planning permission. These sites should be prioritized for development before Green Belt land is considered. The NPPF states that Green Belt is to be protected and requires exceptional circumstances for development. There is nothing exceptional about the council plans to build on unspoilt Green Belt land to meet their housing target when existing Brownfield sites are available. The land south west of Draycott meets all the criteria for Green Belt purposes, preventing urban sprawl, preserving the countryside's open character, and enhancing recreational opportunities for local residents. Changing this land to Grey Belt and developing 190 homes will negatively impact the remaining Green Belt land with overcapacity and increased population density.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	David Thompson	Response-00654	Our greenbelt should be protected as much as possible. Draycott is already under the threat of the Chesterfield to Willington National Grid Pylon scheme and this proposal adds to that.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	David Thurgood	Response-01195	Of the 109 existing Brownfield sites in the EBC 8 of these are over 1H each giving a combined total of 15.29H. The land South West of Draycott is approximately 8H. These 8 sites alone will allow 514 net dwellings to be built. These sites should be prioritised for development before the Greenbelt land to the south west of Draycott is considered and lost forever.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	David Webster	Response-01113	NPPF states that existing Brown Field and Grey Belt sites are to be prioritised over the development of Green Field and certainly Green Belt sites, but these plans offer up Green Belt in advance of Brown Field site development. NPPF states that Green Belt is to be protected and requires exceptional circumstances to be built on. There is nothing exceptional about the council's plans to build on un-spoilt, Green Belt land to meet their current housing target when existing Brownfield sites exist. Great weight should be given to the findings and recommendations of independent Landscape Quality Assessment NPPF states Green Belt serves five purposes which are to; check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another; safeguard the countryside from encroachment; preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and assist urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The land to south west of Draycott meets all of this criteria and not only prevents urban sprawl but sets to preserve the countryside's open character and the enhancement of recreational opportunities for local residents. The NPPF includes an overarching objective to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment, including making effective use of land. Therefore, existing Brownfield sites within the EBC should be prioritised first over using Green Belt land. NPPF refers to Grey Belt as areas of previously developed land or other land that do not strongly contribute to Green Belt purposes, The land south west of Draycott is neither of these and strongly contributes towards Green Belt purposes as it acts as a buffer, safeguards the countryside and acts as a barrier to urban sprawl.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Dexter Codrington	Response-00986	I am strongly against this development. It is the wrong location . EBC should be protecting Green Belt land. The Green Belt and green fields should remain open and safe, preserving public rights of way and access to local green spaces. The Draycott footpaths are in constant use, providing villagers easy access to a countryside environment. This land is rural in character, offering a tranquil and transitional landscape between Draycott Parish, Borrowwash, and Breaston. All these villages are impacted by the proposal to reclassify Green Belt to Grey Belt for housing development. While there is a need for housing, the NPPF states that existing Brownfield and Grey Belt sites should be prioritized over Green Belt sites. There are 109 existing Brownfield sites within EBC, equating to 81 hectares, with 103 of these having full planning permission. These sites should be prioritized for development before Green Belt land is considered. The NPPF states that Green Belt is to be protected and requires exceptional circumstances for development. There is nothing exceptional about the council's plans to build on unspoilt Green Belt land to meet their housing target when existing Brownfield sites are available. The land south west of Draycott meets all the criteria for Green Belt purposes, preventing urban sprawl, preserving the countryside's open character, and enhancing recreational opportunities for local residents. Changing this land to Grey Belt and developing 190 homes will negatively impact the remaining Green Belt land with overcapacity and increased population density.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Diane Webster	Response-01177	Great weight should be given to the findings and recommendations of independent Landscape Quality Assessment NPPF states Green Belt serves five purposes which are to; check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another; safeguard the countryside from encroachment; preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and assist urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The land to south west of Draycott meets all of this criteria and not only prevents urban sprawl but sets to preserve the countryside's open character and the enhancement of recreational opportunities for local residents. The NPPF includes an overarching objective to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment, including making effective use of land. Therefore, existing Brownfield sites within the EBC should be prioritised first over using Green Belt land. NPPF refers to Grey Belt as areas of previously developed land or other land that do not strongly contribute to Green Belt purposes, The land south west of Draycott is neither of these and strongly contributes towards Green Belt purposes as it acts as a buffer, safeguards the countryside and acts as a barrier to urban sprawl. NPPF states that in exceptional circumstances authorities should review Green Belt boundaries in accordance with the policies in this Framework and propose alterations to meet these needs in full, unless the review provides clear evidence that doing so would fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt. Changing the land south west of Draycott to Grey Belt and the development of 190 homes will negatively impact the remaining Green Belt land with overcapacity and increased population density. Working on the current population of Draycott, 190 new homes will be an at least 17% increase in population. This land is rural in character, providing a tranquil transitional landscape between the rural areas of Draycott Parish and Borrowash and other villages surrounding it of Breaston and Borrowash. "NPPF states where major development involving the provision of housing is proposed on land released from the Green Belt through plan preparation or review, or on sites in the Green Belt subject to a planning application, the following contributions (?Golden Rules?) should be made: - necessary improvements to local or national infrastructure; and - the provision of new, or improvements to existing, green spaces that are accessible to the public. New residents should be able to access good quality green spaces within a short walk of their home, whether through onsite provision or through access to offsite spaces. The proposal to remove the parcels of land as identified from Green Belt status and the development of 190 homes will mean access to green spaces for existing residents will be less accessible, and no plans or provisions have been made to improve local infrastructure. We are not aware that any discussion has been undertaken by the authority to with neighbouring authorities on whether they can accommodate the development need through existing Brown Field or Grey Belt land. " NPPF states the development of homes, commercial and other development in the Green Belt should not be regarded as inappropriate where the development would utilise Grey Belt land and would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Bel
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Diane Webster	Response-01177	t across the area of the plan. It is clear the authority is now altering existing and acceptable Green Belt land to suit this paragraph/approach of the NPPF by converting it to Grey Belt. This is both hasty and reckless. Footpaths, the Amenity and enjoyment of the use of these pathways which cross through and around this site which provide an important means by which residents of the local villages can get access to the countryside with substantial benefits for their physical and mental health as well as providing means of sustainable transport. The development on the land south west of Draycott for the people of Draycott and other areas, will have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, replacing green space with 190 houses. The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. It is the wrong model in the wrong place to deliver housing needs being of a scale that is ultimately detrimental to the local landscape and will harm the countryside, wildlife and impact irreversibly upon the area. This when there are 109 existing Brownfield sites within the EBC that should be prioritised first over Green Belt land. Understand there is need for new housing but there are an abundance of brownfield, previously developed sites that the developers and council should explore before this location. There are 109 existing Brownfield sites in EBC giving 81H with 103 of these having full planning permission. These sites should be prioritised first for development before Greenbelt land is considered. Of the 109 existing Brownfield sites in the EBC 8 of these are over 1H each giving a combined total of 15.29H. The land South West of Draycott is c.8H. These 8 sites alone will allow 514 net dwelling to be built. These sites should be prioritised for development before the Greenbelt land to the south west of Draycott is considered and lost forever.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Donna Butcher	Response-01155	Protecting Green Belt land, this land should be kept open and unharmed Protecting public rights of way and access, a large number of footpaths would be affected NPPF states that existing Brown Field and Grey Belt sites are to be prioritised over the development of Green Field and certainly Green Belt sites, but these plans offer up Green Belt in advance of Brown Field site development. NPPF states that Green Belt is to be protected and requires exceptional circumstances to be built on. There is nothing exceptional about the council's plans to build on un-spoilt, Green Belt land to meet their current housing target when existing Brownfield sites exist. Great weight should be given to the findings and recommendations of independent Landscape Quality Assessment The NPPF includes an overarching objective to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment, including making effective use of land. Therefore, existing Brownfield sites within the EBC should be prioritised first over using Green Belt land. NPPF refers to Grey Belt as areas of previously developed land or other land that do not strongly contribute to Green Belt purposes, The land south west of Draycott is neither of these and strongly contributes towards Green Belt purposes as it acts as a buffer, safeguards the countryside and acts as a barrier to urban sprawl. NPPF states that in exceptional circumstances authorities should review Green Belt boundaries in accordance with the policies in this Framework and propose alterations to meet these needs in full, unless the review provides clear evidence that doing so would fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt. Changing the land south west of Draycott to Grey Belt and the development of 190 homes will negatively impact the remaining Green Belt land with overcapacity and increased population density. Working on the current population of Draycott, 190 new homes will be an at least 17% increase in population. This land is rural in character, providing a tranquil transitional landscape between the rural areas of Draycott Parish and Borrowash and other villages surrounding it of Breaston and Borrowash. NPPF states the development of homes, commercial and other development in the Green Belt should not be regarded as inappropriate where the development would utilise Grey Belt land and would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan. It is clear the authority is now altering existing and acceptable Green Belt land to suit this paragraph/approach of the NPPF by converting it to Grey Belt. This is both hasty and reckless. Footpaths, the Amenity and enjoyment of the use of these pathways which cross through and around this site which provide an important means by which residents of the local villages can get access to the countryside with substantial benefits for their physical and mental health as well as providing means of sustainable transport. The development on the land south west of Draycott for the people of Draycott and other areas, will have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, replacing green space with 190 houses. The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Donna Butcher	Response-01155	an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. It is the wrong model in the wrong place to deliver housing needs being of a scale that is ultimately detrimental to the local landscape and will harm the countryside, wildlife and impact irreversibly upon the area. This when there are 109 existing Brownfield sites within the EBC that should be prioritised first over Green Belt land. Understand there is need for new housing but there are an abundance of brownfield, previously developed sites that the developers and council should explore before this location. There are 109 existing Brownfield sites in EBC giving 81H with 103 of these having full planning permission. These sites should be prioritised first for development before Greenbelt land is considered. Of the 109 existing Brownfield sites in the EBC 8 of these are over 1H each giving a combined total of 15.29H. The land South West of Draycott is c.8H. These 8 sites alone will allow 514 net dwelling to be built. These sites should be prioritised for development before the Greenbelt land to the south west of Draycott is considered and lost forever. It was previously thought that the land of the former Stanton Ironworks was taken out of the EBCs core strategy due to contamination that rendered the site unusable. Yet a recent Freedom of Information (FOI) request which was answered by EBC has advised the site is indeed to be utilised and has been allocated 1000 houses. Can EBC please advise if the status of the Stanton Ironworks sites and if this is included within the Core Strategy and how the planned 1000 houses impacts the Greenbelt review and use of Greenbelt land. NPPF states that existing Brown Field and Grey Belt sites are to be prioritised over the development of Green Field and certainly Green Belt sites, but these plans offer up Green Belt in advance of Brown Field site development. NPPF 4. States that local planning authorities should approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way. They should use the full range of planning tools available, including brownfield registers and permission in principle, and work proactively with applicants to secure developments that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. EBC needs to demonstrate what appraisals have been undertaken on the 109 Brownfield sites as detailed within their own Brownfield Register, and why these sites have not been prioritised for development over the identified Green Belt land. NPPF 13. Protecting Green Belt Land:- The government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt is to keep land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. This is an inappropriate development in the Green Belt and there is NO evidence of the appraisals that have been undertaken on existing Brownfield sites within EBC which there are 109 with 8 of these giving over 51H and the opportunity to develop over 500 dwellings. NPPF 146. The applicant and authority MUST make as much use as possible of Brownfield Sites and underutilised land; AND PROVE that there is nothing left before encroaching on the Green Belt.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Donna Butcher	Response-01155	? There is no PROOF of the authority discussing with neighbouring authorities about whether they could accommodate some of the identified need for this development, in order not to use the Green Belt. NPPF 152. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. This application does not demonstrate any exceptional circumstances.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Donna Peace	Response-01344	<p>1 Recognise the loss of the ecology in the area and the importance of the flora, fauna and wildlife. 5 2 Unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape. 6 3 This is a colossal development which is not appropriate for the location chosen. The development will negatively impact the ecology, wildlife and beauty of the area. 7 4 The taking away of grazing/arable land and the disruption for the wildlife. 8 5 These decisions are irreversible, and our children will have less open countryside to explore and play in. Losing safe connecting space between locations. This when existing and available Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised over Greenbelt. 9 6 Recognise the loss of the ecology in the area and the importance of the flora, fauna and wildlife. There is an opinion that the deer fencing would devalue the area of open farmland and public right of way. 10 7 This is a colossal development which is not appropriate for the location chosen. The development will negatively impact the ecology, wildlife and beauty of the area. 11 8 The land to the south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of wildlife from birds, foxes, hedgehogs and squirrels and the development of 190 homes will mean the death of many different animals and the destruction of this mature natural habitat. 12 9 These plans plus the plans for National Grid to install super pylons only circa 600 meters away means the south west area of Draycott, will be hugely impacted from both a conservation and natural environment perspective. This area of the village will be unrealistically overburdened with development on Green Belt and green spaces. 13 10 Following the excavation of the adjacent Derby Road to Draycott canal water voles were discovered and remedial action was taken during this work to prevent endangerment of this wildlife. When considering the adjacent development of 190 houses and the heavy and sustained construction traffic during the life cycle of the development, this will likely force this and other wildlife to relocate from the area. 14 11 Historical badger sett on part of the site to the Victorian tip at the bridge of Nooning Lane. 15 12 The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the village of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. 16 13 To safeguard and enhance biodiversity (including BAP Habitats and Species) and geodiversity and improve connectivity between, and access to, green spaces and functional habitats. This area forms a green corridor and houses a number of RED LIST species 17 14 The proposed site south west of Draycott and the second phase of the development which would mean that in addition to the initial 190 houses, the development of an additional c70 dwellings would be undertaken on the identified safeguarded land on Banksfield Farm, would result in the removal of several TPO trees which contribute to the visual amenity of the area. The removal of these trees would det</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Donna Peace	Response-01344	<p>rimentially impact upon Lime Grove and Derby Road character and appearance. 18 15 NPPF 151. States that once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. This development will remove existing green spaces forever which residents currently have access to including footpath, walks and visual vistas and spatial openness. 19 16 NPPF 192. States that to protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity. The land south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of trees and wildlife including squirrels and badgers. The development on this land will kill wildlife and destroy historic trees and wildlife in the area. This is reckless when existing Brownfield sites existing in EBC which should be used first before Green Belt. 20 17 NPPF 2. States it has three objectives to enable sustainable development. The third of these is an environmental objective ? to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy. The EBCs proposal of reclassifying the land South West of Draycott from Greenbelt to Greenbelt land does not meet this objective and will actually achieve the total opposite.</p>

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Douglas Walker	Response-00994	<p>It is clear from the EBC own policies and the NPPF that protecting Green Belt and Greenfield land that is of good quality is a key priority, yet these plans go totally against these policies. This land should be kept open, unharmed and REMAIN protected for future generations. Furthermore, NPPF 156. The proposed development of 190 houses to the land south west of Draycott when located in the Green Belt, must demonstrate exceptional circumstances and are inappropriate unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated. Can the EBC please advise what 'exceptional circumstances' have lead to the land south west of Draycott being identified for development and losing its Green Belt / Green Field classification ? The NPPF states that existing Brown Field and Grey Belt sites are to be prioritised over the development of Green Field and certainly Green Belt sites, but these plans offer up Green Belt in advance of Brown Field site development. The NPPF also states that Green Belt is to be protected and requires exceptional circumstances to be built on. There is nothing exceptional about the council's plans to build on un-spoilt, Green Belt land to meet their current housing target when existing Brownfield sites exist. Can the EBC please demonstrate what appraisals and outcomes have been undertaken on the existing Brownfield sites within EBC? The NPPF states Green Belt serves five purposes which are to; check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another; safeguard the countryside from encroachment; preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and assist urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The land to south west of Draycott meets all of this criteria and not only prevents urban sprawl but sets to preserve the countryside's open character and the enhancement of recreational opportunities for local residents. Can the EBC please advise how the land south west of Draycott does not meet this criteria? The NPPF includes an overarching objective to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment, including making effective use of land. Therefore, existing Brownfield sites within the EBC should be prioritised first over using Green Belt land. Can the EBC please demonstrate how it has met this policy requirement? NPPF refers to Grey Belt as areas of previously developed land or other land that do not strongly contribute to Green Belt purposes, The land south west of Draycott is neither of these and strongly contributes towards Green Belt purposes as it acts as a buffer, safeguards the countryside and acts as a barrier to urban sprawl. NPPF states that in exceptional circumstances authorities should review Green Belt boundaries in accordance with the policies in this Framework and propose alterations to meet these needs in full, unless the review provides clear evidence that doing so would fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt. Changing the land south west of Draycott to Grey Belt and the development of 190 homes will negatively impact the remaining Green Belt land with overcapacity and increased population density. Working on the current population of Draycott, 190 new homes will be an at least 17% increase in population. NPPF states where major development involving the provision of housing is proposed on land released from the Green Belt through plan preparation or review</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Douglas Walker	Response-00994	<p>w, or on sites in the Green Belt subject to a planning application, the following contributions (?Golden Rules?) should be made: - necessary improvements to local or national infrastructure; and - the provision of new, or improvements to existing, green spaces that are accessible to the public. New residents should be able to access good quality green spaces within a short walk of their home, whether through onsite provision or through access to offsite spaces. The proposal to remove the parcels of land as identified from Green Belt status and the development of 190 homes will mean access to green spaces for existing residents will be less accessible, and no plans or provisions have been made to improve local infrastructure. We are not aware that any discussion has been undertaken by the authority to with neighbouring authorities on whether they can accommodate the development need through existing Brown Field or Grey Belt land. The NPPF further states the development of homes, commercial and other development in the Green Belt should not be regarded as inappropriate where the development would utilise Grey Belt land and would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan. It is clear the authority is now altering existing and acceptable Green Belt land to suit this paragraph/approach of the NPPF by converting it to Grey Belt. This is both hasty and reckless. NPPF 2. States it has three objectives to enable sustainable development. The third of these is an environmental objective ? to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy. The EBCs proposal of reclassifying the land South West of Draycott from Greenbelt to Greybelt land does not meet this objective and will actually achieve the total opposite. NPPF 4. States that local planning authorities should approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way. They should use the full range of planning tools available, including brownfield registers and permission in principle, and work proactively with applicants to secure developments that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. EBC needs to demonstrate what appraisals have been undertaken on the 109 Brownfield sites as detailed within their own Brownfield Register, and why these sites have not been prioritised for development over the identified Green Belt land. NPPF 13. Protecting Green Belt Land:- The government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt is to keep land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. This is an inappropriate development in the Green Belt and there is NO evidence of the appraisals that have been undertaken on existing Brownfield sites within EBC which there are 109 with 8 of these giving over 51H and the opportunity to develop over 500 dwellings. NPPF 20. States that the target level of housing development within the plans should be capped in line with the capacity of Brownfield sites to accommodate it, to protect Green Belt yet these plans significantly exceed it. NPPF 143. The Green Belt serves 5 purposes: 1) To stop urban sprawl 2) To stop towns merging 3)</p>



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Douglas Walker	Response-00994	To safeguard from encroachment onto the countryside 4) To preserve special settings, character and history 5) To ensure the recycling of derelict or Brownfield land. The proposals being made by EBC to reclassify existing Green Belt land to the south west of Draycott does not meet any of these 5 purposes and actually looks to achieve the total opposite. Furthermore, no apparent attempt has been made by EBC to demonstrate why the 109 existing Brownfield sites within EBC have not been prioritised over this Green Belt land. NPPF 146. The applicant and authority MUST make as much use as possible of Brownfield Sites and underutilised land; AND PROVE that there is nothing left before encroaching on the Green Belt. ? There is no PROOF of the authority discussing with neighbouring authorities about whether they could accommodate some of the identified need for this development, in order not to use the Green Belt.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Dr CJ Marvell	Response-01901	The sprawl between Nottingham and Derby is broken significantly only by the countryside to the west of Draycott, between Draycott and Borrowwash. There is another smaller gap, between Borrowwash and Spondon which is already being encroached upon.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Dr CJ Marvell	Response-01901	Draycott and Breaston are already linked without a gap and Breaston and Long Eaton are separated only by a narrow corridor along the motorway. The proposed development reduces the only significant gap between Derby and Nottingham. Loss of Green space. The land to be developed is mostly high grade farmland and small copses of trees. It is highly objectionable that this beautiful green belt should be designated as
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Dr CJ Marvell	Response-01901	"grey belt" merely to suit the purposes of politicians and developers. There is no other justification for this shameful loss of irreplaceable green space.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Dr Shelagh Brown	Response-01158	Loss of Green Belt will have a significant impact for the worse, on the mental health of local residents who currently enjoy walking for relaxation in this area. Brownfield sites should be prioritised for new housing.
			Dudley Medhurst	Response-01180	I strongly beleive that Greenbelt should stay Greenbelt.....where will it stop?
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Elaine Wright	Response-01002	strongly object to the Sustainability Assessment which was undertaken by the EBC when assessing the land south west of Draycott. The EBC assessment scored this land as +3 with a ranking of joint 3rd place, when our independent review using professionals and informed local residents resulted in a score of -6 placing this land ran 20th. When reviewed, clear and obvious errors have been made where the EBC has underplayed and positively scored key questions incorrectly to achieve a desired outcome. For example, 9.1: Will it make efficient use of brownfield land? the EBC states that it will not as the site is entirely Greenfield and we know there over 109 Brownfield sites in EBC. Yet the EBC only gives this question a -1 when it should surely receive an at least a Minor Negative -2 score. Question 16.5: Will it protect the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land? the EBC itself states the land south west of Draycott 'Agricultural Land Classification Grade 2 so is of reasonable quality' and this scheme will not therefore protect the BMV. Yet the EBC has scored it only -1. This in our view should be a Minor Negative -2 as there is limited Grade 2 land within the area with most being Grade 3 & 4. Furthermore, question 16.6: Will it prevent the loss of greenfield land to development? the EBC itself states that 'No, the site is Greenfield in its classification so development would not prevent the loss of greenfield land. The limited scale of site limits this negative impact', yet the site is over 8H of Greenfield Grade 2 quality land and only awards a -1. This is our view should received a -2 or even a -3 as this development will have a significant impact on the Greenfield land and its surrounding areas. Questions 2.2 and 2.1 relate to employment and EBC advises that this scheme will not boost employment in the local area due to its limited scale yet award neutral 0' to both questions. Surely these questions should receive -1 as they fail to deliver on the question. Furthermore, questions such as 14.4, 15.2, 15.3, 15.4, 16.1 and 16.2 are all speculative in their answer as they relate to the developer delivering on certain sustainable aspects which can not possibly be scored at this time. Overall, we strongly object to the EBC Sustainability Assessment and would call for this to be independently reviewed. 11 7 The current housing target which drives the need to develop on the Green Belt is flawed and needs to be changed. It is based on over inflated housing targets that are not realistic, which puts pressure on local authorities to disregard the impact such developments have on local communities and villages to purely meet statistical objectives. This can be seen with the c.17% increase in the population of Draycott if the development of 190 houses goes ahead. This would also be further compounded when the safeguarded land is developed adding an additional c70 houses. This increase and expansion is unrealistic and reckless

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Francis Ian Scott	Response-01535	Protecting Green Belt land, this land should be kept open and unharmed Protecting public rights of way and access, a large number of footpaths would be affected Harm to the landscape is therefore intensified. NPPF states that existing Brown Field and Grey Belt sites are to be prioritised over the development of Green Field and certainly Green Belt sites, but these plans offer up Green Belt in advance of Brown Field site development. NPPF states that Green Belt is to be protected and requires exceptional circumstances to be built on. There is nothing exceptional about the council's plans to build on un-spoilt, Green Belt land to meet their current housing target when existing Brownfield sites exist. Great weight should be given to the findings and recommendations of independent Landscape Quality Assessment NPPF states Green Belt serves five purposes which are to; check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another; safeguard the countryside from encroachment; preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and assist urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The land to south west of Draycott meets all of this criteria and not only prevents urban sprawl but sets to preserve the countryside's open character and the enhancement of recreational opportunities for local residents. The NPPF includes an overarching objective to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment, including making effective use of land. Therefore, existing Brownfield sites within the EBC should be prioritised first over using Green Belt land. NPPF refers to Grey Belt as areas of previously developed land or other land that do not strongly contribute to Green Belt purposes, The land south west of Draycott is neither of these and strongly contributes towards Green Belt purposes as it acts as a buffer, safeguards the countryside and acts as a barrier to urban sprawl. NPPF states that in exceptional circumstances authorities should review Green Belt boundaries in accordance with the policies in this Framework and propose alterations to meet these needs in full, unless the review provides clear evidence that doing so would fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt. Changing the land south west of Draycott to Grey Belt and the development of 190 homes will negatively impact the remaining Green Belt land with overcapacity and increased population density. Working on the current population of Draycott, 190 new homes will be an at least 17% increase in population. This land is rural in character, providing a tranquil transitional landscape between the rural areas of Draycott Parish and Borrowash and other villages surrounding it of Breaston and Borrowash. "NPPF states where major development involving the provision of housing is proposed on land released from the Green Belt through plan preparation or review, or on sites in the Green Belt subject to a planning application, the following contributions (?Golden Rules?) should be made: - necessary improvements to local or national infrastructure; and - the provision of new, or improvements to existing, green spaces that are accessible to the public. New residents should be able to access good quality green spaces within a short walk of their home, whether through onsite provision or through access to offsite spaces. The proposal to remove the parcels of land as
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Francis Ian Scott	Response-01535	identified from Green Belt status and the development of 190 homes will mean access to green spaces for existing residents will be less accessible, and no plans or provisions have been made to improve local infrastructure. We are not aware that any discussion has been undertaken by the authority to with neighbouring authorities on whether they can accommodate the development need through existing Brown Field or Grey Belt land. " NPPF states the development of homes, commercial and other development in the Green Belt should not be regarded as inappropriate where the development would utilise Grey Belt land and would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan. It is clear the authority is now altering existing and acceptable Green Belt land to suit this paragraph/approach of the NPPF by converting it to Grey Belt. This is both hasty and reckless. Footpaths, the Amenity and enjoyment of the use of these pathways which cross through and around this site which provide an important means by which residents of the local villages can get access to the countryside with substantial benefits for their physical and mental health as well as providing means of sustainable transport. The development on the land south west of Draycott for the people of Draycott and other areas, will have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, replacing green space with 190 houses. The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. It is the wrong model in the wrong place to deliver housing needs being of a scale that is ultimately detrimental to the local landscape and will harm the countryside, wildlife and impact irreversibly upon the area. This when there are 109 existing Brownfield sites within the EBC that should be prioritised first over Green Belt land. Will totally spoil a greenbelt area with lovely views. Unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape. The considerable scale, extent and nature of the proposed development would be contrary to national policy in NPPF. Understand there is need for new housing but there are an abundance of brownfield, previously developed sites that the developers and council should explore before this location. There are 109 existing Brownfield sites in EBC giving 81H with 103 of these having full planning permission. These sites should be prioritised first for development before Greenbelt land is considered. Of the 109 existing Brownfield sites in the EBC 8 of these are over 1H each giving a combined total of 15.29H. The land South West of Draycott is c.8H. These 8 sites alone will allow 514 net dwelling to be built. These sites should be prioritised for development before the Greenbelt land to the south west of Draycott is considered and lost forever. There are more appropriate areas that could hold such a large housing development and n

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Francis Ian Scott	Response-01535	ot look out of place and spoil the little green areas left within this community. Whilst we/I understand the need for more housing we/I ask that you reconsider the location proposed and look for an alternative site that would house one more suitably. Supporter of the building of new houses but strongly object to the scale and location of this proposed development on the land South West of Draycott. It was previously thought that the land of the former Stanton Ironworks was taken out of the EBCs core strategy due to contamination that rendered the site unusable. Yet a recent Freedom of Information (FOI) request which was answered by EBC has advised the site is indeed to be utilised and has been allocated 1000 houses. Can EBC please advise if the status of the Stanton Ironworks sites and if this is included within the Core Strategy and how the planned 1000 houses impacts the Greenbelt review and use of Greenbelt land. NPPF states that existing Brown Field and Grey Belt sites are to be prioritised over the development of Green Field and certainly Green Belt sites, but these plans offer up Green Belt in advance of Brown Field site development. "NPPF 2. States it has three objectives to enable sustainable development. The third of these is an environmental objective ? to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy. The EBCs proposal of reclassifying the land South West of Draycott from Greenbelt to Greybelt land does not meet this objective and will actually achieve the total opposite. " NPPF 4. States that local planning authorities should approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way. They should use the full range of planning tools available, including brownfield registers and permission in principle, and work proactively with applicants to secure developments that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. EBC needs to demonstrate what appraisals have been undertaken on the 109 Brownfield sites as detailed within their own Brownfield Register, and why these sites have not been prioritised for development over the identified Green Belt land. NPPF 13. Protecting Green Belt Land:- The government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt is to keep land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. This is an inappropriate development in the Green Belt and there is NO evidence of the appraisals that have been undertaken on existing Brownfield sites within EBC which there are 109 with 8 of these giving over 51H and the opportunity to develop over 500 dwellings. NPPF 20. States that the target level of housing development within the plans should be capped in line with the capacity of Brownfield sites to accommodate it, to protect Green Belt yet these plans significantly exceed it. NPPF 143. The Green Belt serves 5 purposes: 1) To stop urban sprawl 2) To stop towns merging 3) To safeguard from encroachment onto the countryside 4) To preserve special settings, character and history 5) To ensure the recycling of derelict or Brownfield land. The proposals being made by EBC to reclassify existing Green Belt land to the south west of Draycott does not meet any of
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Francis Ian Scott	Response-01535	these 5 purposes and actually looks to achieve the total opposite. Furthermore, no apparent attempt has been made by EBC to demonstrate why the 109 existing Brownfield sites within EBC have not been prioritised over this Green Belt land. NPPF 144. States before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, the strategic policy-making authority should be able to demonstrate that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development. No attempt has been made by the authority to explore existing Brownfield sites or underutilised land within the EBC. NPPF 146. The applicant and authority MUST make as much use as possible of Brownfield Sites and underutilised land; AND PROVE that there is nothing left before encroaching on the Green Belt. ? There is no PROOF of the authority discussing with neighbouring authorities about whether they could accommodate some of the identified need for this development, in order not to use the Green Belt. NPPF 150. Once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity. NPPF 152. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. This application does not demonstrate any exceptional circumstances. NPPF 153. 'Very Special Circumstances? have to be proven i.e. all other options exhausted to classify this application as a 'very special circumstance?. We cannot see any evidence that this has taken place. Therefore, it is an inappropriate application and proposal and does not demonstrate exceptional circumstances. NPPF 156. The proposed development of 190 houses to the land south west of Draycott when located in the Green Belt, must demonstrate exceptional circumstances and are inappropriate unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Gail Holdsworth	Response-00937	The proposed site is protected and green belt. There are constantly used footpaths and rights of way. How can the laws just be changed without full consultation of the people who live in this area. I have received no information from Erewash council about these proposals . I only found out in seeing a notice at a bus stop
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Garry Hickton	Response-01473	The site is Greenbelt and should not be built on
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Gary Siddall	Response-01237	We all know why Green Belt is there and why it's important to preserve - once it's gone, it's gone forever. NPPF states that Green Belt is to be protected and requires exceptional circumstances to be built on. There is nothing exceptional about the council's plans to build on un-spoilt, Green Belt land to meet their current housing target when existing Brownfield sites exist. Green Belt land is there to check the unrestricted sprawl of built-up areas, to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another and safeguard the countryside. The land to south west of Draycott meets all of these and also sets to preserve the countryside's open character and the enhancement of recreational opportunities for local residents. Brown Field and Grey belt areas exist - why have they been just passed over to build on Green Belt ??? Scandalous.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Gemma Woolnough	Response-01394	This housing development is proposed on precious green belt land which is home to a diverse rand of nature of wildlife including: deer, bats, barn owls, foxes, rabbits, badgers and many birds. Green belt land is precious and provides essential homes for wildlife. By building on this land it would result in a significant loss of biodiversity, permanently damaging ecosystems. I strongly object to houses being built on green belt land when other alternative areas are available not on previous land.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	George Foster	Response-01199	Protecting Green Belt land, this land should be kept open and unharmed. Protecting public rights of way and access, a large number of footpaths would be affected leading to harm to the landscape is therefore intensified. NPPF states that existing Brown Field and Grey Belt sites are to be prioritised over the development of Green Field and certainly Green Belt sites, but these plans offer up Green Belt in advance of Brown Field site development. NPPF states that Green Belt is to be protected and requires exceptional circumstances to be built on. There is nothing exceptional about the council's plans to build on un-spoilt, Green Belt land to meet their current housing target when existing Brownfield sites exist. Great weight should be given to the findings and recommendations of independent Landscape Quality Assessment NPPF states Green Belt serves five purposes which are to; check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another; safeguard the countryside from encroachment; preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and assist urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The land to south west of Draycott meets all of this criteria and not only prevents urban sprawl but sets to preserve the countryside's open character and the enhancement of recreational opportunities for local residents. The NPPF includes an overarching objective to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment, including making effective use of land. Therefore, existing Brownfield sites within the EBC should be prioritised first over using Green Belt land. NPPF refers to Grey Belt as areas of previously developed land or other land that do not strongly contribute to Green Belt purposes, The land south west of Draycott is neither of these and strongly contributes towards Green Belt purposes as it acts as a buffer, safeguards the countryside and acts as a barrier to urban sprawl. NPPF states that in exceptional circumstances authorities should review Green Belt boundaries in accordance with the policies in this Framework and propose alterations to meet these needs in full, unless the review provides clear evidence that doing so would fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt. Changing the land south west of Draycott to Grey Belt and the development of 190 homes will negatively impact the remaining Green Belt land with overcapacity and increased population density. Working on the current population of Draycott, 190 new homes will be an at least 17% increase in population. This land is rural in character, providing a tranquil transitional landscape between the rural areas of Draycott Parish and Borrowash and other villages surrounding it of Breaston and Borrowash. NPPF states where major development involving the provision of housing is proposed on land released from the Green Belt through plan preparation or review, or on sites in the Green Belt subject to a planning application, the following contributions (?Golden Rules?) should be made: - necessary improvements to local or national infrastructure; and - the provision of new, or improvements to existing, green spaces that are accessible to the public. New residents should be able to access good quality green spaces within a short walk of their home, whether through onsite provision or through access to offsite spaces. The proposal to remove the parcels
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	George Foster	Response-01199	of land as identified from Green Belt status and the development of 190 homes will mean access to green spaces for existing residents will be less accessible, and no plans or provisions have been made to improve local infrastructure. We are not aware that any discussion has been undertaken by the authority to with neighbouring authorities on whether they can accommodate the development need through existing Brown Field or Grey Belt land. NPPF states the development of homes, commercial and other development in the Green Belt should not be regarded as inappropriate where the development would utilise Grey Belt land and would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan. It is clear the authority is now altering existing and acceptable Green Belt land to suit this paragraph/approach of the NPPF by converting it to Grey Belt. This is both hasty and reckless. Footpaths, the Amenity and enjoyment of the use of these pathways which cross through and around this site which provide an important means by which residents of the local villages can get access to the countryside with substantial benefits for their physical and mental health as well as providing means of sustainable transport. The development on the land south west of Draycott for the people of Draycott and other areas, will have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, replacing green space with 190 houses. The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. It is the wrong model in the wrong place to deliver housing needs being of a scale that is ultimately detrimental to the local landscape and will harm the countryside, wildlife and impact irreversibly upon the area. This when there are 109 existing Brownfield sites within the EBC that should be prioritised first over Green Belt land. Will totally spoil a greenbelt area with lovely views. Unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape. The considerable scale, extent and nature of the proposed development would be contrary to national policy in NPPF. We understand there is need for new housing but there are an abundance of brownfield, previously developed sites that the developers and council should explore before this location. Of the 109 existing Brownfield sites in the EBC 8 of these are over 1H each giving a combined total of 15.29H. The land South West of Draycott is c.8H. These 8 sites alone will allow 514 net dwelling to be built. These sites should be prioritised for development before the Greenbelt land to the south west of Draycott is considered and lost forever. There are more appropriate areas that could hold such a large housing development and not look out of place and spoil the little green areas left within this community. Whilst I understand the need for more housing we/I ask that you reconsider the location proposed and look fo

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	George Foster	Response-01199	r an alternative site that would house one more suitably. I am a supporter of the building of new houses but strongly object to the scale and location of this proposed development on the land South West of Draycott. It was previously thought that the land of the former Stanton Ironworks was taken out of the EBCs core strategy due to contamination that rendered the site unusable. Yet a recent Freedom of Information (FOI) request which was answered by EBC has advised the site is indeed to be utilised and has been allocated 1000 houses. Can EBC please advise if the status of the Stanton Ironworks sites and if this is included within the Core Strategy and how the planned 1000 houses impacts the Greenbelt review and use of Greenbelt land. NPPF states that existing Brown Field and Grey Belt sites are to be prioritised over the development of Green Field and certainly Green Belt sites, but these plans offer up Green Belt in advance of Brown Field site development. NPPF 2. States it has three objectives to enable sustainable development. The third of these is an environmental objective ? to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy. The EBCs proposal of reclassifying the land South West of Draycott from Greenbelt to Greybelt land does not meet this objective and will actually achieve the total opposite. NPPF 4. States that local planning authorities should approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way. They should use the full range of planning tools available, including brownfield registers and permission in principle, and work proactively with applicants to secure developments that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. EBC needs to demonstrate what appraisals have been undertaken on the 109 Brownfield sites as detailed within their own Brownfield Register, and why these sites have not been prioritised for development over the identified Green Belt land. NPPF 13. Protecting Green Belt Land:- The government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt is to keep land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. This is an inappropriate development in the Green Belt and there is NO evidence of the appraisals that have been undertaken on existing Brownfield sites within EBC which there are 109 with 8 of these giving over 51H and the opportunity to develop over 500 dwellings. NPPF 20. States that the target level of housing development within the plans should be capped in line with the capacity of Brownfield sites to accommodate it, to protect Green Belt yet these plans significantly exceed it. NPPF 143. The Green Belt serves 5 purposes: 1) To stop urban sprawl 2) To stop towns merging 3) To safeguard from encroachment onto the countryside 4) To preserve special settings, character and history 5) To ensure the recycling of derelict or Brownfield land. The proposals being made by EBC to reclassify existing Green Belt land to the south west of Draycott does not meet any of these 5 purposes and actually looks to achieve the total opposite. Furthermore, no apparent attempt has been made by EBC to demonstrate why the 109 existing Brownfield sites within EBC have
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	George Foster	Response-01199	not been prioritised over this Green Belt land. NPPF 144. States before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, the strategic policy-making authority should be able to demonstrate that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development. No attempt has been made by the authority to explore existing Brownfield sites or underutilised land within the EBC.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Gill Trickitt	Response-01157	Greenbelt should not be touched. It's greenbelt for a reason. Greybelt and brownbelt should be explored first and there are sites that meet these requirements elsewhere locally that should be built on. The powers that be cannot just disregard greenbelt classification because they feel like it.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Gordon Dahill	Response-00690	Currently the fields being turned from GREEN to GREY BELT are areas of grain production (this country is in need of HOME grown food with foreign imports under threats from world political instability).The field between Bankfields farm and Lime Grove was being manured, ploughed and sewn the VERY DAY by CHANCE ON FACEBOOK THE DAY AFTER THE FINAL DAY FOR COMMENT !!! A VERY POOR SHOW BY THE COUNCIL NOT all have access to or make use of facebook.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Graham Wakeling	Response-01238	Greenbelt land is essential to the shaping of natural landscapes and biodiversity, the loss of our Greenbelt land, while tragic enough will lead to further loss in other protected local areas.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Hannah McMaster	Response-01381	Building on green belt lane should be a last respite, there are plenty of other sites in Erewash that could be utilised fit housing before building on green belt.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Hannah Pritchard	Response-01399	The land allocated for this development forms part of the designated green belt, intended to prevent urban sprawl and preserve rural character. The irreversible loss of this land would undermine local and national planning policy. Once developed, this green belt cannot be restored, and approval of this project would set a dangerous precedent for future green belt encroachment.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	H Foster	Response-00691	Greenbelt is sacrosant and to be able at the click of a button to change parameters to suit this council that is going against all the wishes of the sensible majority holds dear It won't be long before the whole of our area is covered in concrete and tarmac and the people of this area will have to drive to get a breath of true countryside Please look for more suitable, non arable land that does not flood, is not green belt

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Jacqueline Hyett	Response-01548	Protecting Green Belt land, this land should be kept open and unharmed. Protecting public rights of way and access, a large number of footpaths would be affected. Harm to the landscape is therefore intensified.. This land is rural in character, providing a tranquil transitional landscape between the rural areas of Draycott Parish and Borrowwash and other villages surrounding it of Breaston and Borrowwash. The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. Unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape. There are 109 existing Brownfield sites in EBC giving 81H with 103 of these having full planning permission. These sites should be prioritised first for development before Greenbelt land is considered. Will totally spoil a greenbelt area with lovely views.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	James Hargreaves	Response-01315	1. Policy Conflict: Reclassifying Green Belt land as Grey Belt goes against the 2024 NPPF and the 2022 EBC Local Plan. The change was rushed and lacked transparency. 2. Loss of Green Space: The development threatens vital green areas that prevent urban sprawl and preserve the village's historic charm. 3. Unrealistic Housing Goals: The targets used to justify this development are not feasible and disregard the impact on the community.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	James Whyman	Response-01551	1 Protecting Green Belt land, this land should be kept open and unharmed 2 Protecting public rights of way and access, a large number of footpaths would be affected 3 Harm to the landscape is therefore intensified. 4 NPPF states that existing Brown Field and Grey Belt sites are to be prioritised over the development of Green Field and certainly Green Belt sites, but these plans offer up Green Belt in advance of Brown Field site development. 5 NPPF states that Green Belt is to be protected and requires exceptional circumstances to be built on. There is nothing exceptional about the council's plans to build on un-spoilt, Green Belt land to meet their current housing target when existing Brownfield sites exist. 6 Great weight should be given to the findings and recommendations of independent Landscape Quality Assessment 7 NPPF states Green Belt serves five purposes which are to; check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another; safeguard the countryside from encroachment; preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and assist urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The land to south west of Draycott meets all of this criteria and not only prevents urban sprawl but sets to preserve the countryside's open character and the enhancement of recreational opportunities for local residents. 8 The NPPF includes an overarching objective to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment, including making effective use of land. Therefore, existing Brownfield sites within the EBC should be prioritised first over using Green Belt land. 9 NPPF refers to Grey Belt as areas of previously developed land or other land that do not strongly contribute to Green Belt purposes, The land south west of Draycott is neither of these and strongly contributes towards Green Belt purposes as it acts as a buffer, safeguards the countryside and acts as a barrier to urban sprawl. 10 NPPF states that in exceptional circumstances authorities should review Green Belt boundaries in accordance with the policies in this Framework and propose alterations to meet these needs in full, unless the review provides clear evidence that doing so would fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt. Changing the land south west of Draycott to Grey Belt and the development of 190 homes will negatively impact the remaining Green Belt land with overcapacity and increased population density. Working on the current population of Draycott, 190 new homes will be an at least 17% increase in population. 11 This land is rural in character, providing a tranquil transitional landscape between the rural areas of Draycott Parish and Borrowwash and other villages surrounding it of Breaston and Borrowwash. 12 NPPF states where major development involving the provision of housing is proposed on land released from the Green Belt through plan preparation or review, or on sites in the Green Belt subject to a planning application, the following contributions (?Golden Rules?) should be made: - necessary improvements to local or national infrastructure; and - the provision of new, or improvements to existing, green spaces that are accessible to the public. New residents should be able to access good quality green spaces within a short walk of their home, whether through onsite provision or through access to offsite spaces. The proposal to rem

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	James Whyman	Response-01551	<p>ove the parcels of land as identified from Green Belt status and the development of 190 homes will mean access to green spaces for existing residents will be less accessible, and no plans or provisions have been made to improve local infrastructure. We are not aware that any discussion has been undertaken by the authority to with neighbouring authorities on whether they can accommodate the development need through existing Brown Field or Grey Belt land. 13 NPPF states the development of homes, commercial and other development in the Green Belt should not be regarded as inappropriate where the development would utilise Grey Belt land and would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan. It is clear the authority is now altering existing and acceptable Green Belt land to suit this paragraph/approach of the NPPF by converting it to Grey Belt. This is both hasty and reckless. 14 Footpaths, the Amenity and enjoyment of the use of these pathways which cross through and around this site which provide an important means by which residents of the local villages can get access to the countryside with substantial benefits for their physical and mental health as well as providing means of sustainable transport. The development on the land south west of Draycott for the people of Draycott and other areas, will have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, replacing green space with 190 houses. 15 The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. 16 It is the wrong model in the wrong place to deliver housing needs being of a scale that is ultimately detrimental to the local landscape and will harm the countryside, wildlife and impact irreversibly upon the area. This when there are 109 existing Brownfield sites within the EBC that should be prioritised first over Green Belt land. 17 Will totally spoil a greenbelt area with lovely views. 18 Unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape. 19 The considerable scale, extent and nature of the proposed development would be contrary to national policy in NPPF. 20 Understand there is need for new housing but there are an abundance of brownfield, previously developed sites that the developers and council should explore before this location. 21 There are 109 existing Brownfield sites in EBC giving 81H with 103 of these having full planning permission. These sites should be prioritised first for development before Greenbelt land is considered. 22 Of the 109 existing Brownfield sites in the EBC 8 of these are over 1H each giving a combined total of 15.29H. The land South West of Draycott is c.8H. These 8 sites alone will allow 514 net dwelling to be built. These sites should be prioritised for development before the Greenbelt land to the south west of Draycott is considered and lost forever. 23 There are more appropriate are</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	James Whyman	Response-01551	<p>as that could hold such a large housing development and not look out of place and spoil the little green areas left within this community. 24 Whilst we/I understand the need for more housing we/I ask that you reconsider the location proposed and look for an alternative site that would house one more suitably. 25 Supporter of the building of new houses but strongly object to the scale and location of this proposed development on the land South West of Draycott. 26 It was previously thought that the land of the former Stanton Ironworks was taken out of the EBCs core strategy due to contamination that rendered the site unusable. Yet a recent Freedom of Information (FOI) request which was answered by EBC has advised the site is indeed to be utilised and has been allocated 1000 houses. Can EBC please advise if the status of the Stanton Ironworks sites and if this is included within the Core Strategy and how the planned 1000 houses impacts the Greenbelt review and use of Greenbelt land. 27 NPPF states that existing Brown Field and Grey Belt sites are to be prioritised over the development of Green Field and certainly Green Belt sites, but these plans offer up Green Belt in advance of Brown Field site development. 28 NPPF 2. States it has three objectives to enable sustainable development. The third of these is an environmental objective ? to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy. The EBCs proposal of reclassifying the land South West of Draycott from Greenbelt to Greybelt land does not meet this objective and will actually achieve the total opposite. 29 NPPF 4. States that local planning authorities should approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way. They should use the full range of planning tools available, including brownfield registers and permission in principle, and work proactively with applicants to secure developments that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. EBC needs to demonstrate what appraisals have been undertaken on the 109 Brownfield sites as detailed within their own Brownfield Register, and why these sites have not been prioritised for development over the identified Green Belt land. 30 NPPF 13. Protecting Green Belt Land:- The government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt is to keep land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. This is an inappropriate development in the Green Belt and there is NO evidence of the appraisals that have been undertaken on existing Brownfield sites within EBC which there are 109 with 8 of these giving over 51H and the opportunity to develop over 500 dwellings. 31 NPPF 20. States that the target level of housing development within the plans should be capped in line with the capacity of Brownfield sites to accommodate it, to protect Green Belt yet these plans significantly exceed it. 32 NPPF 143. The Green Belt serves 5 purposes: 1) To stop urban sprawl 2) To stop towns merging 3) To safeguard from encroachment onto the countryside 4) To preserve special settings, character and history 5) To ensure the recycling of derelict or Brownfield land. The proposals being made by EBC to reclas</p>

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	James Whyman	Response-01551	sify existing Green Belt land to the south west of Draycott does not meet any of these 5 purposes and actually looks to achieve the total opposite. Furthermore, no apparent attempt has been made by EBC to demonstrate why the 109 existing Brownfield sites within EBC have not been prioritised over this Green Belt land. 33 NPPF 144. States before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, the strategic policy-making authority should be able to demonstrate that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development. No attempt has been made by the authority to explore existing Brownfield sites or underutilised land within the EBC. 34 NPPF 146. The applicant and authority MUST make as much use as possible of Brownfield Sites and underutilised land; AND PROVE that there is nothing left before encroaching on the Green Belt. ? There is no PROOF of the authority discussing with neighbouring authorities about whether they could accommodate some of the identified need for this development, in order not to use the Green Belt. 35 NPPF 150. Once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity. 36 NPPF 152. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. This application does not demonstrate any exceptional circumstances. 37 NPPF 153. 'Very Special Circumstances? have to be proven i.e. all other options exhausted to classify this application as a ?very special circumstance?. We cannot see any evidence that this has taken place. Therefore, it is an inappropriate application and proposal and does not demonstrate exceptional circumstances. 38 NPPF 156. The proposed development of 190 houses to the land south west of Draycott when located in the Green Belt, must demonstrate exceptional circumstances and are inappropriate unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Jane Barker	Response-01178	I think that GreenBelt land should be just that and should be saved and cherished for future generations that will follow us. It should be for all to use and should be open and safe. It should be as originally planned Protected. The fact that Draycott is a village and rural in character is why many people have moved to the area and more houses will dramatically change this making it into a more urban area. Our council should protecting our Greenbelt/green spaces not building on it. There are plenty of brownfield sites that should be used.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	J Morgan	Response-01847	EBC should be protecting Green Belt land. The Green Belt and green fields should remain open and safe, preserving public rights of way and access to local green spaces. The Draycott footpaths are in constant use, providing villagers easy access to a countryside environment. This land is rural in character, offering a tranquil and transitional landscape between Daycott Parish, Borrowwash, and Breaston. All these villages are impacted by the proposal to reclassify Green Belt to Grey Belt for housing development. While there is a need for housing, the NPPF states that existing Brownfield and Grey Belt sites should be prioritized over Green Belt sites. There are 109 existing Brownfield sites within EBC, equating to 81 hectares, with 103 of these having full planning permission. These sites should be prioritized for development before Green Belt land is considered. The NPPF states that Green Belt is to be protected and requires exceptional circumstances for development. There is nothing exceptional about the council plans to build on unspoilt Green Belt land to meet their housing target when existing Brownfield sites are available. The land south west of Draycott meets all the criteria for Green Belt purposes, preventing urban sprawl, preserving the countryside's open character, and enhancing recreational opportunities for local residents. Changing this land to Grey Belt and developing 190 homes will negatively impact the remaining Green Belt land with overcapacity and increased population density.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	John Brayshaw	Response-01379	As they always say "when it is gone, it is gone!" We have already seen much greenbelt removed in the Derby and Erewash areas this has to stop somewhere. How about here and now? To protect fresh air and natural environment for future generations! Please think the Big picture and not the short term financial gain!



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Jonathan Childs	Response-01117	NPPF states that existing Brown Field and Grey Belt sites are to be prioritised over the development of Green Field and certainly Green Belt sites, but these plans offer up Green Belt in advance of Brown Field site development. NPPF states that Green Belt is to be protected and requires exceptional circumstances to be built on. There is nothing exceptional about the council's plans to build on un-spoilt, Green Belt land to meet their current housing target when existing Brown field and other, less sensitive sites exist. NPPF states Green Belt serves five purposes which are to; check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another; safeguard the countryside from encroachment; preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and assist urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The land to south west of Draycott meets all of this criteria and not only prevents urban sprawl but sets to preserve the countryside's open character and the enhancement of recreational opportunities for local residents. 1NPPF states that in exceptional circumstances authorities should review Green Belt boundaries in accordance with the policies in this Framework and propose alterations to meet these needs in full, unless the review provides clear evidence that doing so would fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt. Changing the land south west of Draycott to Grey Belt and the development of 190 homes will negatively impact the remaining Green Belt land with overcapacity and increased population density. Working on the current population of Draycott, 190 new homes will be an at least 17% increase in population with no obvious and corresponding expansion of local infrastructure. NPPF states where major development involving the provision of housing is proposed on land released from the Green Belt through plan preparation or review, or on sites in the Green Belt subject to a planning application, the following contributions (?Golden Rules?) should be made: - necessary improvements to local or national infrastructure; and - the provision of new, or improvements to existing, green spaces that are accessible to the public. New residents should be able to access good quality green spaces within a short walk of their home, whether through onsite provision or through access to offsite spaces. The proposal to remove the parcels of land as identified from Green Belt status and the development of 190 homes will mean access to green spaces for existing residents will be less accessible, and no plans or provisions have been made to improve local infrastructure. We are not aware that any discussion has been undertaken by the authority to with neighbouring authorities on whether they can accommodate the development need through existing Brown Field or Grey Belt land. NPPF states the development of homes, commercial and other development in the Green Belt should not be regarded as inappropriate where the development would utilise Grey Belt land and would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan. It is clear the authority is now altering existing and acceptable Green Belt land to suit this paragraph/approach of the NPPF by converting it to Grey Belt. This is both hasty and reckless. There are 109 existing Brownfield sites within EBC giving 81Ha with 103 of the
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Jonathan Childs	Response-01117	se having full planning permission. These sites should be prioritised first for development before Greenbelt land is considered. Of the 109 existing Brownfield sites in the EBC 8 of these are over 1Ha each giving a combined total of 15.29Ha. The land South West of Draycott is c.8Ha. These 8 sites alone will allow 514 net dwelling to be built. These sites should be prioritised for development before the Greenbelt land to the south west of Draycott is considered and lost forever. It was previously thought that the land of the former Stanton Ironworks was taken out of the EBCs core strategy due to contamination that rendered the site unusable. Yet a recent Freedom of Information (FOI) request which was answered by EBC has advised the site is indeed to be utilised and has been allocated 1000 houses. Can EBC please advise if the status of the Stanton Ironworks sites and if this is included within the Core Strategy and how the planned 1000 houses impacts the Greenbelt review and use of Greenbelt land. NPPF 2. States it has three objectives to enable sustainable development. The third of these is an environmental objective ? to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy. The EBCs proposal of reclassifying the land South West of Draycott from Greenbelt to Greybelt land does not meet this objective and will actually achieve the total opposite. NPPF 4. States that local planning authorities should approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way. They should use the full range of planning tools available, including brownfield registers and permission in principle, and work proactively with applicants to secure developments that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. EBC needs to demonstrate what appraisals have been undertaken on the 109 Brownfield sites as detailed within their own Brownfield Register, and why these sites have not been prioritised for development over the identified Green Belt land. NPPF 20. States that the target level of housing development within the plans should be capped in line with the capacity of Brownfield sites to accommodate it, to protect Green Belt yet these plans significantly exceed it. NPPF 144. States before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, the strategic policy-making authority should be able to demonstrate that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development. No attempt has been made by the authority to explore existing Brownfield sites or underutilised land within the EBC. NPPF 146. The applicant and authority MUST make as much use as possible of Brownfield Sites and underutilised land; AND PROVE that there is nothing left before encroaching on the Green Belt. ? There is no PROOF of the authority discussing with neighbouring authorities about whether they could accommodate some of the identified need for this development, in order not to use the Green Belt. NPPF 150. Once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity. NPPF 152. Inappropriate development is, by definition,

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Jonathan Childs	Response-01117	harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. This application does not demonstrate any exceptional circumstances. NPPF 153. 'Very Special Circumstances? have to be proven i.e. all other options exhausted to classify this application as a ?very special circumstance?. We cannot see any evidence that this has taken place. Therefore, it is an inappropriate application and proposal and does not demonstrate exceptional circumstances. NPPF 156. The proposed development of 190 houses to the land south west of Draycott when located in the Green Belt, must demonstrate exceptional circumstances and are inappropriate unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Jonathan Fletcher	Response-01463	The beauty of Draycott to be ruined forever if these proposals commence! The death of wildlife. Severe congestion and pollution added to the beautiful area. Our green and pleasant land to disappear forever?!!
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Judith Boyle	Response-01418	NPPF states Green Belt serves five purposes which are to; check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another; safeguard the countryside from encroachment; preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and assist urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The land to south west of Draycott meets all of this criteria and not only prevents urban sprawl but sets to preserve the countryside?s open character and the enhancement of recreational opportunities for local residents. Protecting public rights of way and access, a large number of footpaths would be affected
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Julie Pleass	Response-01526	NPPF states that Green Belt is to be protected and requires exceptional circumstances to be built on. There is nothing exceptional about the council's plans to build on un-spoilt, Green Belt land to meet their current housing target when existing Brownfield sites exist.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Juliet Macve	Response-01572	The greenbelt must be preserved. Long-term empty homes should be brought back into use and existing brownfield and grey belt sites prioritised for building. Green belt land should only be built on in exceptional circumstances. In this case, there are no exceptional circumstances and brownfield sites exist in the borough. On this route between Derby and Nottingham, this land is one of very few green spaces left, with all others being very small in size. Urban sprawl cannot be allowed to continue to merge villages etc in this area.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Justine Murrin	Response-01478	I totally disagree with using greenbelt sites when there are many suitable brown sites available. Not only will this remove this green site forever, it will lead to other green belts being under risk. Green belts should NOT be used when brown sites are available!
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Karen Doxey	Response-01236	The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites. I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. It is the wrong model in the wrong place to deliver housing needs being of a scale that is ultimately detrimental to the local landscape and will harm the countryside, wildlife and impact irreversibly upon the area. This when there are 109 existing Brownfield sites within the EBC that should be prioritised first over Green Belt land. Will totally spoil a greenbelt area with lovely views. Unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Karen Smith	Response-01484	There are numerous areas which could accommodate new houses that aren?t being utilised. Industrial areas, like the old factory on Longmoor Lane. Not enough existing brown land is being optimised.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Katie May	Response-01518	Protecting Green Belt land, this land should be kept open and unharmed Protecting public rights of way and access, a large number of footpaths would be affected Harm to the landscape is therefore intensified. NPPF states that existing Brown Field and Grey Belt sites are to be prioritised over the development of Green Field and certainly Green Belt sites, but these plans offer up Green Belt in advance of Brown Field site development. NPPF states that Green Belt is to be protected and requires exceptional circumstances to be built on. There is nothing exceptional about the council's plans to build on un-spoilt, Green Belt land to meet their current housing target when existing Brownfield sites exist. Great weight should be given to the findings and recommendations of independent Landscape Quality Assessment NPPF states Green Belt serves five purposes which are to; check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another; safeguard the countryside from encroachment; preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and assist urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The land to south west of Draycott meets all of this criteria and not only prevents urban sprawl but sets to preserve the countryside's open character and the enhancement of recreational opportunities for local residents. The NPPF includes an overarching objective to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment, including making effective use of land. Therefore, existing Brownfield sites within the EBC should be prioritised first over using Green Belt land. NPPF refers to Grey Belt as areas of previously developed land or other land that do not strongly contribute to Green Belt purposes, The land south west of Draycott is neither of these and strongly contributes towards Green Belt purposes as it acts as a buffer, safeguards the countryside and acts as a barrier to urban sprawl. NPPF states that in exceptional circumstances authorities should review Green Belt boundaries in accordance with the policies in this Framework and propose alterations to meet these needs in full, unless the review provides clear evidence that doing so would fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt. Changing the land south west of Draycott to Grey Belt and the development of 190 homes will negatively impact the remaining Green Belt land with overcapacity and increased population density. Working on the current population of Draycott, 190 new homes will be an at least 17% increase in population. This land is rural in character, providing a tranquil transitional landscape between the rural areas of Draycott Parish and Borrowash and other villages surrounding it of Breaston and Borrowash. "NPPF states where major development involving the provision of housing is proposed on land released from the Green Belt through plan preparation or review, or on sites in the Green Belt subject to a planning application, the following contributions (?Golden Rules?) should be made: - necessary improvements to local or national infrastructure; and - the provision of new, or improvements to existing, green spaces that are accessible to the public. New residents should be able to access good quality green spaces within a short walk of their home, whether through onsite provision or through access to offsite spaces. The proposal to remove the parcels of land as
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Katie May	Response-01518	identified from Green Belt status and the development of 190 homes will mean access to green spaces for existing residents will be less accessible, and no plans or provisions have been made to improve local infrastructure. We are not aware that any discussion has been undertaken by the authority to with neighbouring authorities on whether they can accommodate the development need through existing Brown Field or Grey Belt land. " NPPF states the development of homes, commercial and other development in the Green Belt should not be regarded as inappropriate where the development would utilise Grey Belt land and would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan. It is clear the authority is now altering existing and acceptable Green Belt land to suit this paragraph/approach of the NPPF by converting it to Grey Belt. This is both hasty and reckless. Footpaths, the Amenity and enjoyment of the use of these pathways which cross through and around this site which provide an important means by which residents of the local villages can get access to the countryside with substantial benefits for their physical and mental health as well as providing means of sustainable transport. The development on the land south west of Draycott for the people of Draycott and other areas, will have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, replacing green space with 190 houses. The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. It is the wrong model in the wrong place to deliver housing needs being of a scale that is ultimately detrimental to the local landscape and will harm the countryside, wildlife and impact irreversibly upon the area. This when there are 109 existing Brownfield sites within the EBC that should be prioritised first over Green Belt land. Will totally spoil a greenbelt area with lovely views. Unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape. The considerable scale, extent and nature of the proposed development would be contrary to national policy in NPPF. Understand there is need for new housing but there are an abundance of brownfield, previously developed sites that the developers and council should explore before this location. There are 109 existing Brownfield sites in EBC giving 81H with 103 of these having full planning permission. These sites should be prioritised first for development before Greenbelt land is considered. Of the 109 existing Brownfield sites in the EBC 8 of these are over 1H each giving a combined total of 15.29H. The land South West of Draycott is c.8H. These 8 sites alone will allow 514 net dwelling to be built. These sites should be prioritised for development before the Greenbelt land to the south west of Draycott is considered and lost forever. There are more appropriate areas that could hold such a large housing development and n

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Latie May	Response-01518	<p>ot look out of place and spoil the little green areas left within this community. Whilst we/I understand the need for more housing we/I ask that you reconsider the location proposed and look for an alternative site that would house one more suitably. Supporter of the building of new houses but strongly object to the scale and location of this proposed development on the land South West of Draycott. It was previously thought that the land of the former Stanton Ironworks was taken out of the EBCs core strategy due to contamination that rendered the site unusable. Yet a recent Freedom of Information (FOI) request which was answered by EBC has advised the site is indeed to be utilised and has been allocated 1000 houses. Can EBC please advise if the status of the Stanton Ironworks sites and if this is included within the Core Strategy and how the planned 1000 houses impacts the Greenbelt review and use of Greenbelt land. NPPF states that existing Brown Field and Grey Belt sites are to be prioritised over the development of Green Field and certainly Green Belt sites, but these plans offer up Green Belt in advance of Brown Field site development. "NPPF 2. States it has three objectives to enable sustainable development. The third of these is an environmental objective ? to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy. The EBCs proposal of reclassifying the land South West of Draycott from Greenbelt to Greybelt land does not meet this objective and will actually achieve the total opposite. " NPPF 4. States that local planning authorities should approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way. They should use the full range of planning tools available, including brownfield registers and permission in principle, and work proactively with applicants to secure developments that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. EBC needs to demonstrate what appraisals have been undertaken on the 109 Brownfield sites as detailed within their own Brownfield Register, and why these sites have not been prioritised for development over the identified Green Belt land. NPPF 13. Protecting Green Belt Land:- The government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt is to keep land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. This is an inappropriate development in the Green Belt and there is NO evidence of the appraisals that have been undertaken on existing Brownfield sites within EBC which there are 109 with 8 of these giving over 51H and the opportunity to develop over 500 dwellings. NPPF 20. States that the target level of housing development within the plans should be capped in line with the capacity of Brownfield sites to accommodate it, to protect Green Belt yet these plans significantly exceed it. NPPF 143. The Green Belt serves 5 purposes: 1) To stop urban sprawl 2) To stop towns merging 3) To safeguard from encroachment onto the countryside 4) To preserve special settings, character and history 5) To ensure the recycling of derelict or Brownfield land. The proposals being made by EBC to reclassify existing Green Belt land to the south west of Draycott does not meet any of</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Latie May	Response-01518	<p>these 5 purposes and actually looks to achieve the total opposite. Furthermore, no apparent attempt has been made by EBC to demonstrate why the 109 existing Brownfield sites within EBC have not been prioritised over this Green Belt land. NPPF 144. States before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, the strategic policy-making authority should be able to demonstrate that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development. No attempt has been made by the authority to explore existing Brownfield sites or underutilised land within the EBC. NPPF 146. The applicant and authority MUST make as much use as possible of Brownfield Sites and underutilised land; AND PROVE that there is nothing left before encroaching on the Green Belt. ? There is no PROOF of the authority discussing with neighbouring authorities about whether they could accommodate some of the identified need for this development, in order not to use the Green Belt. NPPF 150. Once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity. NPPF 152. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. This application does not demonstrate any exceptional circumstances. NPPF 153. 'Very Special Circumstances?' have to be proven i.e. all other options exhausted to classify this application as a 'very special circumstance?'. We cannot see any evidence that this has taken place. Therefore, it is an inappropriate application and proposal and does not demonstrate exceptional circumstances. NPPF 156. The proposed development of 190 houses to the land south west of Draycott when located in the Green Belt, must demonstrate exceptional circumstances and are inappropriate unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated.</p>

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Kelly Walker	Response-00911	NPPF states that existing Brown Field and Grey Belt sites are to be prioritised over the development of Green Field and certainly Green Belt sites, but these plans offer up Green Belt in advance of Brown Field site development. NPPF 13. Protecting Green Belt Land:- The government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt is to keep land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. This is an inappropriate development in the Green Belt and there is NO evidence of the appraisals that have been undertaken on existing Brownfield sites within EBC which there are 109 with 8 of these giving over 51H and the opportunity to develop over 500 dwellings. NPPF states that Green Belt is to be protected and requires exceptional circumstances to be built on. There is nothing exceptional about the council's plans to build on un-spoilt, Green Belt land to meet their current housing target when existing Brownfield sites exist. I understand there is need for new housing but there are an abundance of brownfield, previously developed sites that the developers and council should explore before this location. There are 109 existing Brownfield sites in EBC giving 81H with 103 of these having full planning permission. These sites should be prioritised first for development before Greenbelt land is considered. Of the 109 existing Brownfield sites in the EBC 8 of these are over 1H each giving a combined total of 15.29H. The land South West of Draycott is c.8H. These 8 sites alone will allow 514 net dwelling to be built. These sites should be prioritised for development before the Greenbelt land to the south west of Draycott is considered and lost forever. NPPF states Green Belt serves five purposes which are to; check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another; safeguard the countryside from encroachment; preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and assist urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The land to south west of Draycott meets all of this criteria and not only prevents urban sprawl but sets to preserve the countryside's open character and the enhancement of recreational opportunities for local residents. The NPPF includes an overarching objective to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment, including making effective use of land. Therefore, existing Brownfield sites within the EBC should be prioritised first over using Green Belt land. NPPF refers to Grey Belt as areas of previously developed land or other land that do not strongly contribute to Green Belt purposes, The land south west of Draycott is neither of these and strongly contributes towards Green Belt purposes as it acts as a buffer, safeguards the countryside and acts as a barrier to urban sprawl. NPPF states that in exceptional circumstances authorities should review Green Belt boundaries in accordance with the policies in this Framework and propose alterations to meet these needs in full, unless the review provides clear evidence that doing so would fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt. Changing the land south west of Draycott to Grey Belt and the development of 190 homes will negatively impact the remaining Green Belt land with overcapacity and increased population density. Working on the current population of
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Kelly Walker	Response-00911	Draycott, 190 new homes will be an at least 17% increase in population. NPPF states where major development involving the provision of housing is proposed on land released from the Green Belt through plan preparation or review, or on sites in the Green Belt subject to a planning application, the following contributions (?Golden Rules?) should be made: - necessary improvements to local or national infrastructure; and - the provision of new, or improvements to existing, green spaces that are accessible to the public. New residents should be able to access good quality green spaces within a short walk of their home, whether through onsite provision or through access to offsite spaces. The proposal to remove the parcels of land as identified from Green Belt status and the development of 190 homes will mean access to green spaces for existing residents will be less accessible, and no plans or provisions have been made to improve local infrastructure. We are not aware that any discussion has been undertaken by the authority to with neighbouring authorities on whether they can accommodate the development need through existing Brown Field or Grey Belt land. It is the wrong model in the wrong place to deliver housing needs being of a scale that is ultimately detrimental to the local landscape and will harm the countryside, wildlife and impact irreversibly upon the area. This when there are 109 existing Brownfield sites within the EBC that should be prioritised first over Green Belt land. NPPF 143. The Green Belt serves 5 purposes: 1) To stop urban sprawl 2) To stop towns merging 3) To safeguard from encroachment onto the countryside 4) To preserve special settings, character and history 5) To ensure the recycling of derelict or Brownfield land. The proposals being made by EBC to reclassify existing Green Belt land to the south west of Draycott does not meet any of these 5 purposes and actually looks to achieve the total opposite. Furthermore, no apparent attempt has been made by EBC to demonstrate why the 109 existing Brownfield sites within EBC have not been prioritised over this Green Belt land. NPPF 152. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. This application does not demonstrate any exceptional circumstances.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Kerry Naylor	Response-00993	Please where does it stop? Building on green belt. Its called green belt so it separates housing from the land nature needs to survive. Draycott is a village, it will become a suburb of Derby if it joins with Borrowwash. There are other filds in the area that do not impact on residence. Land off Hopewell Road. No residence to impact and land standing dead and empty.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Laura Charier	Response-01218	NPPF states Green Belt serves five purposes which are to; check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another; safeguard the countryside from encroachment; preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and assist urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The land to south west of Draycott meets all of this criteria and not only prevents urban sprawl but sets to preserve the countryside's open character and the enhancement of recreational opportunities for local residents. The NPPF includes an overarching objective to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment, including making effective use of land. Therefore, existing Brownfield sites within the EBC should be prioritised first over using Green Belt land.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Laura Roffey	Response-01479	What is the point of Green Belt if it can be changed at the drop of a hat? It goes against the whole idea of protecting our green spaces in the UK and all the things that are linked eg. open spaces, habitats for animals, cleaner air, nature etc. Surely using Brownfield site, of which there are over 25 in Derbyshire would be better all round.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Lee	Response-00742	1. Drastic Change of character: Ruining the gateway to the village of Draycott forever, the green belt that runs between Borrowash & Draycott is part of the villages character and charm. You get a rural, vibrant feeling and pass into a real village, boasting flowers, wheelbarrows & Derbyshire flags. You'll never get the character & charm back once this is destroyed. If the Draycott development goes ahead & it's the first thing you see, the village of Draycott becomes an estate. The character was part of the reason I bought my house. I wouldn't have bought my house if I knew this overwhelming and unpleasant encroachment on the village was coming. 2. Local planning authorities, like the council in Draycott and Church Wilne, are expected to use their local plans to safeguard the green belt and protect it from inappropriate development. This is a perfect opportunity to showcase why the objection system is in place and governance is required. If the Council's passes this proposition, then it has no credibility, authority or point. Will planning authority be disbanded? I'd rather see my money channelling to something of use. 3. The government should promote a "brownfield first" strategy, brownfield sites should be prioritized for development before considering green belt land. No such prioritization has been done. 4. Precious green belt is being sacrificed with no reasonable alternative list, or proposed sites - why has this not been done? Where is the due diligence? People are not opposed to the need for some new housing but opposed to the location. 5. Why is the priority not brownfield site reinvigorates city centres or waste land. Which need it!! This is a preposterous proposal that is highly inappropriate. You are wasting taxpayer's money on poor decision to act with pace. The location at Draycott is inappropriate & that should not be overlooked because an alleged necessity. Rushing a big decision is not the answer. Why can't a proper plan with plan be drafted with alternative sites? This Greenbelt is not the right place or location. 6. Brown field is ready to start work now surely that's a massive benefit? 7. The assumed cost of Brownfield renovation is not acceptable by who. Government projects always overshot on budget & time. Has a comparison truly and impartially been done, and numbers vetted?
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Lee Bunday	Response-00028	I am writing to object to the Core Strategy Review due to the proposed loss and development of Green Belt land, which undermines its core purposes and long-term environmental and community value. The Green Belt exists to prevent urban sprawl, safeguard the countryside from encroachment, preserve the setting and character of villages, and encourage the regeneration of brownfield land. The current strategy appears to prioritise short-term development gains over these long-standing protections, proposing allocations on Green Belt land without sufficient justification or demonstration of exceptional circumstances? as required by national planning policy. Key concerns include: Lack of robust evidence that all brownfield and non-Green Belt options have been exhausted. Irreversible harm to open landscapes and rural character. Loss of accessible green spaces used by the public for recreation, wellbeing, and mental health. Destruction of natural habitats that support local biodiversity. Risk of setting a precedent for further erosion of the Green Belt boundary in future reviews. Green Belt land plays a crucial role not only in planning policy, but in environmental sustainability? helping to store carbon, reduce flood risk, and act as a buffer against climate change. Once lost, it cannot easily be restored. I urge the council to reconsider proposals that involve Green Belt land and to focus instead on: Prioritising brownfield redevelopment and urban regeneration. Increasing housing density in existing settlements where appropriate. Safeguarding Green Belt boundaries in line with national policy and public interest. Preserving the Green Belt is not an obstacle to growth? it is a commitment to sustainable, responsible, and balanced development.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Linda Jane Jenkins	Response-01007	This is a green and pleasant land supposedly. Once gone it won't be brought back. Green land is good for your health and mental wellbeing. What you are proposing is not. The way you went about it seems to be illegal and if it is not illegal it should be. You announced this policy change on the 19 March but the deadline for questions at the open meeting was 17 of March. How can this be democratic. Aren't you supposed to be representing us your local people?
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Louise and Shane Foster	Response-01219	We were given to understand that EBC would protect Green Belt Land, particularly when the NPPF states that existing Brownfield and Grey Belt Land should be prioritised. Within EBC there are over one hundred existing Brownfield sites most having planning permission already granted. Why the need to use Green Belt Land. The NPPF states that Green Belt Land is to be protected unless there are exceptional circumstances. Surely EBC can meet housing targets using the Brownfield sites with existing planning permission. This decision appears to make no sense.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Luke Harper	Response-00898	Have all 'grey belt' possibilities been exhausted?
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Luke Hatch	Response-00160	I've already spoken about this in previous representations which have clearly been ignored. Even if the site is being reclassified, it still feels like part of the countryside. Walking from Lime Grove, there's a clear shift from village to open green space? that sense of openness would be lost if this development goes ahead.
			Lynne Dundas	Response-01198	We should consider brown field and grey belt sites before we take green belt that is currently being farmed

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Maggie Murphy	Response-00833	. NPPF 73. States that the authority should identify, through the development plan and brownfield registers, land to accommodate at least 10% of their housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare; unless it can be shown, through the preparation of relevant plan policies, that there are strong reasons why this 10% target cannot be achieved. Within Erewash there are 109 Brownfield sites as detailed on the last EBC Brownfield Register 2024, with 103 of these having full planning consent. Of these sites, 8 are over 1H each, giving the ability to develop over 500 houses. Why are these sites not being prioritised first over Green Belt land. The scale and massing of the development, which will begin with 190 houses but will significantly increase when the identified safeguarded land is developed in the future, it is completely out of character with its surroundings and would be incredibly overbearing to the village and neighbourhood, I strongly believe that there are better suited brownfield sites and genuine Grey Belt sites with land that is of poor quality. The land south west of Draycott is Grade 2 Agricultural land (very good) 1. Erewash Borough Council should be protecting Green Belt land, the Green Belt and Green fields should be kept open and safe. Protecting public rights of way and access to the local green spaces must be retained. The Draycott footpaths are in constant use and give people in the village easy access to a countryside environment. This land is rural in character, providing a tranquil and transitional landscape between the rural areas of Draycott Parish, Borrowwash and Breaston. All villages that are also impacted by the proposal to reclassify Green Belt to Grey Belt for development as housing. I Understand that there is need for housing, the NPPF states that existing Brown Field and Grey Belt sites are to be prioritised over the development of Green Field and certainly Green Belt sites, but these plans offer up Green Belt in advance of Brown Field site development. The NPPF includes an overarching objective to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment, including making effective use of land. Therefore, existing Brownfield sites within Erewash Borough Council should be prioritised first over Green Belt land. NOTE there are 109 existing Brownfield sites within EBC that should be prioritised first over Green Belt land. The 109 existing Brownfield sites in EBC equate to 81Hectares with 103 of these having full planning permission. These sites should be prioritised first for development before Greenbelt land is considered. NPPF states that Green belt is to be protected and requires exceptional circumstances to be built on. There is nothing exceptional about the council's plans to build on un-spoilt Green Belt land to meet their current housing target when existing Brownfield sites exist. and should be protected
			Martin Fawcett	Response-01077	Grey and brown sites should be used and take priority over what is already green belt and should remain so
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Martin Kilcoyne	Response-01460	Protecting Green Belt land, this land should be kept open and unharmed Protecting public rights of way and access, a large number of footpaths would be affected Harm to the landscape is therefore intensified. NPPF states that existing Brown Field and Grey Belt sites are to be prioritised over the development of Green Field and certainly Green Belt sites, but these plans offer up Green Belt in advance of Brown Field site development. NPPF states that Green Belt is to be protected and requires exceptional circumstances to be built on. There is nothing exceptional about the council's plans to build on un-spoilt, Green Belt land to meet their current housing target when existing Brownfield sites exist. Great weight should be given to the findings and recommendations of independent Landscape Quality Assessment NPPF states Green Belt serves five purposes which are to; check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another; safeguard the countryside from encroachment; preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and assist urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The land to south west of Draycott meets all of this criteria and not only prevents urban sprawl but sets to preserve the countryside's open character and the enhancement of recreational opportunities for local residents. The NPPF includes an overarching objective to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment, including making effective use of land. Therefore, existing Brownfield sites within the EBC should be prioritised first over using Green Belt land. NPPF refers to Grey Belt as areas of previously developed land or other land that do not strongly contribute to Green Belt purposes, The land south west of Draycott is neither of these and strongly contributes towards Green Belt purposes as it acts as a buffer, safeguards the countryside and acts as a barrier to urban sprawl. NPPF states that in exceptional circumstances authorities should review Green Belt boundaries in accordance with the policies in this Framework and propose alterations to meet these needs in full, unless the review provides clear evidence that doing so would fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt. Changing the land south west of Draycott to Grey Belt and the development of 190 homes will negatively impact the remaining Green Belt land with overcapacity and increased population density. Working on the current population of Draycott, 190 new homes will be an at least 17% increase in population. This land is rural in character, providing a tranquil transitional landscape between the rural areas of Draycott Parish and Borrowwash and other villages surrounding it of Breaston and Borrowwash. "NPPF states where major development involving the provision of housing is proposed on land released from the Green Belt through plan preparation or review, or on sites in the Green Belt subject to a planning application, the following contributions (?Golden Rules?) should be made: - necessary improvements to local or national infrastructure; and - the provision of new, or improvements to existing, green spaces that are accessible to the public. New residents should be able to access good quality green spaces within a short walk of their home, whether through onsite provision or through access to offsite spaces. The proposal to remove the parcels of land as

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Martin Kilcoyne	Response-01460	identified from Green Belt status and the development of 190 homes will mean access to green spaces for existing residents will be less accessible, and no plans or provisions have been made to improve local infrastructure. We are not aware that any discussion has been undertaken by the authority to with neighbouring authorities on whether they can accommodate the development need through existing Brown Field or Grey Belt land. " NPPF states the development of homes, commercial and other development in the Green Belt should not be regarded as inappropriate where the development would utilise Grey Belt land and would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan. It is clear the authority is now altering existing and acceptable Green Belt land to suit this paragraph/approach of the NPPF by converting it to Grey Belt. This is both hasty and reckless. Footpaths, the Amenity and enjoyment of the use of these pathways which cross through and around this site which provide an important means by which residents of the local villages can get access to the countryside with substantial benefits for their physical and mental health as well as providing means of sustainable transport. The development on the land south west of Draycott for the people of Draycott and other areas, will have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, replacing green space with 190 houses. The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. It is the wrong model in the wrong place to deliver housing needs being of a scale that is ultimately detrimental to the local landscape and will harm the countryside, wildlife and impact irreversibly upon the area. This when there are 109 existing Brownfield sites within the EBC that should be prioritised first over Green Belt land. Will totally spoil a greenbelt area with lovely views. Unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape. The considerable scale, extent and nature of the proposed development would be contrary to national policy in NPPF. Understand there is need for new housing but there are an abundance of brownfield, previously developed sites that the developers and council should explore before this location. There are 109 existing Brownfield sites in EBC giving 81H with 103 of these having full planning permission. These sites should be prioritised first for development before Greenbelt land is considered. Of the 109 existing Brownfield sites in the EBC 8 of these are over 1H each giving a combined total of 15.29H. The land South West of Draycott is c.8H. These 8 sites alone will allow 514 net dwelling to be built. These sites should be prioritised for development before the Greenbelt land to the south west of Draycott is considered and lost forever. There are more appropriate areas that could hold such a large housing development and n
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Martin Kilcoyne	Response-01460	ot look out of place and spoil the little green areas left within this community. Whilst we/I understand the need for more housing we/I ask that you reconsider the location proposed and look for an alternative site that would house one more suitably. Supporter of the building of new houses but strongly object to the scale and location of this proposed development on the land South West of Draycott. It was previously thought that the land of the former Stanton Ironworks was taken out of the EBCs core strategy due to contamination that rendered the site unusable. Yet a recent Freedom of Information (FOI) request which was answered by EBC has advised the site is indeed to be utilised and has been allocated 1000 houses. Can EBC please advise if the status of the Stanton Ironworks sites and if this is included within the Core Strategy and how the planned 1000 houses impacts the Greenbelt review and use of Greenbelt land. NPPF states that existing Brown Field and Grey Belt sites are to be prioritised over the development of Green Field and certainly Green Belt sites, but these plans offer up Green Belt in advance of Brown Field site development. "NPPF 2. States it has three objectives to enable sustainable development. The third of these is an environmental objective ? to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy. The EBCs proposal of reclassifying the land South West of Draycott from Greenbelt to Greybelt land does not meet this objective and will actually achieve the total opposite. " NPPF 4. States that local planning authorities should approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way. They should use the full range of planning tools available, including brownfield registers and permission in principle, and work proactively with applicants to secure developments that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. EBC needs to demonstrate what appraisals have been undertaken on the 109 Brownfield sites as detailed within their own Brownfield Register, and why these sites have not been prioritised for development over the identified Green Belt land. NPPF 13. Protecting Green Belt Land:- The government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt is to keep land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. This is an inappropriate development in the Green Belt and there is NO evidence of the appraisals that have been undertaken on existing Brownfield sites within EBC which there are 109 with 8 of these giving over 51H and the opportunity to develop over 500 dwellings. NPPF 20. States that the target level of housing development within the plans should be capped in line with the capacity of Brownfield sites to accommodate it, to protect Green Belt yet these plans significantly exceed it. NPPF 143. The Green Belt serves 5 purposes: 1) To stop urban sprawl 2) To stop towns merging 3) To safeguard from encroachment onto the countryside 4) To preserve special settings, character and history 5) To ensure the recycling of derelict or Brownfield land. The proposals being made by EBC to reclassify existing Green Belt land to the south west of Draycott does not meet any of



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Martin Killohane	Response-01460	these 5 purposes and actually looks to achieve the total opposite. Furthermore, no apparent attempt has been made by EBC to demonstrate why the 109 existing Brownfield sites within EBC have not been prioritised over this Green Belt land. NPPF 144. States before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, the strategic policy-making authority should be able to demonstrate that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development. No attempt has been made by the authority to explore existing Brownfield sites or underutilised land within the EBC. NPPF 146. The applicant and authority MUST make as much use as possible of Brownfield Sites and underutilised land; AND PROVE that there is nothing left before encroaching on the Green Belt. ? There is no PROOF of the authority discussing with neighbouring authorities about whether they could accommodate some of the identified need for this development, in order not to use the Green Belt. NPPF 150. Once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity. NPPF 152. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. This application does not demonstrate any exceptional circumstances. NPPF 153. 'Very Special Circumstances? have to be proven i.e. all other options exhausted to classify this application as a ?very special circumstance?. We cannot see any evidence that this has taken place. Therefore, it is an inappropriate application and proposal and does not demonstrate exceptional circumstances. NPPF 156. The proposed development of 190 houses to the land south west of Draycott when located in the Green Belt, must demonstrate exceptional circumstances and are inappropriate unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Mary Walsh	Response-01197	Protecting Green Belt land, this land should be kept open and unharmed There are 109 existing Brownfield sites in EBC giving 81H with 103 of these having full planning permission. These sites should be prioritised first for development before Greenbelt land is considered. NPPF 143. The Green Belt serves 5 purposes: 1) To stop urban sprawl 2) To stop towns merging 3) To safeguard from encroachment onto the countryside 4) To preserve special settings, character and history 5) To ensure the recycling of derelict or Brownfield land. The proposals being made by EBC to reclassify existing Green Belt land to the south west of Draycott does not meet any of these 5 purposes and actually looks to achieve the total opposite. Furthermore, no apparent attempt has been made by EBC to demonstrate why the 109 existing Brownfield sites within EBC have not been prioritised over this Green Belt land.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Matthew Walker	Response-01313	I strongly do not believe these plans are in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, and the Erewash Borough Councils (EBC) Local Plan 2022. I also do not believe that adequate consultation has been undertaken by EBC with the Draycott Local Parish Council or residents on these plans, and the impact they will have on the local community, wider village and amenity. The NPPF states that Green Belt is to be protected and requires exceptional circumstances to be built on. There is nothing exceptional about the council's plans to build on un-spoilt, Green Belt land to meet their current housing target when existing Brownfield sites exist. NPPF states Green Belt serves five purposes which are to; check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another; safeguard the countryside from encroachment; preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and assist urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The land to south west of Draycott meets all of this criteria and not only prevents urban sprawl but sets to preserve the countryside?s open character and the enhancement of recreational opportunities for local residents. The land south west of Draycott is also land that has not previously been developed meaning it does not constitute Greybelt classification ad should remain Green Field and be maintained as Grade 2 agricultural land. The NPPF includes an overarching objective to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment, including making effective use of land. Therefore, existing Brownfield sites within the EBC should be prioritised first over using Green Belt land. The EBC amended Core Strategy does not meet this criteria. NPPF refers to Grey Belt as areas of previously developed land or other land that do not strongly contribute to Green Belt purposes, The land south west of Draycott is neither of these and strongly contributes towards Green Belt purposes as it acts as a buffer, safeguards the countryside and acts as a barrier to urban sprawl. NPPF states that in exceptional circumstances authorities should review Green Belt boundaries in accordance with the policies in this Framework and propose alterations to meet these needs in full, unless the review provides clear evidence that doing so would fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt. Changing the land south west of Draycott to Grey Belt and the development of 190 homes will negatively impact the remaining Green Belt land with overcapacity and increased population density. Working on the current population of Draycott, 190 new homes will be an at least 17% increase in population. This land is rural in character, providing a tranquil transitional landscape between the rural areas of Draycott Parish and Borrowash and other villages surrounding it of Breaston and Borrowash. NPPF states where major development involving the provision of housing is proposed on land released from the Green Belt through plan preparation or review, or on sites in the Green Belt subject to a planning application, the following contributions (?Golden Rules?) should be made: - necessary improvements to local or national infrastructure; and - the provision of new, or improvements to existing, green spaces that are accessible to the public. New residents should be able to access good quality green spaces within a short walk of their h

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Matthew Walker	Response-01313	ome, whether through onsite provision or through access to offsite spaces. The proposal to remove the parcels of land as identified from Green Belt status and the development of 190 homes will mean access to green spaces for existing residents will be less accessible, and no plans or provisions have been made to improve local infrastructure. We are not aware that any discussion has been undertaken by the authority to with neighbouring authorities on whether they can accommodate the development need through existing Brown Field or Grey Belt land. NPPF states the development of homes, commercial and other development in the Green Belt should not be regarded as inappropriate where the development would utilise Grey Belt land and would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan. It is clear the authority is now altering existing and acceptable Green Belt land to suit this paragraph/approach of the NPPF by converting it to Grey Belt. This is both hasty and reckless. There are 109 existing Brownfield sites in EBC giving 81H with 103 of these having full planning permission. These sites should be prioritised first for development before Greenbelt land is considered. Of the 109 existing Brownfield sites in the EBC 8 of these are over 1H each giving a combined total of 15.29H. The land South West of Draycott is c.8H. These 8 sites alone will allow 514 net dwelling to be built. These sites should be prioritised for development before the Greenbelt land to the south west of Draycott is considered and lost forever. There are more appropriate areas that could hold such a large housing development and not look out of place and spoil the little green areas left within this community. Supporter of the building of new houses but strongly object to the scale and location of this proposed development on the land South West of Draycott. It was previously thought that the land of the former Stanton Ironworks was taken out of the EBCs core strategy due to contamination that rendered the site unusable. Yet a recent Freedom of Information (FOI) request which was answered by EBC has advised the site is indeed to be utilised and has been allocated 1000 houses. Can EBC please advise if the status of the Stanton Ironworks sites and if this is included within the Core Strategy and how the planned 1000 houses impacts the Greenbelt review and use of Greenbelt land. NPPF states that existing Brown Field and Grey Belt sites are to be prioritised over the development of Green Field and certainly Green Belt sites, but these plans offer up Green Belt in advance of Brown Field site development. NPPF 2. States it has three objectives to enable sustainable development. The third of these is an environmental objective ? to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy. The EBCs proposal of reclassifying the land South West of Draycott from Greenbelt to Greybelt land does not meet this objective and will actually achieve the total opposite. NPPF 4. States that local planning authorities should approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way. They should use the full range of planning tools available, including brownfield registers and permission in
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Matthew Walker	Response-01313	principle, and work proactively with applicants to secure developments that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. EBC needs to demonstrate what appraisals have been undertaken on the 109 Brownfield sites as detailed within their own Brownfield Register, and why these sites have not been prioritised for development over the identified Green Belt land. NPPF 13. Protecting Green Belt Land:- The government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt is to keep land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. This is an inappropriate development in the Green Belt and there is NO evidence of the appraisals that have been undertaken on existing Brownfield sites within EBC which there are 109 with 8 of these giving over 51H and the opportunity to develop over 500 dwellings. NPPF 20. States that the target level of housing development within the plans should be capped in line with the capacity of Brownfield sites to accommodate it, to protect Green Belt yet these plans significantly exceed it. NPPF 143. The Green Belt serves 5 purposes: 1) To stop urban sprawl 2) To stop towns merging 3) To safeguard from encroachment onto the countryside 4) To preserve special settings, character and history 5) To ensure the recycling of derelict or Brownfield land. The proposals being made by EBC to reclassify existing Green Belt land to the south west of Draycott does not meet any of these 5 purposes and actually looks to achieve the total opposite. Furthermore, no apparent attempt has been made by EBC to demonstrate why the 109 existing Brownfield sites within EBC have not been prioritised over this Green Belt land. NPPF 144. States before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, the strategic policy-making authority should be able to demonstrate that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development. No attempt has been made by the authority to explore existing Brownfield sites or underutilised land within the EBC. NPPF 146. The applicant and authority MUST make as much use as possible of Brownfield Sites and underutilised land; AND PROVE that there is nothing left before encroaching on the Green Belt. ? There is no PROOF of the authority discussing with neighbouring authorities about whether they could accommodate some of the identified need for this development, in order not to use the Green Belt. NPPF 150. Once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity. NPPF 152. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. This application does not demonstrate any exceptional circumstances. NPPF 153. 'Very Special Circumstances? have to be proven i.e. all other options exhausted to classify this application as a ?very special circumstance?. We cannot see any evidence that this has taken place. Therefore, it is an inappropriate application and proposal and does not demonstrate exceptional circumstances. NPPF 156. The proposed development of 190 houses to the land south west of Draycott when located in the Green Belt, must demonstrate exceptional circumstances and are inappropriate unless very special circumstances can
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Matthew Walker	Response-01313	be demonstrated.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Matt Tovey	Response-00929	Green belt land should be preserved at all costs. We need green spaces for mental wellbeing.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Maureen Pinchbeck	Response-00041	With the unsure state of the world we should be keeping greenbelt, we need to be able to feed ourselves.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Melanie Wilson	Response-00974	Building on Greenbelt should be avoided it is not acceptable to remove this

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Michael Thirtwall	Response-01196	There are 109 existing Brownfield sites within the EBC that should be prioritised before the Green Belt land south west of Draycott is used.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Michelle Marks	Response-00924	The proposed site is designated Green Belt land, which serves a critical role in preventing urban sprawl, protecting natural habitats, and maintaining the rural character of our countryside. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2023) explicitly states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances (Paragraph 140), and that inappropriate development should not be permitted unless very special circumstances exist (Paragraphs 149-150). No compelling justification has been provided to demonstrate that these criteria have been met.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Miss Ella Meredith	Response-01850	EBC should be protecting Green Belt land. The Green Belt and green fields should remain open and safe, preserving public rights of way and access to local green spaces. The Draycott footpaths are in constant use, providing villagers easy access to a countryside environment. This land is rural in character, offering a tranquil and transitional landscape between Daycott Parish, Borrowwash, and Breaston. All these villages are impacted by the proposal to reclassify Green Belt to Grey Belt for housing development. While there is a need for housing, the NPPF states that existing Brownfield and Grey Belt sites should be prioritized over Green Belt sites. There are 109 existing Brownfield sites within EBC, equating to 81 hectares, with 103 of these having full planning permission. These sites should be prioritized for development before Green Belt land is considered. The NPPF states that Green Belt is to be protected and requires exceptional circumstances for development. There is nothing exceptional about the council plans to build on unspoilt Green Belt land to meet their housing target when existing Brownfield sites are available. The land south west of Draycott meets all the criteria for Green Belt purposes, preventing urban sprawl, preserving the countryside's open character, and enhancing recreational opportunities for local residents. Changing this land to Grey Belt and developing 190 homes will negatively impact the remaining Green Belt land with overcapacity and increased population density.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Miss Natalie Walsh	Response-01846	EBC should be protecting Green Belt land. The Green Belt and green fields should remain open and safe, preserving public rights of way and access to local green spaces. The Draycott footpaths are in constant use, providing villagers easy access to a countryside environment. This land is rural in character, offering a tranquil and transitional landscape between Daycott Parish, Borrowwash, and Breaston. All these villages are impacted by the proposal to reclassify Green Belt to Grey Belt for housing development. While there is a need for housing, the NPPF states that existing Brownfield and Grey Belt sites should be prioritized over Green Belt sites. There are 109 existing Brownfield sites within EBC, equating to 81 hectares, with 103 of these having full planning permission. These sites should be prioritized for development before Green Belt land is considered. The NPPF states that Green Belt is to be protected and requires exceptional circumstances for development. There is nothing exceptional about the council plans to build on unspoilt Green Belt land to meet their housing target when existing Brownfield sites are available. The land south west of Draycott meets all the criteria for Green Belt purposes, preventing urban sprawl, preserving the countryside's open character, and enhancing recreational opportunities for local residents. Changing this land to Grey Belt and developing 190 homes will negatively impact the remaining Green Belt land with overcapacity and increased population density.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Miss Paige Murray	Response-01842	EBC should be protecting Green Belt land. The Green Belt and green fields should remain open and safe, preserving public rights of way and access to local green spaces. The Draycott footpaths are in constant use, providing villagers easy access to a countryside environment. This land is rural in character, offering a tranquil and transitional landscape between Daycott Parish, Borrowwash, and Breaston. All these villages are impacted by the proposal to reclassify Green Belt to Grey Belt for housing development. While there is a need for housing, the NPPF states that existing Brownfield and Grey Belt sites should be prioritized over Green Belt sites. There are 109 existing Brownfield sites within EBC, equating to 81 hectares, with 103 of these having full planning permission. These sites should be prioritized for development before Green Belt land is considered. The NPPF states that Green Belt is to be protected and requires exceptional circumstances for development. There is nothing exceptional about the council plans to build on unspoilt Green Belt land to meet their housing target when existing Brownfield sites are available. The land south west of Draycott meets all the criteria for Green Belt purposes, preventing urban sprawl, preserving the countryside's open character, and enhancing recreational opportunities for local residents. Changing this land to Grey Belt and developing 190 homes will negatively impact the remaining Green Belt land with overcapacity and increased population density.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Mr Graham Bingham and Mrs Kristine Bingham	Response-01302	EBC should be protecting the green belt land. While there is a need for housing, the NPPF states that existing Brownfield and Grey belt sites should be prioritized over Green belt sites. There are 109 existing Brownfield sites within EBC, equating to 81 Hectares, with 103 of these having full planning permission. These sites should be prioritized for development before Green Belt land is considered. The NPPF states that Green belt is to be protected and requires exceptional circumstances for development. There is nothing exceptional about the councils plans to build on unspoilt Green Belt land to meet their housing target when existing Brownfield sites are available. The land south west of Draycott meets all the criteria for Green Belt purposes, preventing urban sprawl, preserving the countryside's open character, and enhancing recreational opportunities for local residents. Changing this land to Grey belt and building 190 homes on it will negatively impact the remaining Green Belt land.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Mr G Wyatt	Response-01269	With regard to the proposed planning on the green belt in SW Draycott, in particular the large field that goes down to the main road. This field has been growing cereal crops for the last 15 to 20 years to my knowledge (I have lived in Draycott for the last 73 years). Your proposal says this is going to be taken out of production for housing. Please explain how many acres of green belt and farm land have been taken out of production in Erewash. Production of crops to feed the British people is declining in England and due to climate change, across the world. So in future how will you feed the British people.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Mr R Sykes	Response-00412	That is exactly how it should stay, since the area floods heavily through out the year, the village commitment to supply housing within the Parish was fulfilled in the conversion of Victoria Mills, some 300 homes, Market Street Mills, and Cowslip Meadow. Greed is fuelling the situation, with an estimated 600000 empty properties around the country, get those occupied first.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Mr Scott Walsh	Response-01844	EBC should be protecting Green Belt land. The Green Belt and green fields should remain open and safe, preserving public rights of way and access to local green spaces. The Draycott footpaths are in constant use, providing villagers easy access to a countryside environment. This land is rural in character, offering a tranquil and transitional landscape between Daycott Parish, Borrowwash, and Breaston. All these villages are impacted by the proposal to reclassify Green Belt to Grey Belt for housing development. While there is a need for housing, the NPPF states that existing Brownfield and Grey Belt sites should be prioritized over Green Belt sites. There are 109 existing Brownfield sites within EBC, equating to 81 hectares, with 103 of these having full planning permission. These sites should be prioritized for development before Green Belt land is considered. The NPPF states that Green Belt is to be protected and requires exceptional circumstances for development. There is nothing exceptional about the council plans to build on unspoilt Green Belt land to meet their housing target when existing Brownfield sites are available. The land south west of Draycott meets all the criteria for Green Belt purposes, preventing urban sprawl, preserving the countryside's open character, and enhancing recreational opportunities for local residents. Changing this land to Grey Belt and developing 190 homes will negatively impact the remaining Green Belt land with overcapacity and increased population density.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Mrs Elizabeth White	Response-00060	It is wrong to build on green belt when there is so much brown site that could be used.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Mrs Mary Walsh	Response-01845	EBC should be protecting Green Belt land. The Green Belt and green fields should remain open and safe, preserving public rights of way and access to local green spaces. The Draycott footpaths are in constant use, providing villagers easy access to a countryside environment. This land is rural in character, offering a tranquil and transitional landscape between Daycott Parish, Borrowwash, and Breaston. All these villages are impacted by the proposal to reclassify Green Belt to Grey Belt for housing development. While there is a need for housing, the NPPF states that existing Brownfield and Grey Belt sites should be prioritized over Green Belt sites. There are 109 existing Brownfield sites within EBC, equating to 81 hectares, with 103 of these having full planning permission. These sites should be prioritized for development before Green Belt land is considered. The NPPF states that Green Belt is to be protected and requires exceptional circumstances for development. There is nothing exceptional about the council plans to build on unspoilt Green Belt land to meet their housing target when existing Brownfield sites are available. The land south west of Draycott meets all the criteria for Green Belt purposes, preventing urban sprawl, preserving the countryside's open character, and enhancing recreational opportunities for local residents. Changing this land to Grey Belt and developing 190 homes will negatively impact the remaining Green Belt land with overcapacity and increased population density.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Mrs Patricia L Tacey	Response-00283	The stretch of land between Draycott and Borrowwash is practically the only Green Belt left on the route from Long Eaton to Derby. If this is built on, which once the precedent is set will almost certainly happen, then the whole area will become one extended urban sprawl instead of the individual villages each with it's own character.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Mr Tony Walsh	Response-01849	EBC should be protecting Green Belt land. The Green Belt and green fields should remain open and safe, preserving public rights of way and access to local green spaces. The Draycott footpaths are in constant use, providing villagers easy access to a countryside environment. This land is rural in character, offering a tranquil and transitional landscape between Daycott Parish, Borrowwash, and Breaston. All these villages are impacted by the proposal to reclassify Green Belt to Grey Belt for housing development. While there is a need for housing, the NPPF states that existing Brownfield and Grey Belt sites should be prioritized over Green Belt sites. There are 109 existing Brownfield sites within EBC, equating to 81 hectares, with 103 of these having full planning permission. These sites should be prioritized for development before Green Belt land is considered. The NPPF states that Green Belt is to be protected and requires exceptional circumstances for development. There is nothing exceptional about the council plans to build on unspoilt Green Belt land to meet their housing target when existing Brownfield sites are available. The land south west of Draycott meets all the criteria for Green Belt purposes, preventing urban sprawl, preserving the countryside's open character, and enhancing recreational opportunities for local residents. Changing this land to Grey Belt and developing 190 homes will negatively impact the remaining Green Belt land with overcapacity and increased population density.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Nicole Howe	Response-00881	Prevents Urban Sprawl Green Belts act as buffers around cities and towns to stop them from expanding uncontrollably into the countryside, maintaining distinct boundaries between urban and rural areas. 2. Protects the Environment and Biodiversity These areas often include valuable natural habitats, farmland, and woodland, helping preserve biodiversity, wildlife corridors, and clean air. 3. Preserves Natural Beauty and Open Space Green Belts provide open landscapes that enhance quality of life, offering space for recreation, walking, and connection to nature. 4. Supports Sustainable Development By discouraging outward sprawl, development is directed to brownfield or previously developed land, promoting urban regeneration and more efficient use of infrastructure
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Nigel morton	Response-01351	I object to the core strategy being used to change this area of greenbelt to grey .it is arable land and an area of outstanding beauty and high grade greenbelt .There are 109 brownfield and grey sites which should be used first and areas in draycott that would be better than this ie sawley lane and Hopwell road.This area is absolutely irreplaceable

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Nikki Riches	Response-00950	<p>? As a local resident, I relay on the local greenbelt, and public rights of way to stay both mentally and physically fit. I whole heartedly object to these proposals due to the importance of the green belt for fauna flora, wildlife and the local community as once it's lost its lost forever for future generations. I walk in the area of the proposed development and have seen many different types of wildlife living in the area which is their home. ? Green belt land should be kept open and unharmed, and we should be protecting public rights of way and access, a large number of footpaths would be affected. ? I don't feel taking the green belt for this development constitutes as an ?exceptional circumstance?, I appreciate the housing need, but this is a way for developers to maximise profit, its cheaper to build on unspoilt land and the ?edge? of the village helps with this. There are 109 existing Brownfield sites in EBC giving 81H with 103 of these having full planning permission. These sites should be prioritised first for development before Greenbelt land is even considered. ? NPPF states that existing Brown Field and Grey Belt sites are to be prioritised over the development of Green Field and certainly Green Belt sites, but these plans offer up Green Belt in advance of Brown Field site development. ? NPPF states that Green Belt is to be protected and requires exceptional circumstances to be built on. There is nothing exceptional about the council's plans to build on un-spoilt, Green Belt land to meet their current housing target when existing Brownfield sites exist. ? Great weight should be given to the findings and recommendations of independent Landscape Quality Assessment ? NPPF states Green Belt serves five purposes which are to; check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another; safeguard the countryside from encroachment; preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and assist urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The land to south west of Draycott meets all of this criteria and not only prevents urban sprawl but sets to preserve the countryside's open character and the enhancement of recreational opportunities for local residents. ? The NPPF includes an overarching objective to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment, including making effective use of land. Therefore, existing Brownfield sites within the EBC should be prioritised first over using Green Belt land. ? NPPF refers to Grey Belt as areas of previously developed land or other land that do not strongly contribute to Green Belt purposes, The land south west of Draycott is neither of these and strongly contributes towards Green Belt purposes as it acts as a buffer, safeguards the countryside and acts as a barrier to urban sprawl. ? NPPF states that in exceptional circumstances authorities should review Green Belt boundaries in accordance with the policies in this Framework and propose alterations to meet these needs in full, unless the review provides clear evidence that doing so would fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt. Changing the land south west of Draycott to Grey Belt and the development of 190 homes will negatively impact the remaining Green Belt land with overcapacity and increased population density. Working on the current population of Draycott, 190 new homes will be an at</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Nikki Riches	Response-00950	<p>least 17% increase in population. ? This land is rural in character, providing a tranquil transitional landscape between the rural areas of Draycott Parish and Borrowash and other villages surrounding it of Breaston and Borrowash. ? NPPF states where major development involving the provision of housing is proposed on land released from the Green Belt through plan preparation or review, or on sites in the Green Belt subject to a planning application, the following contributions (?Golden Rules?) should be made: ? necessary improvements to local or national infrastructure; and ? the provision of new, or improvements to existing, green spaces that are accessible to the public. New residents should be able to access good quality green spaces within a short walk of their home, whether through onsite provision or through access to offsite spaces. ? The proposal to remove the parcels of land as identified from Green Belt status and the development of 190 homes will mean access to green spaces for existing residents will be less accessible, and no plans or provisions have been made to improve local infrastructure. We are not aware that any discussion has been undertaken by the authority to with neighbouring authorities on whether they can accommodate the development need through existing Brown Field or Grey Belt land. ? NPPF states the development of homes, commercial and other development in the Green Belt should not be regarded as inappropriate where the development would utilise Grey Belt land and would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan. It is clear the authority is now altering existing and acceptable Green Belt land to suit this paragraph/approach of the NPPF by converting it to Grey Belt. This is both hasty and reckless. ? Footpaths, the Amenity and enjoyment of the use of these pathways which cross through and around this site which provide an important means by which residents of the local villages can get access to the countryside with substantial benefits for their physical and mental health as well as providing means of sustainable transport. The development on the land south west of Draycott for the people of Draycott and other areas, will have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, replacing green space with 190 houses. ? The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. ? It is the wrong model in the wrong place to deliver housing needs being of a scale that is ultimately detrimental to the local landscape and will harm the countryside, wildlife and impact irreversibly upon the area. This when there are 109 existing Brownfield sites within the EBC that should be prioritised first over Green Belt land. ? The development will totally spoil a greenbelt area with lovely views and provide unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape. ?</p>

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Nikki Riches	Response-00950	The considerable scale, extent and nature of the proposed development would be contrary to national policy in NPPF. ? Understand there is need for new housing but there are an abundance of brownfield, previously developed sites that the developers and council should explore before this location. ? There are 109 existing Brownfield sites in EBC giving 81H with 103 of these having full planning permission. These sites should be prioritised first for development before Greenbelt land is considered. ? Of the 109 existing Brownfield sites in the EBC 8 of these are over 1H each giving a combined total of 15.29H. The land South West of Draycott is c.8H. These 8 sites alone will allow 514 net dwelling to be built. These sites should be prioritised for development before the Greenbelt land to the south west of Draycott is considered and lost forever. ? There are more appropriate areas that could hold such a large housing development and not look out of place and spoil the little green areas left within this community. ? Whilst we/I understand the need for more housing we/I ask that you reconsider the location proposed and look for an alternative site that would house one more suitably. ? Supporter of the building of new houses but strongly object to the scale and location of this proposed development on the land South West of Draycott. ? It was previously thought that the land of the former Stanton Ironworks was taken out of the EBCs core strategy due to contamination that rendered the site unusable. Yet a recent Freedom of Information (FOI) request which was answered by EBC has advised the site is indeed to be utilised and has been allocated 1000 houses. Can EBC please advise if the status of the Stanton Ironworks sites and if this is included within the Core Strategy and how the planned 1000 houses impacts the Greenbelt review and use of Greenbelt land. ? NPPF states that existing Brown Field and Grey Belt sites are to be prioritised over the development of Green Field and certainly Green Belt sites, but these plans offer up Green Belt in advance of Brown Field site development. ? NPPF 2. States it has three objectives to enable sustainable development. The third of these is an environmental objective ? to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy. The EBCs proposal of reclassifying the land South West of Draycott from Greenbelt to Greybelt land does not meet this objective and will actually achieve the total opposite. ? NPPF 4. States that local planning authorities should approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way. They should use the full range of planning tools available, including brownfield registers and permission in principle, and work proactively with applicants to secure developments that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. EBC needs to demonstrate what appraisals have been undertaken on the 109 Brownfield sites as detailed within their own Brownfield Register, and why these sites have not been prioritised for development over the identified Green Belt land. ? NPPF 13. Protecting Green Belt Land:- The government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt is to keep land permanently open; the e
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Nikki Riches	Response-00950	ssential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. This is an inappropriate development in the Green Belt and there is NO evidence of the appraisals that have been undertaken on existing Brownfield sites within EBC which there are 109 with 8 of these giving over 51H and the opportunity to develop over 500 dwellings. ? NPPF 20. States that the target level of housing development within the plans should be capped in line with the capacity of Brownfield sites to accommodate it, to protect Green Belt yet these plans significantly exceed it. ? NPPF 143. The Green Belt serves 5 purposes: 1) To stop urban sprawl 2) To stop towns merging 3) To safeguard from encroachment onto the countryside 4) To preserve special settings, character and history 5) To ensure the recycling of derelict or Brownfield land. The proposals being made by EBC to reclassify existing Green Belt land to the south west of Draycott does not meet any of these 5 purposes and actually looks to achieve the total opposite. Furthermore, no apparent attempt has been made by EBC to demonstrate why the 109 existing Brownfield sites within EBC have not been prioritised over this Green Belt land. ? NPPF 144. States before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, the strategic policy-making authority should be able to demonstrate that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development. No attempt has been made by the authority to explore existing Brownfield sites or underutilised land within the EBC. ? NPPF 146. The applicant and authority MUST make as much use as possible of Brownfield Sites and underutilised land; AND PROVE that there is nothing left before encroaching on the Green Belt. ? There is no PROOF of the authority discussing with neighbouring authorities about whether they could accommodate some of the identified need for this development, in order not to use the Green Belt. ? NPPF 150. Once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity. ? NPPF 152. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. This application does not demonstrate any exceptional circumstances. ? NPPF 153. 'Very Special Circumstances' have to be proven i.e. all other options exhausted to classify this application as a ?very special circumstance?. We cannot see any evidence that this has taken place. Therefore, it is an inappropriate application and proposal and does not demonstrate exceptional circumstances. ? NPPF 156. The proposed development of 190 houses to the land south west of Draycott when located in the Green Belt, must demonstrate exceptional circumstances and are inappropriate unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Oliver Kirk	Response-00569	Development here sets a dangerous precedent for the loss of future greenbelt land.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Paul Allen	Response-01082	The area and its distant views towards Risley in the North and Kings mills in the South will be negatively impacted by this substantial, overbearing, development. There are sufficient Brownfield and Grey Belt site located with Erewash Borough Council's control, which should be considered for development before Green Belt sites.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	paul butcher	Response-01154	Protecting Green Belt land, this land should be kept open and unharmed Protecting public rights of way and access, a large number of footpaths would be affected NPPF states that existing Brown Field and Grey Belt sites are to be prioritised over the development of Green Field and certainly Green Belt sites, but these plans offer up Green Belt in advance of Brown Field site development. NPPF states that Green Belt is to be protected and requires exceptional circumstances to be built on. There is nothing exceptional about the council's plans to build on un-spoilt, Green Belt land to meet their current housing target when existing Brownfield sites exist. Great weight should be given to the findings and recommendations of independent Landscape Quality Assessment The NPPF includes an overarching objective to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment, including making effective use of land. Therefore, existing Brownfield sites within the EBC should be prioritised first over using Green Belt land. NPPF refers to Grey Belt as areas of previously developed land or other land that do not strongly contribute to Green Belt purposes, The land south west of Draycott is neither of these and strongly contributes towards Green Belt purposes as it acts as a buffer, safeguards the countryside and acts as a barrier to urban sprawl. NPPF states that in exceptional circumstances authorities should review Green Belt boundaries in accordance with the policies in this Framework and propose alterations to meet these needs in full, unless the review provides clear evidence that doing so would fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt. Changing the land south west of Draycott to Grey Belt and the development of 190 homes will negatively impact the remaining Green Belt land with overcapacity and increased population density. Working on the current population of Draycott, 190 new homes will be an at least 17% increase in population. This land is rural in character, providing a tranquil transitional landscape between the rural areas of Draycott Parish and Borrowash and other villages surrounding it of Breaston and Borrowash. NPPF states the development of homes, commercial and other development in the Green Belt should not be regarded as inappropriate where the development would utilise Grey Belt land and would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan. It is clear the authority is now altering existing and acceptable Green Belt land to suit this paragraph/approach of the NPPF by converting it to Grey Belt. This is both hasty and reckless. Footpaths, the Amenity and enjoyment of the use of these pathways which cross through and around this site which provide an important means by which residents of the local villages can get access to the countryside with substantial benefits for their physical and mental health as well as providing means of sustainable transport. The development on the land south west of Draycott for the people of Draycott and other areas, will have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, replacing green space with 190 houses. The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	paul butcher	Response-01154	an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. It is the wrong model in the wrong place to deliver housing needs being of a scale that is ultimately detrimental to the local landscape and will harm the countryside, wildlife and impact irreversibly upon the area. This when there are 109 existing Brownfield sites within the EBC that should be prioritised first over Green Belt land. Understand there is need for new housing but there are an abundance of brownfield, previously developed sites that the developers and council should explore before this location. There are 109 existing Brownfield sites in EBC giving 81H with 103 of these having full planning permission. These sites should be prioritised first for development before Greenbelt land is considered. Of the 109 existing Brownfield sites in the EBC 8 of these are over 1H each giving a combined total of 15.29H. The land South West of Draycott is c.8H. These 8 sites alone will allow 514 net dwelling to be built. These sites should be prioritised for development before the Greenbelt land to the south west of Draycott is considered and lost forever. It was previously thought that the land of the former Stanton Ironworks was taken out of the EBCs core strategy due to contamination that rendered the site unusable. Yet a recent Freedom of Information (FOI) request which was answered by EBC has advised the site is indeed to be utilised and has been allocated 1000 houses. Can EBC please advise if the status of the Stanton Ironworks sites and if this is included within the Core Strategy and how the planned 1000 houses impacts the Greenbelt review and use of Greenbelt land. NPPF states that existing Brown Field and Grey Belt sites are to be prioritised over the development of Green Field and certainly Green Belt sites, but these plans offer up Green Belt in advance of Brown Field site development. NPPF 4. States that local planning authorities should approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way. They should use the full range of planning tools available, including brownfield registers and permission in principle, and work proactively with applicants to secure developments that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. EBC needs to demonstrate what appraisals have been undertaken on the 109 Brownfield sites as detailed within their own Brownfield Register, and why these sites have not been prioritised for development over the identified Green Belt land. NPPF 13. Protecting Green Belt Land:- The government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt is to keep land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. This is an inappropriate development in the Green Belt and there is NO evidence of the appraisals that have been undertaken on existing Brownfield sites within EBC which there are 109 with 8 of these giving over 51H and the opportunity to develop over 500 dwellings. NPPF 146. The applicant and authority MUST make as much use as possible of Brownfield Sites and underutilised land; AND PROVE that there is nothing left before encroaching on the Green Belt.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	paul butcher	Response-01154	? There is no PROOF of the authority discussing with neighbouring authorities about whether they could accommodate some of the identified need for this development, in order not to use the Green Belt. NPPF 152. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. This application does not demonstrate any exceptional circumstances.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Pauline Marks	Response-00927	The land earmarked for development is part of the designated Green Belt? a vital buffer that prevents urban sprawl, preserves wildlife habitats, and maintains the open, rural landscape that defines Draycott. According to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2023), changes to Green Belt boundaries should occur only under exceptional circumstances (Para 140), and inappropriate development must be avoided unless truly special justification exists (Paras 149?150). No such justification has been presented in this case.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Paul Riley	Response-00029	There are plenty of brown belt and grey belt areas that should be built on before we look to build on ANY green belt land. There is absolutely no excuse for it.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Peter Bates	Response-01912	This has been a Green Belt location for many years and to change its status would be damaging to the Village, its residents, the wildlife and the environment. This is not protecting our fragile environment or providing biodiversity in our green spaces. Crops that feed the nation are also grown on some of this green belt land. Food vs Housing I believe food should come first Especially in to-days world political environment. I am a supporter of building new houses in the Erewash area but strongly object to the scale and location of this proposed development on the land south west of Draycott. This is particularly annoying when the EBC have not demonstrated what appraisals they have done on their current 109 Brownfield sites as detailed within their own Brownfield register, and why these have not been prioritised for development over identified Green Belt land. Why has the former Stanton Iron works land not been mentioned?
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Peter Sutton	Response-00409	Green belt is a finite resource and other areas must be used. This area is massively used by the local community and visitors. It offers huge benefits to physical and mental health.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	R Fazackerley	Response-01415	The development of housing g on thr greenbelt and in a known flood prone area is irresponsible the loss of this land and amenity will adversely affect thr localcommunity and it's wellbeing
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Richard Keith Hanbury	Response-01087	We love our green belt as it is. It is great when I walk to my parents. It helps my health and wellbeing. I would hate to see it all go. The green belt is for the future not just for us to use. Once gone it will never be given back. The green belt is precious and should not be written off so lightly. How can you be so heartless in taking it away. There are plenty of affordable houses for sale in this area right now. Please leave our precious, beautiful countryside alone.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Richard Syson	Response-01317	Protecting Green Belt land, this land should be kept open and unharmed. Protecting public rights of way and access, a large number of footpaths would be affected. Harm to the landscape is therefore intensified. The updated NPPF - 12/12/24 states that Green Belt is to be protected and requires exceptional circumstances to be built on. There is nothing exceptional about the council's plans to build on un-spoilt, Green Belt land to meet their current housing target when existing Brownfield sites exist. The updated NPPF - 12/12/24 states Green Belt serves five purposes which are to; check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another; safeguard the countryside from encroachment; preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and assist urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The land to south west of Draycott meets all of this criteria and not only prevents urban sprawl but sets to preserve the countryside's open character and the enhancement of recreational opportunities for local residents. The Labour Party stated in their 2024 election manifesto that they were committed to "brownfield first approach" but would loosen planning laws to create a new class of "grey belt" land for "low quality green belt areas", where "low quality" would include "poor quality scrubland / mothballed on the outskirts of towns" - the green belt land earmarked for this preposterous development proposal is neither - it is unspoiled green fields There are 109 existing Brownfield sites in EBC giving 81H with 103 of these having full planning permission. These sites should be prioritised first for development before Greenbelt land is considered. Of the 109 existing Brownfield sites in the EBC 8 of these are over 1H each giving a combined total of 15.29H. The land South West of Draycott is c.8H. These 8 sites alone will allow 514 net dwelling to be built. These sites should be prioritised for development before the Greenbelt land to the south west of Draycott is considered and lost forever.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Rick Howden	Response-01421	This land is rural in character, providing a tranquil transitional landscape between the rural areas of Draycott Parish and Borrowash and other villages surrounding it of Breaston and Borrowash. NPPF states the development of homes, commercial and other development in the Green Belt should not be regarded as inappropriate where the development would utilise Grey Belt land and would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan. It is clear the authority is now altering existing and acceptable Green Belt land to suit this paragraph/approach of the NPPF by converting it to Grey Belt. This is both hasty and reckless.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Robert Alan Duncanson	Response-00855	IF BUILDING IS ALLOWED THEN IT WILL JUST CONTINUE TO EXPAND THE VILLAGE AND IT WILL CEASE TO BE A VILLAGE AND LOSE ALL THE APEAL FOR PEOPLE



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Robert Mee	Response-01505	My main reason for objecting to these developments is that I do not believe that the criteria set out in the NPPF has been met justifying any encroachment into the Green Belt at this time. The Core Strategy and this Amendment are developed in order to meet the housing targets allocated to the council by central government. I do not believe that the number of houses required by government constitutes, in itself, the 'exceptional circumstances' which are required under the Framework. This is particularly so in view of there being no published objective basis for the numbers allocated to each authority. The term 'exceptional circumstances' does include 'instances where an authority cannot meet its identified need for homes?'. The waiting list for social housing in the general area might suggest that this is the case, but I do not accept that these plans will go far to address this issue? the vast majority of the planned housing allocations are not even for affordable housing, let alone social housing. Additionally, I do not remember seeing evidence that Erewash has specifically quantified local (i.e. Erewash) housing needs. I also do not believe that much, if any, of the Green Belt selected for development would fit the definition of 'Grey Belt?'. As a concept, I can support the idea of Grey Belt as originally reported, i.e. pieces of land within the Green Belt which have previously been developed? indeed, I can think of a few locally, though they are all fairly small. I find the arguments that I have heard over distances between the edge of Derby and the edge of other towns, and how these distances will still be maintained, extremely spurious. The Green Belt in its entirety exists to prevent Nottingham and Derby from merging? while building on any of these sites does not immediately make the two cities any closer to each other, it does reduce the green space between the two cities, which is precisely what the Green Belt was established to prevent. The Green Belt is a regional initiative, covering two counties and several local authorities. With Erewash having such a high proportion of its land earmarked as Green Belt it is incumbent on the region as a whole to find a solution to the housing shortage, rather than to expect our authority to have to sacrifice its green spaces.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Roger Brown	Response-00999	Once green belt has been used for development it can never be returned. The green belt which surrounds Draycott is precious for its ecosystems, its access to nature, the envelopment of a village atmosphere and the now almost disappeared green separation of Derby and Nottingham. There are precious few fields evident along the A6005 corridor from Derby to Nottingham, this would involve the loss of two more and would put Draycott a little closer to Borrowash by narrowing that gap, the last between Draycott and Derby.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Ross Roberts	Response-01377	We should not be building on green belt land
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Ruth Hawkins	Response-01277	I understand there is a need for new housing but there are brownfield, previously developed sites that the developers and council should explore before this location. ie the 109 existing Brownfield sites in EBC with 103 of these having full planning permission. These sites should be prioritised first for development before Greenbelt land is considered.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Sandra Ison	Response-01897	Erewash Borough Council should be looking at existing brown field sites or the regeneration of empty buildings for development.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Sarah	Response-01541	We use this area for dog walks and wildlife. It's very limited already.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Sarah Hargreaves	Response-01314	1. Contradiction to NPPF: The reclassification of Green Belt land to Grey Belt contradicts the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024 and the EBC Local Plan 2022. The Grey Belt policy has been implemented hastily and lacks transparency. 2. Impact on Green Spaces: The proposed development threatens to destroy protected green spaces, which are essential for preventing urban sprawl, safeguarding the countryside, and preserving the character of a historic village such as Draycott. 3. Housing Targets: The current housing targets driving this development are flawed and unrealistic, leading to overburdening local communities and disregarding the impact on the village.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Sara Walker-Bradley	Response-01440	This is green belt land, there are plenty of grey sites already in Erewash which should be allocated first, green belt should be protected.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Scott Gardner	Response-01554	My fundamental objection lies in the proposed development on Green Belt land. This directly contradicts the core principles of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which places significant importance on protecting the Green Belt from inappropriate development. The loss of this "sensitive Green Belt land" will irrevocably harm the character of our village and the surrounding countryside. Policy 3 of the Erewash Core Strategy also addresses the Green Belt, and this proposal appears to be in direct conflict with its aims to safeguard this vital asset. The claim that there is "no other choice" than to build on the Green Belt is unsubstantiated given the lack of transparency regarding the consideration of alternative sites. Performing basic research of alternatives provides numerous options, there are significant numbers of vacant, run down old factories etc in Long Eaton just as one example, the old school site in Breaston is another. There are 109 existing brownbelt sites within EBC, 81 Hectares! 103 of these have full planning permission. There is nothing exceptional about the circumstances of this proposal other than the political desire of Councillors to fulfill national housing targets

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Sean Peace	Response-01347	<p>1 Recognise the loss of the ecology in the area and the importance of the flora, fauna and wildlife. 5 2 Unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape. 6 3 This is a colossal development which is not appropriate for the location chosen. The development will negatively impact the ecology, wildlife and beauty of the area. 7 4 The taking away of grazing/arable land and the disruption for the wildlife. 8 5 These decisions are irreversible, and our children will have less open countryside to explore and play in. Losing safe connecting space between locations. This when existing and available Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised over Greenbelt. 9 6 Recognise the loss of the ecology in the area and the importance of the flora, fauna and wildlife. There is an opinion that the deer fencing would devalue the area of open farmland and public right of way. 10 7 This is a colossal development which is not appropriate for the location chosen. The development will negatively impact the ecology, wildlife and beauty of the area. 11 8 The land to the south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of wildlife from birds, foxes, hedgehogs and squirrels and the development of 190 homes will mean the death of many different animals and the destruction of this mature natural habitat. 12 9 These plans plus the plans for National Grid to install super pylons only circa 600 meters away means the south west area of Draycott, will be hugely impacted from both a conservation and natural environment perspective. This area of the village will be unrealistically overburdened with development on Green Belt and green spaces. 13 10 Following the excavation of the adjacent Derby Road to Draycott canal water voles were discovered and remedial action was taken during this work to prevent endangerment of this wildlife. When considering the adjacent development of 190 houses and the heavy and sustained construction traffic during the life cycle of the development, this will likely force this and other wildlife to relocate from the area. 14 11 Historical badger sett on part of the site to the Victorian tip at the bridge of Nooning Lane. 15 12 The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the village of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/ I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. 16 13 To safeguard and enhance biodiversity (including BAP Habitats and Species) and geodiversity and improve connectivity between, and access to, green spaces and functional habitats. This area forms a green corridor and houses a number of RED LIST species 17 14 The proposed site south west of Draycott and the second phase of the development which would mean that in addition to the initial 190 houses, the development of an additional c70 dwellings would be undertaken on the identified safeguarded land on Banksfield Farm, would result in the removal of several TPO trees which contribute to the visual amenity of the area. The removal of these trees would det</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Sean Peace	Response-01347	<p>rimentially impact upon Lime Grove and Derby Road character and appearance. 18 15 NPPF 151. States that once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. This development will remove existing green spaces forever which residents currently have access to including footpath, walks and visual vistas and spatial openness. 19 16 NPPF 192. States that to protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity. The land south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of trees and wildlife including squirrels and badgers. The development on this land will kill wildlife and destroy historic trees and wildlife in the area. This is reckless when existing Brownfield sites existing in EBC which should be used first before Green Belt. 20 17 NPPF 2. States it has three objectives to enable sustainable development. The third of these is an environmental objective ? to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy. The EBCs proposal of reclassifying the land South West of Draycott from Greenbelt to Greenbelt land does not meet this objective and will actually achieve the total opposite.</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Simon Jenkins	Response-01287	<p>We worked hard all our lives to live in a house that we love. Bought specifically because it is at the side of greenbelt land that we thought would never be built on. We've not been consulted about the proposed change to greybelt, nobody from Labour will even have the bottle to come and talk to us about it and we do not agree. The recent meeting to vote in the proposal at Long Eaton was an absolute stich up, and a total disgrace. Can you please tell me what sort of compensation we are going to get if our property gets devalued ?????</p>

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	S M Beresford	Response-01851	EBC should be protecting Green Belt land. The Green Belt and green fields should remain open and safe, preserving public rights of way and access to local green spaces. The Draycott footpaths are in constant use, providing villagers easy access to a countryside environment. This land is rural in character, offering a tranquil and transitional landscape between Daycott Parish, Borrowwash, and Breaston. All these villages are impacted by the proposal to reclassify Green Belt to Grey Belt for housing development. While there is a need for housing, the NPPF states that existing Brownfield and Grey Belt sites should be prioritized over Green Belt sites. There are 109 existing Brownfield sites within EBC, equating to 81 hectares, with 103 of these having full planning permission. These sites should be prioritized for development before Green Belt land is considered. The NPPF states that Green Belt is to be protected and requires exceptional circumstances for development. There is nothing exceptional about the council plans to build on unspoilt Green Belt land to meet their housing target when existing Brownfield sites are available. The land south west of Draycott meets all the criteria for Green Belt purposes, preventing urban sprawl, preserving the countryside's open character, and enhancing recreational opportunities for local residents. Changing this land to Grey Belt and developing 190 homes will negatively impact the remaining Green Belt land with overcapacity and increased population density.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Susan Baker	Response-01316	Reclassifying Green Belt land to ?Grey Belt? flies in the face of national policy and local plans. These green spaces are vital?they stop urban sprawl, protect our countryside, and preserve the soul of our village. The way this has been handled feels rushed and lacking in transparency.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Susan Foster	Response-00824	I am sure there are other sites, not Green Belt ones. Stealing the green belt is reprehensible, there are many fields around the village that are not being used for agricultural purposes that could fulfil the need for housing.. Why not research those, some of them do not have the flooding problems that the proposed fields have. I would not buy a house that was liable to flooding, especially with the climate change that is forecast!
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Teresa Batchelor	Response-01240	Green Belt land was designated as such to ensure that local communities, villages and residential areas generally, could be assured that green spaces would remain for their enjoyment and avoid residential areas just "joining up" over time as development continued, and forming just one huge residential area. Keeping green open spaces, i.e. Green Belts, ensures communities stay independent of each other and retain their own individuality with their own traditions and pride in their communities. This is the way communities have existed for centuries and what makes an area attractive to live in. Removing our Green Belt and just replacing it with 190 houses is blatantly not in the interests of the residents of Draycott.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Teresa Shaw	Response-01309	1. Drastic Change of character: Ruining the gateway to the villages forever, the green belt that runs between Borrowwash & Draycott is part of the villages character and charm. You get a rural, vibrant feeling and pass into a real village, boasting flowers, wheelbarrows & Derbyshire flags. You'll never get the character & charm back once this is destroyed. If the Draycott development goes ahead & it's the first thing you see, the village of Draycott becomes an estate. The pleasant drive I enjoy passing from Borrowws to Draycott will be ruined. I wouldn't have bought my house if I knew this overwhelming and unpleasant encroachment on the village was coming. 2. Local planning authorities, like the council in Draycott and Church Wilne, are expected to use their local plans to safeguard the green belt and protect it from inappropriate development. This is a perfect opportunity to showcase why the objection system is in place and governance is required. If the Council's passes this proposition, then it has no credibility, authority or point. Will planning authority be disbanded? I'd rather see my money channelling to something of use. 3. The government should promote a "brownfield first" strategy, brownfield sites should be prioritized for development before considering green belt land. No such prioritization has been done to an acceptable level. 4. Precious green belt is being sacrificed with no reasonable alternative list, or proposed sites - why has this not been done? Where is the due diligence? People are not opposed to the need for some new housing but opposed to quantity and certain poor locations. 5. Why is the priority not brownfield site reinvigorates city centres or waste land. Which need it!! This is a preposterous proposal that is highly inappropriate. The location at Draycott is inappropriate & that should not be overlooked because an alleged necessity. Rushing a big decision is not the answer. Why can't a proper plan with plan be drafted with alternative sites? This Greenbelt is not the right place or location. 6. Brown field is ready to start work now surely that's a massive benefit? 7. The assumed cost of Brownfield renovation is not acceptable by who. Government projects always overshoot on budget & time. Has a comparison truly and impartially been done, and numbers vetted?
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Tim Hawkins	Response-00661	Proposal to build on a productive area of the greenbelt, grade 2 agricultural land, is against any sustainable approach for food security. By erroneously renaming it as greenfield is both disingenuous and misleading.
		Green Belt	Tony burton	Response-01382	Greenbelt should be left alone
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Tracey Morton	Response-00968	This area of beauty should be kept as it is and brownfield sites used 2 protect public right of way 3 This development would increase Draycott population by 17% 4 the scale of the development, extent and nature of it is contrary o NPPF 5 unnecessary damage to green belt resulting in irreversible blot on the landscape 6 This site is higher grade greenbelt and shouldn't even be considered 7 te footpath is well used through this site dur to its beauty, wildlife and views
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	T Shields	Response-00570	Even if EBC chose not to designate the site as grey-belt, It is VERY likely that in a planning appeal for housing on the site a planning Inspector would decide it is grey-belt when using the qualifying criteria in the NPPF. As grey-belt land any housing development would be required to meet the 'Golden Rules' at paragraphs 156/157 of the NPPF. It is this requirement that means that developers would be obligated to provide higher levels of affordable housing.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Viv Wright	Response-00035	The reasons for retaining Green belt areas around villages and towns still stands, urban sprawl and merging of communities creates loss of identity, and community a basic human need and mental health necessity, open green spaces accessible for all .The loss of wildlife habitat is against everything we are trying to correct .

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	Wilfred Boone	Response-01424	"NPPF states where major development involving the provision of housing is proposed on land released from the Green Belt through plan preparation or review, or on sites in the Green Belt subject to a planning application, the following contributions (?Golden Rules?) should be made: - necessary improvements to local or national infrastructure; and - the provision of new, or improvements to existing, green spaces that are accessible to the public. New residents should be able to access good quality green spaces within a short walk of their home, whether through onsite provision or through access to offsite spaces. The proposal to remove the parcels of land as identified from Green Belt status and the development of 190 homes will mean access to green spaces for existing residents will be less accessible, and no plans or provisions have been made to improve local infrastructure. We are not aware that any discussion has been undertaken by the authority to with neighbouring authorities on whether they can accommodate the development need through existing Brown Field or Grey Belt land. "
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	William Batchelor	Response-01210	There are still exisiting Brown field sites in Erewash to be developed but because it costs more for developers, they are being ignored. Planners must not take easy option to convert Green Belt land because it's easier.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	zak butcher	Response-01156	Protecting Green Belt land, this land should be kept open and unharmed Protecting public rights of way and access, a large number of footpaths would be affected NPPF states that existing Brown Field and Grey Belt sites are to be prioritised over the development of Green Field and certainly Green Belt sites, but these plans offer up Green Belt in advance of Brown Field site development. NPPF states that Green Belt is to be protected and requires exceptional circumstances to be built on. There is nothing exceptional about the council's plans to build on un-spoilt, Green Belt land to meet their current housing target when existing Brownfield sites exist. Great weight should be given to the findings and recommendations of independent Landscape Quality Assessment The NPPF includes an overarching objective to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment, including making effective use of land. Therefore, existing Brownfield sites within the EBC should be prioritised first over using Green Belt land. NPPF refers to Grey Belt as areas of previously developed land or other land that do not strongly contribute to Green Belt purposes, The land south west of Draycott is neither of these and strongly contributes towards Green Belt purposes as it acts as a buffer, safeguards the countryside and acts as a barrier to urban sprawl. NPPF states that in exceptional circumstances authorities should review Green Belt boundaries in accordance with the policies in this Framework and propose alterations to meet these needs in full, unless the review provides clear evidence that doing so would fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt. Changing the land south west of Draycott to Grey Belt and the development of 190 homes will negatively impact the remaining Green Belt land with overcapacity and increased population density. Working on the current population of Draycott, 190 new homes will be an at least 17% increase in population. This land is rural in character, providing a tranquil transitional landscape between the rural areas of Draycott Parish and Borrowash and other villages surrounding it of Breaston and Borrowash. NPPF states the development of homes, commercial and other development in the Green Belt should not be regarded as inappropriate where the development would utilise Grey Belt land and would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan. It is clear the authority is now altering existing and acceptable Green Belt land to suit this paragraph/approach of the NPPF by converting it to Grey Belt. This is both hasty and reckless. Footpaths, the Amenity and enjoyment of the use of these pathways which cross through and around this site which provide an important means by which residents of the local villages can get access to the countryside with substantial benefits for their physical and mental health as well as providing means of sustainable transport. The development on the land south west of Draycott for the people of Draycott and other areas, will have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, replacing green space with 190 houses. The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	ok butcher	Response-01155	an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. It is the wrong model in the wrong place to deliver housing needs being of a scale that is ultimately detrimental to the local landscape and will harm the countryside, wildlife and impact irreversibly upon the area. This when there are 109 existing Brownfield sites within the EBC that should be prioritised first over Green Belt land. Understand there is need for new housing but there are an abundance of brownfield, previously developed sites that the developers and council should explore before this location. There are 109 existing Brownfield sites in EBC giving 81H with 103 of these having full planning permission. These sites should be prioritised first for development before Greenbelt land is considered. Of the 109 existing Brownfield sites in the EBC 8 of these are over 1H each giving a combined total of 15.29H. The land South West of Draycott is c.8H. These 8 sites alone will allow 514 net dwelling to be built. These sites should be prioritised for development before the Greenbelt land to the south west of Draycott is considered and lost forever. It was previously thought that the land of the former Stanton Ironworks was taken out of the EBCs core strategy due to contamination that rendered the site unusable. Yet a recent Freedom of Information (FOI) request which was answered by EBC has advised the site is indeed to be utilised and has been allocated 1000 houses. Can EBC please advise if the status of the Stanton Ironworks sites and if this is included within the Core Strategy and how the planned 1000 houses impacts the Greenbelt review and use of Greenbelt land. NPPF states that existing Brown Field and Grey Belt sites are to be prioritised over the development of Green Field and certainly Green Belt sites, but these plans offer up Green Belt in advance of Brown Field site development. NPPF 4. States that local planning authorities should approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way. They should use the full range of planning tools available, including brownfield registers and permission in principle, and work proactively with applicants to secure developments that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. EBC needs to demonstrate what appraisals have been undertaken on the 109 Brownfield sites as detailed within their own Brownfield Register, and why these sites have not been prioritised for development over the identified Green Belt land. NPPF 13. Protecting Green Belt Land:- The government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt is to keep land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. This is an inappropriate development in the Green Belt and there is NO evidence of the appraisals that have been undertaken on existing Brownfield sites within EBC which there are 109 with 8 of these giving over 51H and the opportunity to develop over 500 dwellings. NPPF 146. The applicant and authority MUST make as much use as possible of Brownfield Sites and underutilised land; AND PROVE that there is nothing left before encroaching on the Green Belt.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Green Belt	ok butcher	Response-01155	? There is no PROOF of the authority discussing with neighbouring authorities about whether they could accommodate some of the identified need for this development, in order not to use the Green Belt. NPPF 152. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. This application does not demonstrate any exceptional circumstances.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	adrian leeming	Response-01249	Draycott does not have the infrastructure, shops, restaurants, dentists, doctors or schools to support 190 new families and from experience it has been proven that developers don't do anything to remedy this, why would they, there is no profit in doing this? It has also been proven that the local economy does not address this, there is a chronic shortage of all of these things, even more critically in rural area and the demand doesn't prompt supply to the detriment of society.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Alison Bowley	Response-01174	Draycott has little in the way of facilities, no doctor's surgery, no dental surgery. People have to travel to obtain the increasingly sought after NHS services. Potentially, there could be approximately another extra 800 people from Draycott alone requiring GP/Dental appointments. It is difficult enough now trying to obtain NHS care. I say this as a retired NHS worker, so speak from years of experience.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Alison Thirlwall	Response-01390	Loss of open space and green spaces ? this is vital for our community?s wellbeing. Primary School affected with noise and traffic. The footpaths that cross the land have amazing views and are used regularly by residents and visitors. The recent pandemic years have shown us that we need space to exercise and be at peace with ourselves and nature, for our own mental wellbeing. This development will have the effect, that anyone using the path would not benefit from the current sprawling Greenbelt views as it will be gone forever. It will have a detrimental effect on the wellbeing of people who enjoy the countryside, not to mention wildlife habitats, which are already under extreme pressure. The recent pandemic has highlighted the valuable and regular use of these footpaths, promoting and fostering good mental health. This land is rural in character, providing a tranquil transitional landscape between the rural areas of Draycott Parish, and the small villages surrounding it of Borrowash and Breaston. It is the wrong model in the wrong place to deliver the EBCs housing needs being of a scale that is ultimately detrimental to the local landscape and will harm the countryside, wildlife and impact irreversibly upon the area and its residents. Footpaths, the Amenity and enjoyment of the use of these pathways which cross through and around this site which provide an important means by which residents of the local villages can get access to the countryside with substantial benefits for their physical and mental health as well as providing means of sustainable transport. For the people of Draycott and other areas, this will have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, replacing green space with 190 houses. The sheer scale of the proposed site will have such an irreversible effect on the landscape. The land/footpaths will be surrounded by housing which will render the land unusable by residents whom rely on it as an area to escape and relax. These footpaths are well-used by many people for physical and mental health. This may seem insignificant to others however, residents rely on this land to enable freedom and a work life balance, which will be lost as result of development on this green belt. Footpaths although still evident on the plan will no longer be enjoyed by families maintaining their ongoing mental health, health and well-being as they will not have the same enjoyment having to walk through a housing estate. NPPF 8. Promoting healthy and safe communities:- 104. Planning policies and decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and access, including taking opportunities to provide better facilities for users, this area has significant lengths of footpaths that will be affected by the development of 190 houses on land south west of Draycott. Promoting healthy and safe communities the effect on our healthy lifestyles, especially our local health and well-being needs ? taking away our green space and facility would be detrimental to our community and our day to day needs would fall short by the loss of our valued facilities Open space and recreation. NPPF102. Access to a network of high quality open spaces would be reduced by this application and our opportunities for physical activity and health and wellbeing would be adversely affected There would be a detrimental effect on the Carbon Sink opportunities by the loss of open land and the effects of a housing development To improve local accessibility to healthcare, educat
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Alison Thirlwall	Response-01390	tion, employment, retail facilities and recreational resources including open spaces to enhance wellbeing and promote healthy and sustainable lifestyles. This application will have a negative effect on both wellbeing and health, including mental and emotional wellbeing.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Andrew and Jane Gilmour	Response-01329	The proposed development of 580 houses across Draycott, Borrowash and Breaston will have a significant effect on the access to Doctors surgery appointments. There are 3 surgeries serving these areas that might have to accommodate a further 1000 to 1500 patients with car parking and access already an issue. This is without taking into account further development taking place on the four safeguarded areas.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Anthony Bradley	Response-01442	The current practices can not support so many extra houses, which will effect the current residents care.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Anthony Lawton-Reeve	Response-00971	Only the bare minimum consultation has been undertaken by EBC with the local residence of Draycott. The six week consultation period is not sufficient when considering the share size of the development and impact on the village, and is not sufficient time for the local parish and residence to develop a set of objections. When two weeks of the consultation period was across easter. This action by the EBC was irresponsible and not acting in the interests of the local communities this plan impacts.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Anthony Walsh	Response-00992	I have just tried for four days to get an appointment Our current doctors availability is not fit for purpose. Adding to this will literally collapse this 'not fit for purpose' system
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Avice Boyle	Response-01427	To create safe and attractive places which contribute towards quality of life and community cohesion. This project will significantly detrimentally impact on the quality of life and fragment the community who use this area as a community facility. Including educational opportunities for local schools.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Barbara Crane	Response-00268	There is no doctors? surgery in Draycott. The Overdale Medical practice serves Draycott, Breaston and Borrowash. It is at capacity.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Ben Kassoul	Response-01024	The additional homes will increase demand to the local doctors in Breaston and make it extremely difficult to get appointments.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Ben Marshall	Response-01212	The area already struggles with health care facilities. The additional burden will further cripple residents ability to get access to health care.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Bernadette Rothwell	Response-00998	I see no information on this brief for the extension of local medical services all of which are stretched to beyond breaking for both appointments and parking.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Bradley Peace	Response-01348	Local GP surgeries and dental practices are already struggling to meet the needs of existing residents. Increasing the population significantly will make it even harder for people to access timely medical and dental care.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Caroline and John Thirwell	Response-01001	There has been little time to consider the impact on our community of this increase in the village population. The infrastructure of a doctor or dentist is not present in our village (the doctor was withdrawn many years ago even though the village has grown in numbers since we first settled here) and we are still not fully aware of the plans for the land South West of the village.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Colin & Cynthia Green	Response-00922	No Dentist either NHS or private in Draycott, no GP surgery in Draycott, nearest Breaston or Borrowash so Pharmacy will not cover extra patients. Currently, very difficult to get to speak to a GP representative so will only get much worse.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	David and Nicala O'Leary	Response-00822	There are no medical facilities within Draycott; residents must travel to Breaston or Borrowash for GP and dental services.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	David Atchison	Response-01247	Local health care facilities are already completely overwhelmed and this proposal will only put further strain on them, reducing availability and quality of care for existing residents.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	David Thompson	Response-00654	Local doctors are already at breaking point and those of us who are residents in the village already to struggle to get into our own doctors that we've been registered with for years. Adding further housing will mean further applications to register with the local doctors / dentists etc and create even more problems for getting appointments.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	David Webster	Response-01113	Has there been a study of the extra 17% of population will have on our healthcare can it cope ?
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Dexter Codrington	Response-00986	Draycott does not have a doctors or dentist surgery. The current doctors practise is shared between Borrowwash, Breaston and Draycott. Yet again this is about the cumulative effect for the 3 planned developments. It is very difficult to get an appointment today, the surgery will not cope. There is no NHS Dentist locally. There are no NHS dentists taking on new patients as at today. I have spent 2 hrs trying to find one
			Diane Webster	Response-01177	Has a survey taken place so that the Local Doctors practice can cope with the additional 17% plus patients
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Donna Peace	Response-01344	Healthcare: Local GP surgeries and dental practices are already struggling to meet the needs of existing residents. Increasing the population significantly will make it even harder for people to access timely medical and dental care.
			Donna Wheatley	Response-00863	It is hard enough to get a GP appointment as it is, how is adding an additional 700 homes going to help, it won't....
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Douglas Walker	Response-00994	The General Practice Doctors and Dental Surgeries are already over subscribed with many of them no not taking on any new patients with many Draycott residents having to use other surgeries in other villages/towns. This development will further compound these issues. How does the EBC plan to mitigate these very real issues and pressure on local infrastructure?
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Dr Shelagh Brown	Response-01158	Draycott, Borrowwash and Breaston already have an inadequate number of GPs and dentists.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Dudley Medhurst	Response-01180	There are no available NHS dentists in the area. The docotors (2 practises covering Breaston, Draycott & Borrowwash) are already struggling with current population and another 700 houses and approx another 2000 people will not help anybody .
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Gail Holdsworth	Response-00937	There us one very small GP surgery in Draycott. I do not see how it can cope with such a large influx. It is hard enough to get appointments as it is.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Gary Siddall	Response-01237	Draycott has NO doctors or dentists - so new residents (even IF they could actually afford to live in the new houses...) have no "basic amenities" in the village. Everybody knows that it's difficult enough as it is to get in to a doctors, but almost impossible to get an NHS dentist anywhere in the area. This is the case NOW - it will be massively worse with 190+ additional households ! There is not enough local infrastructure to support so many more people.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Gemma Woolnough	Response-01394	Currently in Draycott there is not a doctors or a dentist. The nearest doctors is in Breaston or Borrowwash which is already very busy with limited appointment capacity. There are currently no NHS dentist places for adults in Breaston or Borrowwash meaning that the new residents in the housing development would need to travel some way out to try and find a dentist. The village is not set up to cater for more residents due to the lack of any medical provision in the form of a doctors or dentist.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Gerri Hickton	Response-01472	Local doctors and dentists are already struggling to provide a service to current residents
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Gill Trickitt	Response-01157	We have no doctor or dentist in Draycott currently so it's ridiculous to consider that the local area can accommodate these extra needs for likely 400 or so more people.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Gordon Dahill	Response-00690	Doctors and dentists are only in the adjoining villages and are already overloaded with patients.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Graham Wakeling	Response-01238	Local Doctors, Dentists and pharmacies will be affected, increasing waiting times, and making it even more impossible to be seen, and treated locally.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Hannah McMaster	Response-01381	The local doctors is at capacity, waiting times are already long and services stretched. The local GP will not only have to serve the additional housing in Draycott but those proposed in Breaston also.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Hannah Pritchard	Response-01399	The Overdale Medical Practices in Breaston and Borrowwash, which serve Draycott, are already overstretched. In January, they released a public statement citing overwhelming patient demand, leading to outsourcing of minor cases to the Draycott pharmacy. Local dental practices have also stopped accepting new NHS patients. Adding hundreds more residents without parallel investment in new or expanded facilities will render healthcare inaccessible for both current and new residents.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Jacqueline Hyett	Response-01548	Loss of open space and green spaces ? this is vital for our community's wellbeing This land is rural in character, providing a tranquil transitional landscape between the rural areas of Draycott Parish, and the small villages surrounding it of Borrowwash and Breaston. To improve local accessibility to healthcare, education, employment, retail facilities and recreational resources including open spaces to enhance wellbeing and promote healthy and sustainable lifestyles. This application will have a negative effect on both wellbeing and health including mental and emotional wellbeing.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	James Hargreaves	Response-01315	1. Overstretched Services: Draycott lacks GP and dental services. Nearby facilities are already overwhelmed and unable to meet current demand.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	James Whyman	Response-01551	1 Loss of open space and green spaces ? this is vital for our community?s wellbeing 2 Primary School affected with noise and traffic 3 The footpaths that cross the land have amazing views and are used regularly by residents and visitors. The recent pandemic years have shown us that we need space to exercise and be at peace with ourselves and nature, for our own mental wellbeing. This development will have the effect, that anyone using the path would not benefit from the current sprawling Greenbelt views as it will be gone forever. 4 It will have a detrimental effect on the wellbeing of people who enjoy the countryside, not to mention wildlife habitats, which are already under extreme pressure. 6 The recent pandemic has highlighted the valuable and regular use of these footpaths, promoting and fostering good mental health. 7 This land is rural in character, providing a tranquil transitional landscape between the rural areas of Draycott Parish, and the small villages surrounding it of Borrowash and Breaston. 8 It is the wrong model in the wrong place to deliver the EBCs housing needs being of a scale that is ultimately detrimental to the local landscape and will harm the countryside, wildlife and impact irreversibly upon the area and its residents. 9 Footpaths, the Amenity and enjoyment of the use of these pathways which cross through and around this site which provide an important means by which residents of the local villages can get access to the countryside with substantial benefits for their physical and mental health as well as providing means of sustainable transport. For the people of Draycott and other areas, this will have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, replacing green space with 190 houses. 10 The sheer scale of the proposed site will have such an irreversible effect on the landscape. The land/footpaths will be surrounded by housing which will render the land unusable by residents whom rely on it as an area to escape and relax. These footpaths are well-used by many people for physical and mental health. This may seem insignificant to others however, residents rely on this land to enable freedom and a work life balance, which will be lost as result of development on this green belt. 11 Footpaths although still evident on the plan will no longer be enjoyed by families maintaining their ongoing mental health, health and well-being as they will not have the same enjoyment having to walk through a housing estate. 12 NPPF 8. Promoting healthy and safe communities:- 104. Planning policies and decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and access, including taking opportunities to provide better facilities for users, this area has significant lengths of footpaths that will be affected by the development of 190 houses on land south west of Draycott. 13 Promoting healthy and safe communities the effect on our healthy lifestyles, especially our local health and well-being needs ? taking away our green space and facility would be detrimental to our community and our day to day needs would fall short by the loss of our valued facilities 14 Open space and recreation. NPPF102. Access to a network of high quality open spaces would be reduced by this application and our opportunities for physical activity and health and wellbeing would be adversely affected 15 There would be a detrimental effect on the Carbon Sink opportunities by the loss of open land and the effects of a housing development 16 Only the bare min
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	James Whyman	Response-01551	imum consultation has been undertaken by EBC with the local residence of Draycott. The six week consultation period is not sufficient when considering the share size of the development and impact on the village, and is not sufficient time for the local parish and residence to develop a set of objections. When two weeks of the consultation period was across easter. This action by the EBC was irresponsible and not acting in the interests of the local communities this plan impacts. 17 To improve local accessibility to healthcare, education, employment, retail facilities and recreational resources including open spaces to enhance wellbeing and promote healthy and sustainable lifestyles. This application will have a negative effect on both wellbeing and health including mental and emotional wellbeing. 18 To create safe and attractive places which contribute towards quality of life and community cohesion. This project will significantly detrimentally impact on the quality of life and fragment the community who use this area as a community facility. Including educational opportunities for local schools.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Jane Barker	Response-01178	It is a known local fact that there are NO dentists in the area taking on new NHS patients. This covers Breaston, Draycott & Borrowash. It is also a concern that the already pressured local Doctors surgeries will be unable to cope as there are only 2 practices that cover the area of Breaston, Draycott and Borrowash which could possibly be in the region of 700 houses and subsequently say double or triple that for residents. We are struggling now to get appointments. The doctors are concerned but cannot turn anybody away but this will long term impact everybody new and old alike. It is a big concern to many people in the village.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Jonathan Childs	Response-01117	Contrary to comments and statements made by stakeholders with a clear and vested interest in progressing this development, requirements for local healthcare provision already very clearly exceed the available capacity. I have personally waited 15 months for a routine hospital appointment to be issued. We have had no access to NHS dentistry services since Covid - despite widely-publicised suggestions to the contrary - and my family do NOT in fact now have an NHS dentist, despite remaining registered at a local practice! As a result, we have been forced to resort to inconvenient and expensive private treatment. Availability of doctors has reduced in recent years and is likely to continue to do so whilever more senior practitioners retire and the younger ones leave the profession. With no visible or apparent efforts in place to relieve any of the above issues, any increase in the present level of local population can only compound and exacerbate the current issues.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Jonathan Fletcher	Response-01463	The introduction of all these new properties will make it impossible to get a doctor?s appointment, when it?s already an impossible situation .
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Julie Pleass	Response-01526	Our local surgery is excellent but already extremely busy with the patients. The additional houses will cause much stress on an already busy surgery making it more difficult to get appointments with doctors and healthcare workers
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Juliet Macve	Response-01572	It is already difficult to get an appointment at Overdale Medical Practice in either Breaston or Borrowash. For those of us who suffer ongoing, chronic health conditions this is a major problem which affects ability to work as well as to have an acceptable quality of life. I also understand that local dentist practices are not able to take on additional patients. The number of proposed new houses will create major issues with the availability of healthcare.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Karen Doxey	Response-01236	Loss of open space and green spaces ? this is vital for our community?s wellbeing It is the wrong model in the wrong place to deliver the EBCs housing needs being of a scale that is ultimately detrimental to the local landscape and will harm the countryside, wildlife and impact irreversibly upon the area and its residents. There is will be a negative impact on local services such as healthcare, ie doctors, dentists , education with so many extra people.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Karen Smith	Response-01484	I'm concerned about the lack of infrastructure to support the proposed development.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Karla Williams	Response-00077	Healthcare contributions are welcome to improve surgeries in the area given the volume of site put forward in Breaston, Draycott and Borrowwash collectively.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Kayleigh Bonallie	Response-01375	There are no health are facilities in the village, and the surrounding villages are at breaking point
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Kerry Naylor	Response-00993	As a Draycott resident I cannot get registered for the doctors due to shortage of doctors. I have been unable to find an NHS dentist in the area. We do not even have a dentist in Draycott.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Laura Charier	Response-01218	NPPF states that infrastructure must come first, yet the outline ideas to provide infrastructure are either not in place or are no timeline in advance of the proposed developments. There are currently no plans to develop new healthcare or improved infrastructure with these significant scale extensions of population. Surrounding healthcare facilities are already struggling to cope with the current demand. The accessibility and quality of the service offered to the exiting and future habitants will be negatively impacted. Promoting healthy and safe communities the effect on our healthy lifestyles, especially our local health and well-being needs ? taking away our green space and facility would be detrimental to our community and our day to day needs would fall short by the loss of our valued facilities.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Laura Roffey	Response-01479	The influx of 190 homes would prove to be a massive burden on the local doctors and dentists. These are both already overstretched NHS resources and adding more people would be extremely detrimental to the healthcare of any residents in the locale. Are there plans to add more support healthcare facilities as well - I think not.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Lee	Response-00742	1. Doctors - Draycott has no services are already shared with neighbouring villages and stretched. What investments will be made in existing new surgeries or expansions. Are people?s health and wellbeing no longer a priority? 2. Dentist - Draycott has none therefore my family drive miles for a dentist. What investments will be made in existing new surgeries or expansions. Are people?s dental health and well-being no longer a priority?
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Lee Bunday	Response-00028	The strategy outlines significant residential growth, which will place increased pressure on local healthcare services ? including GPs, hospitals, urgent care centres, and community health services. However, there is little evidence in the review that this expected demand has been matched with clear, funded plans to expand and enhance local healthcare capacity. Many local residents already experience long wait times for GP appointments, delays in specialist care, and overcrowding in emergency departments. The village has no Dentist or Doctors available, with villagers already travelling to Breaston or Borrowwash to get these services. So again the allocations here, and Borrowwash and Breaston without proactive investment and coordination with the NHS and Integrated Care Systems, the influx of new residents will further strain a system that is already under pressure. Key concerns include: No clear identification of new healthcare facility sites in development zones. Lack of committed funding or partnerships to deliver new or expanded services. No strategic health needs assessment tied to population growth. Risk of reduced service quality and accessibility for both new and existing residents. Healthcare is a fundamental public service, and any strategic growth plan must prioritise the health and well-being of the community. I urge the council to revise the Core Strategy Review to include detailed plans for healthcare provision, supported by collaboration with relevant health authorities and a commitment to infrastructure delivery that keeps pace with development.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Linda Jane Jenkins	Response-01007	There is no doctor in Draycott. Most of us use the overdale practice in breaston and Borrowwash. With 150 homes nere and 400 in Borrowwash it will become impossible to see a doctor in a timely fashion. Already the pharmacy is overstretched. There is no dentist. How will these people get proper care and attention.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Louise and Shane Foster	Response-01219	Causing extra pressure on amenities particularly medical and dental care.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Louise Burnell	Response-00262	Healthcare facilities unable to cope with increase in demand
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Luke Harper	Response-00898	There is no GP surgery or Dentist in the village. Breaston Dentist does not accept new NHS patients. Overdale Medical Practice takes over 30 mins trying to get through when called to make an appointment
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Luke Hatch	Response-00160	Access to GPs and dentists is already limited. Adding more pressure to the system without increasing provision will make it even harder for local people to get the care they need. We already go to Breaston or Borrowwash for our doctors. With more people in Draycott and both those areas, these surgeries will be further stretched.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Maggie Murphy	Response-00833	an additional 700 homes in Borrowwash, Breaston and Draycott will destroy an already swamped doctors practice. NOTE there is on practice shared across the 3 villages with no actual doctors building in Draycott
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Martin Fawcett	Response-01077	It?s difficult to get appointments now so building more houses with occupants will only make matters worse
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Martin Kilcoyne	Response-01460	It is currently almost impossible to get a doctor's appointment at our local practices (neither of which are in Draycott but wither Breaston or Borrowwash). The addition of these houses will only make matters worse as there is no provision made for an additional doctors surgery in these plans.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Maureen Pinchbeck	Response-00041	Already difficult to get a doctor?s appointment. Will only get worse.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Melanie Wilson	Response-00974	The Healthcare providers are already overstretched , the development should not be considered without a robust plan to increase the healthcare facilities in the area.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Michael Thirtwall	Response-01196	There are currently no plans to develop new healthcare or improved infrastructure with these significant scale extensions of population. Existing facilities will be overwhelmed by 190 new households.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Michelle Marks	Response-00924	Local GP surgeries and dental practices are struggling to meet current demand. A significant increase in population will further reduce access to timely medical care.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Mr Graham Bingham and Mrs Kristine Bingham	Response-01302	Draycott has no GP service, residents are reliant on the already overstretched Overdale Medical practice centered in Breaston and Borrowwash. the addition of 190 houses and a possible 550 people (at a conservative estimate) will overwhelm the already overstretched GP service.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Mr R Sykes	Response-00412	Overloading an existing NHS practice and non- existent Dental service.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Mrs Elizabeth White	Response-00060	The local doctors may have trouble accommodating the possibility of an extra 500 people.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Mrs Patricia L Tacey	Response-00283	Since the surgery in Draycott was removed residents have to go to either Breaston, Borrowwash or Long Eaton to see a doctor. With a further 190 more families to cater for from Draycott alone this will put even more pressure on an already stretched National Health service.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Mrs V Atkin	Response-01871	Also the surgery will be impacted.
		Healthcare Facilities	Nat	Response-00158	It's difficult to get an appointment at the local doctors as it is without having even more people in the area
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Nigel morton	Response-01351	Draycott has no doctors ,we have to use the park borrowash or overdale borrowash/ breaston .As a patient of the park for 60 years I had to leave because of standards and am now with overdale ,who are very good but already stretched ,as someone with poor health are fear there may get harder to get appointments dur to 700 proposed houses over draycott,breaston and borrowash
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Nikki Riches	Response-00950	? There is already an undue strain on local healthcare facilities, how are these going to cope not only with the additional proposed housing in Draycott, but those proposed in Breaston and Borrowwash. The GP services are already stretched and we don't have anything designated in Draycott. Dentists are not available....what about social care? I don't feel like these have been considered in the core strategy and it is expected to be absorbed by existing services, which is not acceptable and another of the many reasons why i object to these proposals.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Oliver Kirk	Response-00569	Will additional healthcare facilities be uplifted to cope with the increase demand from new housing in the area. What proposals will housing developers provide to mitigate the strain put on healthcare that is already at breaking point.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Owen	Response-01547	Will there be any additional NHS dentist and Doctors to help with the additional people in the area.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Paul Allen	Response-01082	There is insufficient school spaces, school parking, village parking and medical services at present and the development can only make matters worse.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Pauline Marks	Response-00927	Local GP and dental services are overstretched, and the added pressure could lead to longer wait times and reduced access to care.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Paul Riley	Response-00029	Doctors and dentists are already operating at capacity and have now room for any additional patients.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Peter Sutton	Response-00409	There are no NHS GP or Dental facilities in Draycott. Residents use surgeries in nearby Breaston and Borrowwash but these are oversubscribed. I cannot get through to my GP surgery until mid afternoon or an appointment for weeks. Urgent care in the area all have extremely long waits. This is compounded by the other proposed developments in Breaston, Sandiacre and Borrowwash.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	R Beresford	Response-01907	There are just 2 doctors practices within the area of Borrowwash Breaston and Draycott. They are difficult enough to get appointments, how on earth will they cope with all the extra residents. As for dentists there aren't any NHS ones.. within the area.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	R Fazackerley	Response-01415	Local doctors surgery's cannot cope with the current demand of existing residents - this development will make it even harder to access services
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Richard Keith Hanbury	Response-01087	It's hard enough getting a doctors appointment at the moment. When the population increases substantially this could become life threatening when you can't see a doctor. Are you funding new GPs to cope with the increased work load. And are you funding them before the massive influx of people.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Richard Syson	Response-01317	The addition of 190 + potential further 70 homes would have a significant impact upon the local surgery - Overdale Medical Practice - as there could be an additional 500+ people living in Draycott. There does not appear to be any mention of any obligation for the developers to fund any necessary expansion of the surgery's capacity or any increased NHS funding. Therefore, the level of service / ability to book appointments / receive healthcare must be detrimentally impacted
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Robert Alan Duncanson	Response-00855	DRAYCOTT DOES NOT HAVE ITS OWN DOCTORS OR DENTIST, SO THE STRAIN ON THOSE FACILITIES BY THIS NUMBER OF PEOPLE WOULD MEAN IT WOULD BE HARDER FOR PEOPLE ALREADY LISTED AT SURGERIES TO GET APPOINTMENTS AND BE SEEN PROMPTLY
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Roger Brown	Response-00999	There are no doctors or dentists in Draycott. The nearest doctors surgery is a branch surgery of one of the Borrowwash practices located in Breaston but all practices are already at or near capacity. The nearest dentists are in Breaston, Borrowwash and Long Eaton but there are no local dental practices offering NHS care.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Ruth Hawkins	Response-01277	There are no healthcare facilities in the south west of Draycott and the addition of 190 homes will place added pressure on already overstretched facilities in the neighbouring areas
		Healthcare Facilities	Sarah	Response-01541	Already struggle to get an appointment and the service is overstretched.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Sarah Hargreaves	Response-01314	1. NHS Services: There are no provisions within Draycott for GP or Dentistry. Existing local services are already over subscribed and struggling to cope with demand.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Sara Walker-Bradley	Response-01440	The local practice is not large enough to support all the extra residents, it's already a struggle to get appointments
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Scott Gardner	Response-01554	It is ludicrous to suggest that 190 new homes will not overwhelm our already struggling local services. Councillor Wayne Major's past concerns about the lack of infrastructure consideration for other developments are directly applicable here. Councillor Scott's stark reminder that Draycott residents already have to travel to neighboring villages for basic NHS care and even further to Derby for dental services paints a clear picture of existing capacity limitations. This development will undoubtedly push our healthcare facilities, and other essential services to breaking point. Draycott doesn't have a doctor or a dentist, its impossible to get a dental appointment within a reasonable timeframe locally.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Sean Peace	Response-01347	Local GP surgeries and dental practices are already struggling to meet the needs of existing residents. Increasing the population significantly will make it even harder for people to access timely medical and dental care.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Simon Jenkins	Response-01287	Difficult enough as it is. Draycott does not have a doctors surgery and getting an appointment at Breaston or Borrowwash is not easy. Again, stating the obvious 600 to 800 extra people flooding in would cause chaos !!!
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	S M Beresford	Response-01851	There are just 2 doctors practices within the area of Borrowwash Breaston and Draycott. They are difficult enough to get appointments, how on earth will they cope with all the extra residents. As for dentists there aren't any NHS ones.. within the area.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Susan Baker	Response-01316	There?s no GP or dentist in Draycott. The services we do have nearby are stretched to breaking point. Adding hundreds more residents without expanding healthcare is simply irresponsible. I wait weeks for appointments
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Susan Foster	Response-00824	No dentist,no doctor's surgery in the village, no space for new patients and not enough specialists to tend to the extra bodies.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Teresa Batchelor	Response-01240	Our local GP Practice, Overdale Medical, is stretched as it is. This is obvious by the time it takes to get through to the practice or get an appointment. Again, as with the schooling situation, where are the new residents expected to register for a GP Practice without it having a huge detrimental effect on Overdale and those local residents already registered with the practice. More patients will make its ability to offer a good level of care to its patients virtually impossible.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Teresa Shaw	Response-01309	1. Doctors - Draycott has no services are already shared with neighbouring villages and stretched. What investments will be made in existing new surgeries or expansions. Are people?s health and wellbeing no longer a priority? 2. Dentist - Draycott has none therefore my family drive miles for a dentist. What investments will be made in existing new surgeries or expansions. Are people?s dental health and well-being no longer a priority?
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Tim Hawkins	Response-00661	As there are currently no Doctors surgery or Dentists in the village, and no commitment in the sustainability assessment to provide additional infrastructure to provide these services then having a larger population is not going to make the situation any easier. The current Doctors is full, and there is no NHS dentistry service within miles of the village as now, despite what an EBC member falsely claimed during the public meeting.
			Tony burton	Response-01382	It's a problem trying to get to the doctors now more houses.jess chance.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Tracey Morton	Response-00968	Draycott has no doctors surgery or dentist 2 people in draycott have to use one of 2doctors surgeries which are near capacity 3 the proposed 700 house s between Draycott, Breaston and borrowwash will have a massive effect on the doctors surgeries 4 These surgeries will be pushed to breaking point and patients will suffer 5 maternity services have already Benn moved from overdale to long eaton
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	T Shields	Response-00570	Any infrastructure shortfall/need arising for healthcare can be offset by a proportionate financial requirement from developers through a section 106 obligation.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Viv Wright	Response-00035	It is already challenging to access healthcare in a timely manner, GP services are at bursting point already.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	Wilfred Boone	Response-01424	To improve local accessibility to healthcare, education, employment, retail facilities and recreational resources including open spaces to enhance wellbeing and promote healthy and sustainable lifestyles. This application will have a negative effect on both wellbeing and health including mental and emotional wellbeing.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Healthcare Facilities	William Batchelor	Response-01210	Overdale Medical Centre in Breaston already stretched covering Breaston and Drayott, does not have capacity to take on 190 extra households. Overdale Borrowwash will also be over capacity meaning that it ceases to be a potential offering for Draycott peopel who can travel
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	adrian leeming	Response-01249	There would be a detrimental effect on the Carbon Sink opportunities by the loss of open land and the effects of a housing development of this size. NPPF 207. States in determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets? importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation. Yet development on the land south west of Draycott will significantly impact and later the heritage of the Village including the destruction of unspoilt Green Belt land, the adjacent conservation site of the canal and other listed heritage sites that surround the identified area.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Alison Thirlwall	Response-01390	Our local surroundings will become dominated by housing estates and will blight the local walks along the Public Right of Way which connect the village. The sheer scale of the proposed site will have such an irreversible effect on the landscape. The land/footpaths will be surrounded by housing which will render the land unusable by residents who rely on it as an area to escape and relax. These footpaths are well-used by many people for physical and mental health. This may seem insignificant to others however, residents rely on this land to enable freedom and a work life balance, which will be lost as result of this development. Footpaths although still evident on the plan will no longer be enjoyed by families maintaining their ongoing mental health, health and well-being as they will not have the same enjoyment having to walk through a housing estate. Footpaths, the amenity and enjoyment of the use of these pathways which cross through and around this site which provide an important means by which residents of the local villages can get access to the countryside with substantial benefits for their physical and mental health as well as providing means of sustainable transport. For the people of Draycott and other areas, this will have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, replacing green space with 190 houses. This unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape. These plans, plus the plans for National Grid to install super pylons only circa 600 meters away, means the south west area of Draycott, will be hugely impacted from both a conservation and natural environment perspective. This area of the village will be unrealistically overburdened with development on Green Belt and green spaces. The development of 190 homes will have a significantly negative impact of the visual openness of the area. This development will interrupt and spoil the landscape, negatively impacting the perceptual qualities of the area. The development will significantly obstruct and diminish the visual experience of the open countryside. The development of the 190 homes will also have a significantly negative impact on the spatial openness of the area, impacting both the physical and geographical characteristics of the open land, which prevents urban sprawl and maintains the separation between settlements. It will overwhelmingly impact the natural and undeveloped nature of the Green Belt area. Protecting public rights of way and access, footpaths would be affected by this development.
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	A Northeast	Response-01848	The existing footpaths and access to the small wood bring great enjoyment to all who walk these trails, providing substantial benefits for physical and mental health. The development will have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, replacing green space with 190 houses. The proposal is far too big and overpowering for the village, impacting its heritage and cherished greenbelt landscape.
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Anthony Lawton-Reeve	Response-00971	Unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape when existing Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised before the Greenbelt land south west of Draycott.
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Anthony Walsh	Response-00992	The taking away of grazing/arable land and the disruption for the wildlife. Recognise the loss of the ecology in the area and the importance of the flora, fauna and wildlife. There is an opinion that the deer fencing would devalue the area of open farmland and public right of way.
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Avice Boyle	Response-01427	Under S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended, contributions can be sought from developers towards the costs of providing community and social infrastructure, the need for which has arisen as a result of new development taking place. The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate when existing Brownfield sites are available within EBC. The footpaths that cross the land have amazing views and are used regularly by residents and visitors. The recent pandemic years have shown us that we need space to exercise and be at peace with ourselves and nature, for our own mental wellbeing. This development will have the effect, that anyone using the path would feel imprisoned by a housing estate. These decisions are irreversible, and our children will have less open countryside to explore and play in. Losing safe connecting space between locations. This when existing and available Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised over Greenbelt. The sheer scale of the proposed site will have such an irreversible effect on the landscape. The land/footpaths will be surrounded by housing which will render the land unusable by residents whom rely on it as an area to escape and relax. These footpaths are well-used by many people for physical and mental health. This may seem insignificant to others however, residents rely on this land to enable freedom and a work life balance, which will be lost as result of this development.
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Ben Marshall	Response-01212	The development of 190 homes will have a significantly negative impact on the spatial openness of the area, impacting both the physical and geographical characteristics of the open land, which prevents urban sprawl and maintains the separation between settlements. It will overwhelmingly impact the natural and undeveloped nature of the Green Belt area.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Bradley Peace	Response-01348	Under S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended, contributions can be sought from developers towards the costs of providing community and social infrastructure, the need for which has arisen as a result of new development taking place. 5 2 No additional open space opportunities, protection of the public right of way or indeed to better facilities. If S106 funding is available for an application of this type this must be considered. 6 3 This land is rural in character, providing a tranquil transitional landscape between the rural areas of Draycott Parish, and the villages surrounding it of Borrowash and Breaston. 7 4 The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate when existing Brownfield sites are available within EBC. 8 5 The footpaths that cross the land have amazing views and are used regularly by residents and visitors. The recent pandemic years have shown us that we need space to exercise and be at peace with ourselves and nature, for our own mental wellbeing. This development will have the effect, that anyone using the path would feel imprisoned by a housing estate. 9 6 Loss of open land frequently used 10 7 These decisions are irreversible, and our children will have less open countryside to explore and play in. Losing safe connecting space between locations. This when existing and available Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised over Greenbelt. 11 8 Our local surroundings will become dominated by housing estates and will blight the local walks along the Public Right of Way which connect our Village. 12 9 The sheer scale of the proposed site will have such an irreversible effect on the landscape. The land/footpaths will be surrounded by housing which will render the land unusable by residents whom rely on it as an area to escape and relax. These footpaths are well-used by many people for physical and mental health. This may seem insignificant to others however, residents rely on this land to enable freedom and a work life balance, which will be lost as result of this development. 13 10 Footpaths although still evident on the plan will no longer be enjoyed by families maintaining their ongoing mental health, health and well-being as they will not have the same enjoyment having to walk through a housing estate. 14 11 Footpaths, the Amenity and enjoyment of the use of these pathways which cross through and around this site which provide an important means by which residents of the local villages can get access to the countryside with substantial benefits for their physical and mental health as well as providing means of sustainable transport. For the people of Draycott and other areas, this will have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, replacing green space with 190 houses. 15 12 Unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape. 16 13 These plans plus the plans for National Grid to
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Bradley Peace	Response-01348	install super pylons only circa 600 meters away means the south west area of Draycott, will be hugely impacted from both a conservation and natural environment perspective. This area of the village will be unrealistically overburdened with development on Green Belt and green spaces. 17 14 The development of 190 homes will have a significantly negative impact of the visual openness of the area. This development will interrupt and spoil the landscape, negatively impacting the perceptual qualities of the area. The development will significantly obstruct and diminish the visual experience of the open countryside. 18 15 The development of 190 homes will have a significantly negative impact on the spatial openness of the area, impacting both the physical and geographical characteristics of the open land, which prevents urban sprawl and maintains the separation between settlements. It will overwhelmingly impact the natural and undeveloped nature of the Green Belt area. 19 16 Protecting public rights of way and access, footpaths would be affected by this development. 20 17 Increased harm to the character of Public Rights of Way. 21 18 Boundaries are changed by fencing and walls. 22 19 The NPPF includes an overarching objective to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment, including making effective use of land. 23 20 Strongly object to this application the amenity and enjoyment of the use of the paths which cross the site will be severely compromised by the development. These paths provide an important means by which residents from the local area can get access to the countryside with substantial benefits for their physical and mental health. 24 21 The suggested 190 houses to the land south west of Draycott would enclose the paths, which would have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, as would the replacement of green fields with 190 houses. 25 22 We acknowledge it is a balance between the adverse effects on the footpaths against the desirability of the development taking place, but question if the proposed measures would be sufficient to prevent a severe adverse effect on the use of the paths. 26 23 The recent pandemic has highlighted the valuable and regular use of these footpaths, promoting and fostering good mental health. 27 24 An extensive network of public footpaths is within the application site, and there are many in the near vicinity. The footpaths are well used and highly valued as an amenity. 28 25 Public footpaths this development would surely take away the enjoyment of what countryside walks we have left around. 29 27 The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. 30 28 The footpaths that cross the land have amazing views and are used regularly by residents and visitors. The recent pandemic years have shown us that we need space to exercise and be at peace with ourselves and nature, for our own mental wellbeing. 31 29 It is the

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Bradley Pearce	Response-01348	wrong model in the wrong place to meet the EBCs housing needs when existing Brownfield sites exist within EBC being of a scale that is ultimately detrimental to the local landscape and will harm the countryside, wildlife and impact irreversibly upon the area. 32 30 Our local surroundings will become dominated by this housing development and will blight the local walks along the Public Right of Way which connect our Village. 33 32 The NPPF includes an overarching objective to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment, including making effective use of land. There are 109 existing Brownfield sites within the EBC that should be prioritised before the Green Belt land south west of Draycott is used. 34 33 Historic structures act as a focal point in countryside views and make a huge contribution to environmental quality. Their setting is often a major part of their significance. The proposed housing development to the land South West of Draycott deprives them of their context. 35 34 The proposed development is considered to have an adverse impact on the setting of local heritage assets. 36 35 This would have a detrimental and cumulative impact which would be harmful to local heritage assets. 37 36 The use of long/heavy goods vehicles should be prohibited due to the significant amount of Grade I and II listed buildings in the vicinity of the proposed development on land south west of Draycott. 38 37 Historic England show 14 listed building in Draycott: - Victoria Mill Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1281333 / Church of St Chads, Church Wilne, Grade 1 listed building, list entry number 1281336 / Cart Shed and Stable at Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1140155 / Cedars Farm House, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1087964 / The Cotton Processing and Storage Building at Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1329376 / Doubling Mill at Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1140154 / Draycott Hall and Outbuildings, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1334834 / Front Range Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1334835 / Levers Machine Shed, Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1250092 / Cotton warehouse, chimney and outbuilding, Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1250121 / Cotton spinning mill and office block, Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1250046 / Potter Lane Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1087966 / Nooning Lane Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1417622 / Hopwell Road Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1087963 39 38 NPPF states that infrastructure must come first, yet the outline ideas to provide infrastructure are either not in place or are no timeline in advance of the proposed developments. There are currently no plans to develop new healthcare or improved infrastructure with these significant scale extensions of population. 40 41 The amenity value of the footpaths through the application site would be entirely lost, and that of the surrounding footpaths greatly diminished due to the change from a beautiful rural landscape to a vast housing estate, with high fences/walls and a significant amount of houses adding to this negative impact. 41 45 It is the wrong model in the wrong place to deliver the EBCs housing needs being of a scale that is ultimately detrimental to the local landsca
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Bradley Pearce	Response-01348	pe and will harm the countryside, wildlife and impact irreversibly upon the area and its residents. 42 46 Unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape when existing Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised before the Greenbelt land south west of Draycott. 43 47 NPPF 8. Promoting healthy and safe communities:- 104. Planning policies and decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and access, including taking opportunities to provide better facilities for users, this area has significant amount of footpaths that will be affected by the development of 190 houses. 44 48 NPPF states that sustainable development should be achieved. There is an obvious lack of definition of why this site is a ?sustainable location?. The introduction of 190 houses will increase waste, carbon footprint and impact the areas future biodiversity needs. 45 49 NPPF 150. States that if it is necessary to restrict development in a village primarily because of the important contribution which the open character of the village makes to the openness of the Green Belt, the village should be included in the Green Belt. If, however, the character of the village needs to be protected for other reasons, other means should be used, such as conservation area or normal development management policies, and the village should be excluded from the Green Belt. The land south west of Draycott significantly contributes to the village and its character. This village is a part of this land and the Green Belt status allows villagers to access green spaces and enhances the village feel of the area which is rural. 46 50 NPPF 151. States that once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. This development will remove existing green spaces forever which residents currently have access to including footpath, walks and visual vistas and spatial openness. 47 51 NPPF 207. States in determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets? importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation. Yet development on the land south west of Draycott will significantly impact and later the heritage of the Village including the destruction of unspoilt Green Belt land, the adjacent conservation site of the canal and other listed heritage sites that surround the identified area. 48 52 NPPF 208. States the local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affect

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	Bradley Pearce	Response-01348	ing the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal. This development will impact Nooning Lane Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1417622. 49 53 NPPF 102. Access to a network of high quality open spaces would be reduced by this application and our opportunities for physical activity and health and wellbeing would be adversely affected 50 54 There would be a detrimental effect on the Carbon Sink opportunities by the loss of open land and the effects of a housing development of this size. 51 55 To improve local accessibility to healthcare, education, employment, retail facilities and recreational resources including open spaces to enhance wellbeing and promote healthy and sustainable lifestyles. This application will have a negative effect on both wellbeing and health including mental and emotional wellbeing. 52 56 To create safe and attractive places which contribute towards quality of life and community cohesion. This project will significantly detrimentally impact on the quality of life and fragment the community who use this area as a community facility. Including educational opportunities for local schools. 53 57 To conserve and enhance the Borough landscape character. This proposal does not promote the conservation or enhancement of the local landscape and is an inappropriate development.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	Colin & Cynthia Green	Response-00922	Greenbelt, river views which does flood believe it or not, beautiful old trees & hedgerows, will be gone & lost forever if this goes ahead. Wildlife will be affected also of course. Walkers use these footpaths & this will be affected no doubt.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	David Atchison	Response-01247	This land is rural in character, providing a tranquil transitional landscape between the rural areas of Draycott Parish, and the villages surrounding it of Borrowwash and Breaston. The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate when existing Brownfield sites are available within EBC. Unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	David Boyle	Response-01426	The suggested 190 houses to the land south west of Draycott would enclose the paths, which would have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, as would the replacement of green fields with 190 houses. We acknowledge it is a balance between the adverse effects on the footpaths against the desirability of the development taking place, but question if the proposed measures would be sufficient to prevent a severe adverse effect on the use of the paths. An extensive network of public footpaths is within the application site, and there are many in the near vicinity. The footpaths are well used and highly valued as an amenity. The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	David G York	Response-01843	The existing footpaths and access to the small wood bring great enjoyment to all who walk these trails, providing substantial benefits for physical and mental health. The development will have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, replacing green space with 190 houses. The proposal is far too big and overpowering for the village, impacting its heritage and cherished greenbelt landscape.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	David Thompson	Response-00654	Development of the housing will affect the landscape of the village and spoil the views of residents that have backed onto those affected fields for years.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	David Webster	Response-01113	Our local surroundings will become dominated by housing estates and will blight the local walks along the Public Right of Way which connect our Village. The sheer scale of the proposed site will have such an irreversible effect on the landscape. The land/footpaths will be surrounded by housing which will render the land unusable by residents whom rely on it as an area to escape and relax. These footpaths are well-used by many people for physical and mental health. This may seem insignificant to others however, residents rely on this land to enable freedom and a work life balance, which will be lost as result of this development. Footpaths although still evident on the plan will no longer be enjoyed by families maintaining their ongoing mental health, health and well-being as they will not have the same enjoyment having to walk through a housing estate. Footpaths, the Amenity and enjoyment of the use of these pathways which cross through and around this site which provide an important means by which residents of the local villages can get access to the countryside with substantial benefits for their physical and mental health as well as providing means of sustainable transport. For the people of Draycott and other areas, this will have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, replacing green space with 190 houses. Unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape. These plans plus the plans for National Grid to install super pylons only circa 600 meters away means the south west area of Draycott, will be hugely impacted from both a conservation and natural environment perspective. This area of the village will be unrealistically overburdened with development on Green Belt and green spaces. The development of 190 homes will have a significantly negative impact of the visual openness of the area. This development will interrupt and spoil the landscape, negatively impacting the perceptual qualities of the area. The development will significantly obstruct and diminish the visual experience of the open countryside. The development of 190 homes will have a significantly negative impact on the spatial openness of the area, impacting both the physical and geographical characteristics of the open land, which prevents urban sprawl and maintains the separation between settlements. It will overwhelmingly impact the natural and undeveloped nature of the Green Belt area.
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Dexter Codrington	Response-00986	The landscape of the proposed development welcomes you as you enter Draycott from Borrowash. It is fitting with a Village that does sit outside of suburbia. The existing footpaths and access to the small wood bring great enjoyment to all who walk these trails, providing substantial benefits for physical and mental health. The development will have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, replacing green space with 190+ houses. The proposal is far too big and overpowering for the village, impacting its heritage and cherished greenbelt landscape. The area has an abundance of wildlife, including protected species such as bats and many migrating birds. These animals and birds will lose their habitats and nesting sites, which is not protecting our fragile environment or providing for biodiversity in our green spaces.
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Diane Webster	Response-01177	The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate when existing Brownfield sites are available within EBC. The footpaths that cross the land have amazing views and are used regularly by residents and visitors. The recent pandemic years have shown us that we need space to exercise and be at peace with ourselves and nature, for our own mental wellbeing. This development will have the effect, that anyone using the path would feel imprisoned by a housing estate. Loss of open land frequently used These decisions are irreversible, and our children will have less open countryside to explore and play in. Losing safe connecting space between locations. This when existing and available Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised over Greenbelt. Our local surroundings will become dominated by housing estates and will blight the local walks along the Public Right of Way which connect our Village. The sheer scale of the proposed site will have such an irreversible effect on the landscape. The land/footpaths will be surrounded by housing which will render the land unusable by residents whom rely on it as an area to escape and relax. These footpaths are well-used by many people for physical and mental health. This may seem insignificant to others however, residents rely on this land to enable freedom and a work life balance, which will be lost as result of this development. Footpaths although still evident on the plan will no longer be enjoyed by families maintaining their ongoing mental health, health and well-being as they will not have the same enjoyment having to walk through a housing estate. Footpaths, the Amenity and enjoyment of the use of these pathways which cross through and around this site which provide an important means by which residents of the local villages can get access to the countryside with substantial benefits for their physical and mental health as well as providing means of sustainable transport. For the people of Draycott and other areas, this will have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, replacing green space with 190 houses. Unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape. These plans plus the plans for National Grid to install super pylons only circa 600 meters away means the south west area of Draycott, will be hugely impacted from both a conservation and natural environment perspective. This area of the village will be unrealistically overburdened with development on Green Belt and green spaces. The development of 190 homes will have a significantly negative impact of the visual openness of the area. This development will interrupt and spoil the landscape, negatively impacting the perceptual qualities of the area. The development will significantly obstruct and diminish the visual experience of the open countryside. The development of 190 homes will have a significantly negative impact on the



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	Jane Webster	Response-01177	<p>spatial openness of the area, impacting both the physical and geographical characteristics of the open land, which prevents urban sprawl and maintains the separation between settlements. It will overwhelmingly impact the natural and undeveloped nature of the Green Belt area. Protecting public rights of way and access, footpaths would be affected by this development. Increased harm to the character of Public Rights of Way. Boundaries are changed by fencing and walls. The NPPF includes an overarching objective to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment, including making effective use of land. Strongly object to this application the amenity and enjoyment of the use of the paths which cross the site will be severely compromised by the development. These paths provide an important means by which residents from the local area can get access to the countryside with substantial benefits for their physical and mental health. The suggested 190 houses to the land south west of Draycott would enclose the paths, which would have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, as would the replacement of green fields with 190 houses. We acknowledge it is a balance between the adverse effects on the footpaths against the desirability of the development taking place, but question if the proposed measures would be sufficient to prevent a severe adverse effect on the use of the paths. The recent pandemic has highlighted the valuable and regular use of these footpaths, promoting and fostering good mental health. An extensive network of public footpaths is within the application site, and there are many in the near vicinity. The footpaths are well used and highly valued as an amenity. Public footpaths this development would surely take away the enjoyment of what countryside walks we have left around. The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. The footpaths that cross the land have amazing views and are used regularly by residents and visitors. The recent pandemic years have shown us that we need space to exercise and be at peace with ourselves and nature, for our own mental wellbeing. It is the wrong model in the wrong place to meet the EBCs housing needs when existing Brownfield sites exist within EBC being of a scale that is ultimately detrimental to the local landscape and will harm the countryside, wildlife and impact irreversibly upon the area. Our local surroundings will become dominated by this housing development and will blight the local walks along the Public Right of Way which connect our Village. The NPPF includes an overarching objective to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment, including making effective use of land. There are 109 existing Brownfield sites within the EBC that should be prioritised before the Green Belt land south west of Draycott is used. Historic structures act as a focal point in countryside views an</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	Jane Webster	Response-01177	<p>d make a huge contribution to environmental quality. Their setting is often a major part of their significance. The proposed housing development to the land South West of Draycott deprives them of their context. The proposed development is considered to have an adverse impact on the setting of local heritage assets. This would have a detrimental and cumulative impact which would be harmful to local heritage assets. The use of long/heavy goods vehicles should be prohibited due to the significant amount of Grade I and II listed buildings in the vicinity of the proposed development on land south west of Draycott. Historic England show 14 listed building in Draycott: - Victoria Mill Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1281333 / Church of St Chads, Church Wilne, Grade 1 listed building, list entry number 1281336 / Cart Shed and Stable at Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1140155 / Cedars Farm House, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1087964 / The Cotton Processing and Storage Building at Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1329376 / Doubling Mill at Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1140154 / Draycott Hall and Outbuildings, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1334834 / Front Range Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1334835 / Levers Machine Shed, Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1250092 / Cotton warehouse, chimney and outbuilding, Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1250121 / Cotton spinning mill and office block, Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1250046 / Potter Lane Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1087966 / Nooning Lane Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1417622 / Hopwell Road Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1087963 NPPF states that infrastructure must come first, yet the outline ideas to provide infrastructure are either not in place or are no timeline in advance of the proposed developments. There are currently no plans to develop new healthcare or improved infrastructure with these significant scale extensions of population. The amenity value of the footpaths through the application site would be entirely lost, and that of the surrounding footpaths greatly diminished due to the change from a beautiful rural landscape to a vast housing estate, with high fences/walls and a significant amount of houses adding to this negative impact. It is the wrong model in the wrong place to deliver the EBCs housing needs being of a scale that is ultimately detrimental to the local landscape and will harm the countryside, wildlife and impact irreversibly upon the area and its residents. Unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape when existing Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised before the Greenbelt land south west of Draycott.</p>

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	Donna Butcher	Response-01155	<p>The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate when existing Brownfield sites are available within EBC. The footpaths that cross the land have amazing views and are used regularly by residents and visitors. The recent pandemic years have shown us that we need space to exercise and be at peace with ourselves and nature, for our own mental wellbeing. This development will have the effect, that anyone using the path would feel imprisoned by a housing estate. These decisions are irreversible, and our children will have less open countryside to explore and play in. Losing safe connecting space between locations. This when existing and available Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised over Greenbelt. The sheer scale of the proposed site will have such an irreversible effect on the landscape. The land/footpaths will be surrounded by housing which will render the land unusable by residents whom rely on it as an area to escape and relax. These footpaths are well-used by many people for physical and mental health. This may seem insignificant to others however, residents rely on this land to enable freedom and a work life balance, which will be lost as result of this development. Footpaths although still evident on the plan will no longer be enjoyed by families maintaining their ongoing mental health, health and well-being as they will not have the same enjoyment having to walk through a housing estate. The development of 190 homes will have a significantly negative impact of the visual openness of the area. This development will interrupt and spoil the landscape, negatively impacting the perceptual qualities of the area. The development will significantly obstruct and diminish the visual experience of the open countryside. An extensive network of public footpaths is within the application site, and there are many in the near vicinity. The footpaths are well used and highly valued as an amenity. The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. NPPF states that infrastructure must come first, yet the outline ideas to provide infrastructure are either not in place or are no timeline in advance of the proposed developments. There are currently no plans to develop new healthcare or improved infrastructure with these significant scale extensions of population. The amenity value of the footpaths through the</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	Donna Butcher	Response-01155	<p>application site would be entirely lost, and that of the surrounding footpaths greatly diminished due to the change from a beautiful rural landscape to a vast housing estate, with high fences/walls and a significant amount of houses adding to this negative impact. It is the wrong model in the wrong place to deliver the EBCs housing needs being of a scale that is ultimately detrimental to the local landscape and will harm the countryside, wildlife and impact irreversibly upon the area and its residents. NPPF 150. States that if it is necessary to restrict development in a village primarily because of the important contribution which the open character of the village makes to the openness of the Green Belt, the village should be included in the Green Belt. If, however, the character of the village needs to be protected for other reasons, other means should be used, such as conservation area or normal development management policies, and the village should be excluded from the Green Belt. The land south west of Draycott significantly contributes to the village and its character. This village is a part of this land and the Green Belt status allows villagers to access green spaces and enhances the village feel of the area which is rural. NPPF 207. States in determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets? importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation. Yet development on the land south west of Draycott will significantly impact and later the heritage of the Village including the destruction of unspoilt Green Belt land, the adjacent conservation site of the canal and other listed heritage sites that surround the identified area.</p>

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	Donna Peace	Response-01344	<p>1 Under S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended, contributions can be sought from developers towards the costs of providing community and social infrastructure, the need for which has arisen as a result of new development taking place. 5 2 No additional open space opportunities, protection of the public right of way or indeed to better facilities. If S106 funding is available for an application of this type this must be considered. 6 3 This land is rural in character, providing a tranquil transitional landscape between the rural areas of Draycott Parish, and the villages surrounding it of Borrowash and Breaston. 7 4 The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate when existing Brownfield sites are available within EBC. 8 5 The footpaths that cross the land have amazing views and are used regularly by residents and visitors. The recent pandemic years have shown us that we need space to exercise and be at peace with ourselves and nature, for our own mental wellbeing. This development will have the effect, that anyone using the path would feel imprisoned by a housing estate. 9 6 Loss of open land frequently used 10 7 These decisions are irreversible, and our children will have less open countryside to explore and play in. Losing safe connecting space between locations. This when existing and available Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised over Greenbelt. 11 8 Our local surroundings will become dominated by housing estates and will blight the local walks along the Public Right of Way which connect our Village. 12 9 The sheer scale of the proposed site will have such an irreversible effect on the landscape. The land/footpaths will be surrounded by housing which will render the land unusable by residents whom rely on it as an area to escape and relax. These footpaths are well-used by many people for physical and mental health. This may seem insignificant to others however, residents rely on this land to enable freedom and a work life balance, which will be lost as result of this development. 13 10 Footpaths although still evident on the plan will no longer be enjoyed by families maintaining their ongoing mental health, health and well-being as they will not have the same enjoyment having to walk through a housing estate. 14 11 Footpaths, the Amenity and enjoyment of the use of these pathways which cross through and around this site which provide an important means by which residents of the local villages can get access to the countryside with substantial benefits for their physical and mental health as well as providing means of sustainable transport. For the people of Draycott and other areas, this will have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, replacing green space with 190 houses. 15 12 Unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape. 16 13 These plans plus the plans for National Grid t</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	Donna Peace	Response-01344	<p>o install super pylons only circa 600 meters away means the south west area of Draycott, will be hugely impacted from both a conservation and natural environment perspective. This area of the village will be unrealistically overburdened with development on Green Belt and green spaces. 17 14 The development of 190 homes will have a significantly negative impact of the visual openness of the area. This development will interrupt and spoil the landscape, negatively impacting the perceptual qualities of the area. The development will significantly obstruct and diminish the visual experience of the open countryside. 18 15 The development of 190 homes will have a significantly negative impact on the spatial openness of the area, impacting both the physical and geographical characteristics of the open land, which prevents urban sprawl and maintains the separation between settlements. It will overwhelmingly impact the natural and undeveloped nature of the Green Belt area. 19 16 Protecting public rights of way and access, footpaths would be affected by this development. 20 17 Increased harm to the character of Public Rights of Way. 21 18 Boundaries are changed by fencing and walls. 22 19 The NPPF includes an overarching objective to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment, including making effective use of land. 23 20 Strongly object to this application the amenity and enjoyment of the use of the paths which cross the site will be severely compromised by the development. These paths provide an important means by which residents from the local area can get access to the countryside with substantial benefits for their physical and mental health. 24 21 The suggested 190 houses to the land south west of Draycott would enclose the paths, which would have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, as would the replacement of green fields with 190 houses. 25 22 We acknowledge it is a balance between the adverse effects on the footpaths against the desirability of the development taking place, but question if the proposed measures would be sufficient to prevent a severe adverse effect on the use of the paths. 26 23 The recent pandemic has highlighted the valuable and regular use of these footpaths, promoting and fostering good mental health. 27 24 An extensive network of public footpaths is within the application site, and there are many in the near vicinity. The footpaths are well used and highly valued as an amenity. 28 25 Public footpaths this development would surely take away the enjoyment of what countryside walks we have left around. 29 27 The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. 30 28 The footpaths that cross the land have amazing views and are used regularly by residents and visitors. The recent pandemic years have shown us that we need space to exercise and be at peace with ourselves and nature, for our own mental wellbeing. 31 29 It is th</p>

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	Jonna Peace	Response-01344	<p>e wrong model in the wrong place to meet the EBCs housing needs when existing Brownfield sites exist within EBC being of a scale that is ultimately detrimental to the local landscape and will harm the countryside, wildlife and impact irreversibly upon the area. 32 30 Our local surroundings will become dominated by this housing development and will blight the local walks along the Public Right of Way which connect our Village. 33 32 The NPPF includes an overarching objective to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment, including making effective use of land. There are 109 existing Brownfield sites within the EBC that should be prioritised before the Green Belt land south west of Draycott is used. 34 33 Historic structures act as a focal point in countryside views and make a huge contribution to environmental quality. Their setting is often a major part of their significance. The proposed housing development to the land South West of Draycott deprives them of their context. 35 34 The proposed development is considered to have an adverse impact on the setting of local heritage assets. 36 35 This would have a detrimental and cumulative impact which would be harmful to local heritage assets. 37 36 The use of long/heavy goods vehicles should be prohibited due to the significant amount of Grade I and II listed buildings in the vicinity of the proposed development on land south west of Draycott. 38 37 Historic England show 14 listed building in Draycott: - Victoria Mill Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1281333 / Church of St Chads, Church Wilne, Grade 1 listed building, list entry number 1281336 / Cart Shed and Stable at Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1140155 / Cedars Farm House, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1087964 / The Cotton Processing and Storage Building at Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1329376 / Doubling Mill at Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1140154 / Draycott Hall and Outbuildings, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1334834 / Front Range Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1334835 / Levers Machine Shed, Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1250092 / Cotton warehouse, chimney and outbuilding, Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1250121 / Cotton spinning mill and office block, Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1250046 / Potter Lane Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1087966 / Nooning Lane Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1417622 / Hopwell Road Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1087963 39 38 NPPF states that infrastructure must come first, yet the outline ideas to provide infrastructure are either not in place or are no timeline in advance of the proposed developments. There are currently no plans to develop new healthcare or improved infrastructure with these significant scale extensions of population. 40 41 The amenity value of the footpaths through the application site would be entirely lost, and that of the surrounding footpaths greatly diminished due to the change from a beautiful rural landscape to a vast housing estate, with high fences/walls and a significant amount of houses adding to this negative impact. 41 45 It is the wrong model in the wrong place to deliver the EBCs housing needs being of a scale that is ultimately detrimental to the local lands</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	Jonna Peace	Response-01344	<p>cape and will harm the countryside, wildlife and impact irreversibly upon the area and its residents. 42 46 Unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape when existing Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised before the Greenbelt land south west of Draycott. 43 47 NPPF 8. Promoting healthy and safe communities:- 104. Planning policies and decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and access, including taking opportunities to provide better facilities for users, this area has significant amount of footpaths that will be affected by the development of 190 houses. 44 48 NPPF states that sustainable development should be achieved. There is an obvious lack of definition of why this site is a ?sustainable location?. The introduction of 190 houses will increase waste, carbon footprint and impact the areas future biodiversity needs. 45 49 NPPF 150. States that if it is necessary to restrict development in a village primarily because of the important contribution which the open character of the village makes to the openness of the Green Belt, the village should be included in the Green Belt. If, however, the character of the village needs to be protected for other reasons, other means should be used, such as conservation area or normal development management policies, and the village should be excluded from the Green Belt. The land south west of Draycott significantly contributes to the village and its character. This village is a part of this land and the Green Belt status allows villagers to access green spaces and enhances the village feel of the area which is rural. 46 50 NPPF 151. States that once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. This development will remove existing green spaces forever which residents currently have access to including footpath, walks and visual vistas and spatial openness. 47 51 NPPF 207. States in determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets? importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation. Yet development on the land south west of Draycott will significantly impact and later the heritage of the Village including the destruction of unspoilt Green Belt land, the adjacent conservation site of the canal and other listed heritage sites that surround the identified area. 48 52 NPPF 208. States the local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affe</p>

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Johna Peace	Response-01344	<p>cting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal. This development will impact Nooning Lane Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1417622. 49 53 NPPF 102. Access to a network of high quality open spaces would be reduced by this application and our opportunities for physical activity and health and wellbeing would be adversely affected 50 54 There would be a detrimental effect on the Carbon Sink opportunities by the loss of open land and the effects of a housing development of this size. 51 55 To improve local accessibility to healthcare, education, employment, retail facilities and recreational resources including open spaces to enhance wellbeing and promote healthy and sustainable lifestyles. This application will have a negative effect on both wellbeing and health including mental and emotional wellbeing. 52 56 To create safe and attractive places which contribute towards quality of life and community cohesion. This project will significantly detrimentally impact on the quality of life and fragment the community who use this area as a community facility. Including educational opportunities for local schools. 53 57 To conserve and enhance the Borough landscape character. This proposal does not promote the conservation or enhancement of the local landscape and is an inappropriate development.</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Douglas Walker	Response-00994	<p>This land is rural in character, providing a tranquil transitional landscape between the rural areas of Draycott Parish, and the villages surrounding it of Borrowash and Breaston. This development will mean the loss of this green space forever. These decisions are irreversible, and our children will have less open countryside to explore and play in. Losing safe connecting space between locations. This when existing and available Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised over Greenbelt. Furthermore, this development will lead to the unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape. These plans plus the plans for National Grid to install super pylons only circa 600 meters away means the south west area of Draycott, will be hugely impacted from both a conservation and natural environment perspective. This area of the village will be unrealistically overburdened with development on Green Belt and green spaces. The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate when existing Brownfield sites are available within EBC. The NPPF 150. States that if it is necessary to restrict development in a village primarily because of the important contribution which the open character of the village makes to the openness of the Green Belt, the village should be included in the Green Belt. If, however, the character of the village needs to be protected for other reasons, other means should be used, such as conservation area or normal development management policies, and the village should be excluded from the Green Belt. The land south west of Draycott significantly contributes to the village and its character. This village is a part of this land and the Green Belt status allows villagers to access green spaces and enhances the village feel of the area which is rural. The sheer scale of the proposed site will have such an irreversible effect on the landscape. The land/footpaths will be surrounded by housing which will render the land unusable by residents whom rely on it as an area to escape and relax. These footpaths are well-used by many people for physical and mental health. This may seem insignificant to others however, residents rely on this land to enable freedom and a work life balance, which will be lost as result of this development. Footpaths, the Amenity and enjoyment of the use of these pathways which cross through and around this site which provide an important means by which residents of the local villages can get access to the countryside with substantial benefits for their physical and mental health as well as providing means of sustainable transport. For the people of Draycott and other areas, this will have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, replacing green space with 190 houses. The development of 190 homes will have a significantly negative impact of the visual openness of the area. This development will interrupt</p>

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	Douglas Walker	Response-00994	<p>t and spoil the landscape, negatively impacting the perceptual qualities of the area. The development will significantly obstruct and diminish the visual experience of the open countryside. The development of 190 homes will have a significantly negative impact on the spatial openness of the area, impacting both the physical and geographical characteristics of the open land, which prevents urban sprawl and maintains the separation between settlements. It will overwhelmingly impact the natural and undeveloped nature of the Green Belt area. The suggested 190 houses to the land south west of Draycott would enclose the paths, which would have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, as would the replacement of green fields with 190 houses. The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. It is the wrong model in the wrong place to meet the EBCs housing needs when existing Brownfield sites exist within EBC being of a scale that is ultimately detrimental to the local landscape and will harm the countryside, wildlife and impact irreversibly upon the area. Our local surroundings will become dominated by this housing development and will blight the local walks along the Public Right of Way which connect our Village. The NPPF includes an overarching objective to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment, including making effective use of land. There are 109 existing Brownfield sites within the EBC that should be prioritised before the Green Belt land south west of Draycott is used. It is the wrong model in the wrong place to deliver the EBCs housing needs being of a scale that is ultimately detrimental to the local landscape and will harm the countryside, wildlife and impact irreversibly upon the area and its residents. NPPF 151. States that once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. This development will remove existing green spaces forever which residents currently have access to including footpath, walks and visual vistas and spatial openness. NPPF 207. States in determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets? importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	Douglas Walker	Response-00994	<p>include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation. Yet development on the land south west of Draycott will significantly impact and later the heritage of the Village including the destruction of unspoilt Green Belt land, the adjacent conservation site of the canal and other listed heritage sites that surround the identified area. NPPF 208. States the local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset?s conservation and any aspect of the proposal. This development will impact Nooning Lane Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1417622.</p>

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	Francis Ian Scott	Response-01535	<p>Under S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended, contributions can be sought from developers towards the costs of providing community and social infrastructure, the need for which has arisen as a result of new development taking place. No additional open space opportunities, protection of the public right of way or indeed to better facilities. If S106 funding is available for an application of this type this must be considered. This land is rural in character, providing a tranquil transitional landscape between the rural areas of Draycott Parish, and the villages surrounding it of Borrowwash and Breaston. The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate when existing Brownfield sites are available within EBC. The footpaths that cross the land have amazing views and are used regularly by residents and visitors. The recent pandemic years have shown us that we need space to exercise and be at peace with ourselves and nature, for our own mental wellbeing. This development will have the effect, that anyone using the path would feel imprisoned by a housing estate. Loss of open land frequently used These decisions are irreversible, and our children will have less open countryside to explore and play in. Losing safe connecting space between locations. This when existing and available Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised over Greenbelt. Our local surroundings will become dominated by housing estates and will blight the local walks along the Public Right of Way which connect our Village. The sheer scale of the proposed site will have such an irreversible effect on the landscape. The land/footpaths will be surrounded by housing which will render the land unusable by residents whom rely on it as an area to escape and relax. These footpaths are well-used by many people for physical and mental health. This may seem insignificant to others however, residents rely on this land to enable freedom and a work life balance, which will be lost as result of this development. Footpaths although still evident on the plan will no longer be enjoyed by families maintaining their ongoing mental health, health and well-being as they will not have the same enjoyment having to walk through a housing estate. Footpaths, the Amenity and enjoyment of the use of these pathways which cross through and around this site which provide an important means by which residents of the local villages can get access to the countryside with substantial benefits for their physical and mental health as well as providing means of sustainable transport. For the people of Draycott and other areas, this will have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, replacing green space with 190 houses. Unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape. These plans plus the plans for National Grid to install super pylons only circa 600 meters away means the s</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	Francis Ian Scott	Response-01535	<p>outh west area of Draycott, will be hugely impacted from both a conservation and natural environment perspective. This area of the village will be unrealistically overburdened with development on Green Belt and green spaces. The development of 190 homes will have a significantly negative impact of the visual openness of the area. This development will interrupt and spoil the landscape, negatively impacting the perceptual qualities of the area. The development will significantly obstruct and diminish the visual experience of the open countryside. The development of 190 homes will have a significantly negative impact on the spatial openness of the area, impacting both the physical and geographical characteristics of the open land, which prevents urban sprawl and maintains the separation between settlements. It will overwhelmingly impact the natural and undeveloped nature of the Green Belt area. Protecting public rights of way and access, footpaths would be affected by this development. Increased harm to the character of Public Rights of Way. Boundaries are changed by fencing and walls. The NPPF includes an overarching objective to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment, including making effective use of land. Strongly object to this application the amenity and enjoyment of the use of the paths which cross the site will be severely compromised by the development. These paths provide an important means by which residents from the local area can get access to the countryside with substantial benefits for their physical and mental health. The suggested 190 houses to the land south west of Draycott would enclose the paths, which would have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, as would the replacement of green fields with 190 houses. We acknowledge it is a balance between the adverse effects on the footpaths against the desirability of the development taking place, but question if the proposed measures would be sufficient to prevent a severe adverse effect on the use of the paths. The recent pandemic has highlighted the valuable and regular use of these footpaths, promoting and fostering good mental health. An extensive network of public footpaths is within the application site, and there are many in the near vicinity. The footpaths are well used and highly valued as an amenity. Public footpaths this development would surely take away the enjoyment of what countryside walks we have left around. The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. The footpaths that cross the land have amazing views and are used regularly by residents and visitors. The recent pandemic years have shown us that we need space to exercise and be at peace with ourselves and nature, for our own mental wellbeing. It is the wrong model in the wrong place to meet the EBCs housing needs when existing Brownfield sites exist within EBC being of a scale that is ultimately det</p>

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	Francis Ian Scott	Response-01535	<p>rimental to the local landscape and will harm the countryside, wildlife and impact irreversibly upon the area. Our local surroundings will become dominated by this housing development and will blight the local walks along the Public Right of Way which connect our Village. The NPPF includes an overarching objective to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment, including making effective use of land. There are 109 existing Brownfield sites within the EBC that should be prioritised before the Green Belt land south west of Draycott is used. Historic structures act as a focal point in countryside views and make a huge contribution to environmental quality. Their setting is often a major part of their significance. The proposed housing development to the land South West of Draycott deprives them of their context. The proposed development is considered to have an adverse impact on the setting of local heritage assets. This would have a detrimental and cumulative impact which would be harmful to local heritage assets. The use of long/heavy goods vehicles should be prohibited due to the significant amount of Grade I and II listed buildings in the vicinity of the proposed development on land south west of Draycott. Historic England show 14 listed building in Draycott: - Victoria Mill Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1281333 / Church of St Chads, Church Wilne, Grade 1 listed building, list entry number 1281336 / Cart Shed and Stable at Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1140155 / Cedars Farm House, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1087964 / The Cotton Processing and Storage Building at Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1329376 / Doubling Mill at Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1140154 / Draycott Hall and Outbuildings, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1334834 / Front Range Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1334835 / Levers Machine Shed, Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1250092 / Cotton warehouse, chimney and outbuilding, Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1250121 / Cotton spinning mill and office block, Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1250046 / Potter Lane Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1087966 / Nooning Lane Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1417622 / Hopwell Road Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1087963 NPPF states that infrastructure must come first, yet the outline ideas to provide infrastructure are either not in place or are no timeline in advance of the proposed developments. There are currently no plans to develop new healthcare or improved infrastructure with these significant scale extensions of population. The amenity value of the footpaths through the application site would be entirely lost, and that of the surrounding footpaths greatly diminished due to the change from a beautiful rural landscape to a vast housing estate, with high fences/walls and a significant amount of houses adding to this negative impact. It is the wrong model in the wrong place to deliver the EBCs housing needs being of a scale that is ultimately detrimental to the local landscape and will harm the countryside, wildlife and impact irreversibly upon the area and its residents. Unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape when existing Br</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	Francis Ian Scott	Response-01535	<p>ownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised before the Greenbelt land south west of Draycott. NPPF 8. Promoting healthy and safe communities:- 104. Planning policies and decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and access, including taking opportunities to provide better facilities for users, this area has significant amount of footpaths that will be affected by the development of 190 houses. NPPF states that sustainable development should be achieved. There is an obvious lack of definition of why this site is a ?sustainable location?. The introduction of 190 houses will increase waste, carbon footprint and impact the areas future biodiversity needs. NPPF 150. States that if it is necessary to restrict development in a village primarily because of the important contribution which the open character of the village makes to the openness of the Green Belt, the village should be included in the Green Belt. If, however, the character of the village needs to be protected for other reasons, other means should be used, such as conservation area or normal development management policies, and the village should be excluded from the Green Belt. The land south west of Draycott significantly contributes to the village and its character. This village is a part of this land and the Green Belt status allows villagers to access green spaces and enhances the village feel of the area which is rural. NPPF 151. States that once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. This development will remove existing green spaces forever which residents currently have access to including footpath, walks and visual vistas and spatial openness. "NPPF 207. States in determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets? importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation. Yet development on the land south west of Draycott will significantly impact and later the heritage of the Village including the destruction of unspoilt Green Belt land, the adjacent conservation site of the canal and other listed heritage sites that surround the identified area. " "NPPF 208. States the local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between</p>



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Rancis Ian Scott	Response-01935	the heritage asset?s conservation and any aspect of the proposal. This development will impact Nooning Lane Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1417622." NPPF 102. Access to a network of high quality open spaces would be reduced by this application and our opportunities for physical activity and health and wellbeing would be adversely affected There would be a detrimental effect on the Carbon Sink opportunities by the loss of open land and the effects of a housing development of this size. To improve local accessibility to healthcare, education, employment, retail facilities and recreational resources including open spaces to enhance wellbeing and promote healthy and sustainable lifestyles. This application will have a negative effect on both wellbeing and health including mental and emotional wellbeing. To create safe and attractive places which contribute towards quality of life and community cohesion. This project will significantly detrimentally impact on the quality of life and fragment the community who use this area as a community facility. Including educational opportunities for local schools. To conserve and enhance the Borough landscape character. This proposal does not promote the conservation or enhancement of the local landscape and is an inappropriate development.
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Gail Holdsworth	Response-00937	This is a village in a rural setting. This will create a total change to Draycott. Houses for sale in Draycott will no longer be able to say ?house for sale in the ever sought after village?.
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Gary Siddall	Response-01237	This land is rural in character, providing a tranquil transitional landscape between the rural areas of Draycott Parish, and the villages surrounding it of Borrowwash and Breaston - land which is frequently used ! The housing proposal is far too big overpowering, it will completely change the landscape of the whole area, denying the villagers of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful countryside to walk in freely and experience the trees. flowers and diverse wildlife, as they have done for many, many years. Once it's gone, it's gone - please don't let it go !
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Gemma Woolnough	Response-01394	The land proposed for the housing development is directly adjacent and opposite many residential homes and is kept as agricultural fields with horses grazed on the fields. By building on this land it would negatively impact the landscape of the whole village with the loss of beautiful open space, which many people find positively impacts their mental health. The housing development would cause a loss of this landscape, instead built on and concreted over, negatively impacting the area.
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	George Foster	Response-01199	Under S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended, contributions can be sought from developers towards the costs of providing community and social infrastructure, the need for which has arisen as a result of new development taking place. No additional open space opportunities, protection of the public right of way or indeed to better facilities. If S106 funding is available for an application of this type this must be considered. This land is rural in character, providing a tranquil transitional landscape between the rural areas of Draycott Parish, and the villages surrounding it of Borrowwash and Breaston. The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate when existing Brownfield sites are available within EBC. The footpaths that cross the land have amazing views and are used regularly by residents and visitors. The recent pandemic years have shown us that we need space to exercise and be at peace with ourselves and nature, for our own mental wellbeing. This development will have the effect, that anyone using the path would feel imprisoned by a housing estate. Loss of open land frequently used. These decisions are irreversible, and our children will have less open countryside to explore and play in. Losing safe connecting space between locations. This when existing and available Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised over Greenbelt. Our local surroundings will become dominated by housing estates and will blight the local walks along the Public Right of Way which connect our Village. The sheer scale of the proposed site will have such an irreversible effect on the landscape. The land/footpaths will be surrounded by housing which will render the land unusable by residents whom rely on it as an area to escape and relax. These footpaths are well-used by many people for physical and mental health. This may seem insignificant to others however, residents rely on this land to enable freedom and a work life balance, which will be lost as result of this development. Footpaths although still evident on the plan will no longer be enjoyed by families maintaining their ongoing mental health, health and well-being as they will not have the same enjoyment having to walk through a housing estate. Footpaths, the Amenity and enjoyment of the use of these pathways which cross through and around this site which provide an important means by which residents of the local villages can get access to the countryside with substantial benefits for their physical and mental health as well as providing means of sustainable transport. For the people of Draycott and other areas, this will have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, replacing green space with 190 houses. Unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape. These plans plus the plans for National Grid to install super pylons only circa 600 meters away means the

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	George Foster	Response-01199	south west area of Draycott, will be hugely impacted from both a conservation and natural environment perspective. This area of the village will be unrealistically overburdened with development on Green Belt and green spaces. The development of 190 homes will have a significantly negative impact of the visual openness of the area. This development will interrupt and spoil the landscape, negatively impacting the perceptual qualities of the area. The development will significantly obstruct and diminish the visual experience of the open countryside. The development of 190 homes will have a significantly negative impact on the spatial openness of the area, impacting both the physical and geographical characteristics of the open land, which prevents urban sprawl and maintains the separation between settlements. It will overwhelmingly impact the natural and undeveloped nature of the Green Belt area. The NPPF includes an overarching objective to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment, including making effective use of land. It is the wrong model in the wrong place to meet the EBCs housing needs when existing Brownfield sites exist within EBC being of a scale that is ultimately detrimental to the local landscape and will harm the countryside, wildlife and impact irreversibly upon the area. The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. NPPF 8. Promoting healthy and safe communities:- 104. Planning policies and decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and access, including taking opportunities to provide better facilities for users, this area has significant amount of footpaths that will be affected by the development of 190 houses. NPPF states that sustainable development should be achieved. There is an obvious lack of definition of why this site is a ?sustainable location?. The introduction of 190 houses will increase waste, carbon footprint and impact the areas future biodiversity needs. NPPF 150. States that if it is necessary to restrict development in a village primarily because of the important contribution which the open character of the village makes to the openness of the Green Belt, the village should be included in the Green Belt. If, however, the character of the village needs to be protected for other reasons, other means should be used, such as conservation area or normal development management policies, and the village should be excluded from the Green Belt. The land south west of Draycott significantly contributes to the village and its character. This village is a part of this land and the Green Belt status allows villagers to access green spaces and enhances the village feel of the area which is rural. NPPF 151. States that once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunitie
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	George Foster	Response-01199	s for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. This development will remove existing green spaces forever which residents currently have access to including footpath, walks and visual vistas and spatial openness. NPPF 207. States in determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets? importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation. Yet development on the land south west of Draycott will significantly impact and later the heritage of the Village including the destruction of unspoilt Green Belt land, the adjacent conservation site of the canal and other listed heritage sites that surround the identified area. NPPF 208. States the local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset?s conservation and any aspect of the proposal. This development will impact Nooning Lane Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1417622. NPPF 102. Access to a network of high quality open spaces would be reduced by this application and our opportunities for physical activity and health and wellbeing would be adversely affected. There would be a detrimental effect on the Carbon Sink opportunities by the loss of open land and the effects of a housing development of this size. It is important the EBC conserves and enhances the Borough landscape character and not destroy it. This proposal does not promote the conservation or enhancement of the local landscape and is an inappropriate development.
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Graham Wakeling	Response-01238	the natural landscape will be destroyed ad lost forever, one of the great things about being in any small village is being one step from countryside and nature. skyline, natural light and character of the area will be completely altered forever.
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Hannah Pritchard	Response-01399	The site is an integral part of the rural landscape that defines Draycott?s identity. Development would result in the urbanisation of a tranquil, agricultural area, damaging views and the natural setting enjoyed by residents and visitors alike. It would permanently alter the visual character of the parish, impacting tourism, recreation, and quality of life.
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	James Hargreaves	Response-01315	1. Cumulative Impact: The proposed pylon route from Chesterfield to Willington adds to the pressure on this part of the village. The combined effect of multiple developments is already affecting residents? mental health and wellbeing.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	James Whyman	Response-01551	<p>1 Under S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended, contributions can be sought from developers towards the costs of providing community and social infrastructure, the need for which has arisen as a result of new development taking place. 2 No additional open space opportunities, protection of the public right of way or indeed to better facilities. If S106 funding is available for an application of this type this must be considered. 3 This land is rural in character, providing a tranquil transitional landscape between the rural areas of Draycott Parish, and the villages surrounding it of Borrowash and Breaston. 4 The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate when existing Brownfield sites are available within EBC. 5 The footpaths that cross the land have amazing views and are used regularly by residents and visitors. The recent pandemic years have shown us that we need space to exercise and be at peace with ourselves and nature, for our own mental wellbeing. This development will have the effect, that anyone using the path would feel imprisoned by a housing estate. 6 Loss of open land frequently used 7 These decisions are irreversible, and our children will have less open countryside to explore and play in. Losing safe connecting space between locations. This when existing and available Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised over Greenbelt. 8 Our local surroundings will become dominated by housing estates and will blight the local walks along the Public Right of Way which connect our Village. 9 The sheer scale of the proposed site will have such an irreversible effect on the landscape. The land/footpaths will be surrounded by housing which will render the land unusable by residents whom rely on it as an area to escape and relax. These footpaths are well-used by many people for physical and mental health. This may seem insignificant to others however, residents rely on this land to enable freedom and a work life balance, which will be lost as result of this development. 10 Footpaths although still evident on the plan will no longer be enjoyed by families maintaining their ongoing mental health, health and well-being as they will not have the same enjoyment having to walk through a housing estate. 11 Footpaths, the Amenity and enjoyment of the use of these pathways which cross through and around this site which provide an important means by which residents of the local villages can get access to the countryside with substantial benefits for their physical and mental health as well as providing means of sustainable transport. For the people of Draycott and other areas, this will have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, replacing green space with 190 houses. 12 Unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape. 13 These plans plus the plans for National Grid to install super pylons only cir</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	James Whyman	Response-01551	<p>ca 600 meters away means the south west area of Draycott, will be hugely impacted from both a conservation and natural environment perspective. This area of the village will be unrealistically overburdened with development on Green Belt and green spaces. 14 The development of 190 homes will have a significantly negative impact of the visual openness of the area. This development will interrupt and spoil the landscape, negatively impacting the perceptual qualities of the area. The development will significantly obstruct and diminish the visual experience of the open countryside. 15 The development of 190 homes will have a significantly negative impact on the spatial openness of the area, impacting both the physical and geographical characteristics of the open land, which prevents urban sprawl and maintains the separation between settlements. It will overwhelmingly impact the natural and undeveloped nature of the Green Belt area. 16 Protecting public rights of way and access, footpaths would be affected by this development. 17 Increased harm to the character of Public Rights of Way. 18 Boundaries are changed by fencing and walls. 19 The NPPF includes an overarching objective to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment, including making effective use of land. 20 Strongly object to this application the amenity and enjoyment of the use of the paths which cross the site will be severely compromised by the development. These paths provide an important means by which residents from the local area can get access to the countryside with substantial benefits for their physical and mental health. 21 The suggested 190 houses to the land south west of Draycott would enclose the paths, which would have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, as would the replacement of green fields with 190 houses. 22 We acknowledge it is a balance between the adverse effects on the footpaths against the desirability of the development taking place, but question if the proposed measures would be sufficient to prevent a severe adverse effect on the use of the paths. 23 The recent pandemic has highlighted the valuable and regular use of these footpaths, promoting and fostering good mental health. 24 An extensive network of public footpaths is within the application site, and there are many in the near vicinity. The footpaths are well used and highly valued as an amenity. 25 Public footpaths this development would surely take away the enjoyment of what countryside walks we have left around. 27 The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. 28 The footpaths that cross the land have amazing views and are used regularly by residents and visitors. The recent pandemic years have shown us that we need space to exercise and be at peace with ourselves and nature, for our own mental wellbeing. 29 It is the wrong model in the wrong place to meet the EBCs housing needs when existin</p>

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	James Whyman	Response-01551	<p>g Brownfield sites exist within EBC being of a scale that is ultimately detrimental to the local landscape and will harm the countryside, wildlife and impact irreversibly upon the area. 30 Our local surroundings will become dominated by this housing development and will blight the local walks along the Public Right of Way which connect our Village. 32 The NPPF includes an overarching objective to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment, including making effective use of land. There are 109 existing Brownfield sites within the EBC that should be prioritised before the Green Belt land south west of Draycott is used. 33 Historic structures act as a focal point in countryside views and make a huge contribution to environmental quality. Their setting is often a major part of their significance. The proposed housing development to the land South West of Draycott deprives them of their context. 34 The proposed development is considered to have an adverse impact on the setting of local heritage assets. 35 This would have a detrimental and cumulative impact which would be harmful to local heritage assets. 36 The use of long/heavy goods vehicles should be prohibited due to the significant amount of Grade I and II listed buildings in the vicinity of the proposed development on land south west of Draycott. 37 Historic England show 14 listed building in Draycott: - Victoria Mill Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1281333 / Church of St Chads, Church Wilne, Grade 1 listed building, list entry number 1281336 / Cart Shed and Stable at Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1140155 / Cedars Farm House, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1087964 / The Cotton Processing and Storage Building at Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1329376 / Doubling Mill at Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1140154 / Draycott Hall and Outbuildings, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1334834 / Front Range Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1334835 / Levers Machine Shed, Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1250092 / Cotton warehouse, chimney and outbuilding, Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1250121 / Cotton spinning mill and office block, Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1250046 / Potter Lane Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1087966 / Nooning Lane Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1417622 / Hopwell Road Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1087963 38 NPPF states that infrastructure must come first, yet the outline ideas to provide infrastructure are either not in place or are no timeline in advance of the proposed developments. There are currently no plans to develop new healthcare or improved infrastructure with these significant scale extensions of population. 41 The amenity value of the footpaths through the application site would be entirely lost, and that of the surrounding footpaths greatly diminished due to the change from a beautiful rural landscape to a vast housing estate, with high fences/walls and a significant amount of houses adding to this negative impact. 45 It is the wrong model in the wrong place to deliver the EBCs housing needs being of a scale that is ultimately detrimental to the local landscape and will harm the countryside, wildlife and impact irreversibly upon the area and its residents. 46 U</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	James Whyman	Response-01551	<p>necessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape when existing Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised before the Greenbelt land south west of Draycott. 47 NPPF 8. Promoting healthy and safe communities:- 104. Planning policies and decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and access, including taking opportunities to provide better facilities for users, this area has significant amount of footpaths that will be affected by the development of 190 houses. 48 NPPF states that sustainable development should be achieved. There is an obvious lack of definition of why this site is a ?sustainable location?. The introduction of 190 houses will increase waste, carbon footprint and impact the areas future biodiversity needs. 49 NPPF 150. States that if it is necessary to restrict development in a village primarily because of the important contribution which the open character of the village makes to the openness of the Green Belt, the village should be included in the Green Belt. If, however, the character of the village needs to be protected for other reasons, other means should be used, such as conservation area or normal development management policies, and the village should be excluded from the Green Belt. The land south west of Draycott significantly contributes to the village and its character. This village is a part of this land and the Green Belt status allows villagers to access green spaces and enhances the village feel of the area which is rural. 50 NPPF 151. States that once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. This development will remove existing green spaces forever which residents currently have access to including footpath, walks and visual vistas and spatial openness. 51 NPPF 207. States in determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets? importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation. Yet development on the land south west of Draycott will significantly impact and later the heritage of the Village including the destruction of unspoilt Green Belt land, the adjacent conservation site of the canal and other listed heritage sites that surround the identified area. 52 NPPF 208. States the local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take t</p>

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	James Whyman	Response-01551	his into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal. This development will impact Nooning Lane Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1417622. 53 NPPF 102. Access to a network of high quality open spaces would be reduced by this application and our opportunities for physical activity and health and wellbeing would be adversely affected 54 There would be a detrimental effect on the Carbon Sink opportunities by the loss of open land and the effects of a housing development of this size. 55 To improve local accessibility to healthcare, education, employment, retail facilities and recreational resources including open spaces to enhance wellbeing and promote healthy and sustainable lifestyles. This application will have a negative effect on both wellbeing and health including mental and emotional wellbeing. 56 To create safe and attractive places which contribute towards quality of life and community cohesion. This project will significantly detrimentally impact on the quality of life and fragment the community who use this area as a community facility. Including educational opportunities for local schools. 57 To conserve and enhance the Borough landscape character. This proposal does not promote the conservation or enhancement of the local landscape and is an inappropriate development.
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Jane Barker	Response-01178	To change the landscape of the village would be detrimental to those that already choose to live there. You will change the pleasure that people have using the green spaces/. footpaths etc. and do not wish to walk through housing estates.
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	J Morgan	Response-01847	The existing footpaths and access to the small wood bring great enjoyment to all who walk these trails, providing substantial benefits for physical and mental health. The development will have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, replacing green space with 190 houses. The proposal is far too big and overpowering for the village, impacting its heritage and cherished greenbelt landscape.
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Jonathan Childs	Response-01117	Under S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended, contributions can be sought from developers towards the costs of providing community and social infrastructure, the need for which has arisen as a result of new development taking place. No additional open space opportunities, protection of the public right of way or indeed to better facilities. If S106 funding is available for an application of this type this must be considered. This land is rural in character, providing a tranquil transitional landscape between the rural areas of Draycott Parish, and the villages surrounding it of Borrowwash and Breaston. The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red list species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate when existing Brownfield sites are available within EBC. The footpaths that cross the land have amazing views and are used regularly by residents and visitors. The recent pandemic years have shown us that we need space to exercise and be at peace with ourselves and nature, for our own mental wellbeing. This development will have the effect, that anyone using the path would feel imprisoned by a housing estate. These decisions are irreversible, and our children (and their children) will have less open countryside to explore and play in, losing safe connecting space between locations. Once given up, this can NEVER be recovered or replaced! Our local surroundings will become dominated by housing estates and will blight or obstruct the local walks along the Public Right of Way which connect our village. The sheer scale of the proposed site will have such an irreversible effect on the landscape. The land/footpaths will be surrounded by housing which will render the land unusable by residents whom rely on it as an area to escape and relax. These footpaths are well-used by many people for physical and mental health. This may seem insignificant to others however, residents rely on this land to enable freedom and a work life balance, which will be lost as result of this development. Footpaths although still evident on the plan will no longer be enjoyed by families maintaining their ongoing mental health, health and well-being as they will not have the same enjoyment having to walk through a housing estate. These plans plus the plans for National Grid to install super pylons only circa 600 meters away means the south west area of Draycott, will be hugely impacted from both a conservation and natural environment perspective. This area of the village will be unrealistically overburdened with development on Green Belt and green spaces. The NPPF includes an overarching objective to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment, including making effective use of land. The use of long/heavy goods vehicles should be prohibited due to the significant amount of Grade I and II listed buildings in the vicinity of the proposed development on land south west of Draycott. Historic England show 14 listed bui

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	Jonathan Childs	Response-01117	lding in Draycott: - Victoria Mill Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1281333 / Church of St Chads, Church Wilne, Grade 1 listed building, list entry number 1281336 / Cart Shed and Stable at Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1140155 / Cedars Farm House, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1087964 / The Cotton Processing and Storage Building at Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1329376 / Doubling Mill at Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1140154 / Draycott Hall and Outbuildings, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1334834 / Front Range Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1334835 / Levers Machine Shed, Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1250092 / Cotton warehouse, chimney and outbuilding, Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1250121 / Cotton spinning mill and office block, Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1250046 / Potter Lane Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1087966 / Nooning Lane Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1417622 / Hopwell Road Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1087963 NPPF states that infrastructure must come first, yet the outline ideas to provide infrastructure are either not in place or are no timeline in advance of the proposed developments. There are currently no plans to develop new healthcare or improved infrastructure with these significant scale extensions of population. The amenity value of the footpaths through the application site would be entirely lost, and that of the surrounding footpaths greatly diminished due to the change from a beautiful rural landscape to a vast housing estate, with high fences/walls and a significant amount of houses adding to this negative impact. NPPF states that sustainable development should be achieved. There is an obvious lack of definition of why this site is a ?sustainable location?. The introduction of 190 houses will increase waste, carbon footprint and impact the areas future biodiversity needs. NPPF 150. States that if it is necessary to restrict development in a village primarily because of the important contribution which the open character of the village makes to the openness of the Green Belt, the village should be included in the Green Belt. If, however, the character of the village needs to be protected for other reasons, other means should be used, such as conservation area or normal development management policies, and the village should be excluded from the Green Belt. The land south west of Draycott significantly contributes to the village and its character. This village is a part of this land and the Green Belt status allows villagers to access green spaces and enhances the village feel of the area which is rural. NPPF 151. States that once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. This development will remove existing green spaces forever which residents currently have access to including footpath, walks and visual vistas and spatial openness. NPPF 207. States in determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applican
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	Jonathan Childs	Response-01117	t to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets? importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation. Yet development on the land south west of Draycott will significantly impact and later the heritage of the Village including the destruction of unspoilt Green Belt land, the adjacent conservation site of the canal and other listed heritage sites that surround the identified area. NPPF 208. States the local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset?s conservation and any aspect of the proposal. This development will impact Nooning Lane Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1417622. NPPF 102. Access to a network of high quality open spaces would be reduced by this application and our opportunities for physical activity and health and wellbeing would be adversely affected There would be a detrimental effect on the Carbon Sink opportunities by the loss of open land and the effects of a housing development of this size.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	Jonathan Fletcher	Response-01463	I don?t think I really have to explain how the effects of so many new properties will destroy the beauty of the landscape!!
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	Judith Boyle	Response-01418	The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate when existing Brownfield sites are available within EBC.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	Justine Murrin	Response-01478	This large amount of housing will change the charater of this local area by increasing the population by 17% will negatively affect the village atmosphere and look of the area
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	Karen Doney	Response-01236	This land is rural in character, providing a tranquil transitional landscape between the rural areas of Draycott Parish, and the villages surrounding it of Borrowash and Breaston. The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate when existing Brownfield sites are available within EBC.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	Katie May	Response-01518	<p>Under S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended, contributions can be sought from developers towards the costs of providing community and social infrastructure, the need for which has arisen as a result of new development taking place. No additional open space opportunities, protection of the public right of way or indeed to better facilities. If S106 funding is available for an application of this type this must be considered. This land is rural in character, providing a tranquil transitional landscape between the rural areas of Draycott Parish, and the villages surrounding it of Borrowwash and Breaston. The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate when existing Brownfield sites are available within EBC. The footpaths that cross the land have amazing views and are used regularly by residents and visitors. The recent pandemic years have shown us that we need space to exercise and be at peace with ourselves and nature, for our own mental wellbeing. This development will have the effect, that anyone using the path would feel imprisoned by a housing estate. Loss of open land frequently used These decisions are irreversible, and our children will have less open countryside to explore and play in. Losing safe connecting space between locations. This when existing and available Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised over Greenbelt. Our local surroundings will become dominated by housing estates and will blight the local walks along the Public Right of Way which connect our Village. The sheer scale of the proposed site will have such an irreversible effect on the landscape. The land/footpaths will be surrounded by housing which will render the land unusable by residents whom rely on it as an area to escape and relax. These footpaths are well-used by many people for physical and mental health. This may seem insignificant to others however, residents rely on this land to enable freedom and a work life balance, which will be lost as result of this development. Footpaths although still evident on the plan will no longer be enjoyed by families maintaining their ongoing mental health, health and well-being as they will not have the same enjoyment having to walk through a housing estate. Footpaths, the Amenity and enjoyment of the use of these pathways which cross through and around this site which provide an important means by which residents of the local villages can get access to the countryside with substantial benefits for their physical and mental health as well as providing means of sustainable transport. For the people of Draycott and other areas, this will have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, replacing green space with 190 houses. Unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape. These plans plus the plans for National Grid to install super pylons only circa 600 meters away means the s</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	Katie May	Response-01518	<p>outh west area of Draycott, will be hugely impacted from both a conservation and natural environment perspective. This area of the village will be unrealistically overburdened with development on Green Belt and green spaces. The development of 190 homes will have a significantly negative impact of the visual openness of the area. This development will interrupt and spoil the landscape, negatively impacting the perceptual qualities of the area. The development will significantly obstruct and diminish the visual experience of the open countryside. The development of 190 homes will have a significantly negative impact on the spatial openness of the area, impacting both the physical and geographical characteristics of the open land, which prevents urban sprawl and maintains the separation between settlements. It will overwhelmingly impact the natural and undeveloped nature of the Green Belt area. Protecting public rights of way and access, footpaths would be affected by this development. Increased harm to the character of Public Rights of Way. Boundaries are changed by fencing and walls. The NPPF includes an overarching objective to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment, including making effective use of land. Strongly object to this application the amenity and enjoyment of the use of the paths which cross the site will be severely compromised by the development. These paths provide an important means by which residents from the local area can get access to the countryside with substantial benefits for their physical and mental health. The suggested 190 houses to the land south west of Draycott would enclose the paths, which would have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, as would the replacement of green fields with 190 houses. We acknowledge it is a balance between the adverse effects on the footpaths against the desirability of the development taking place, but question if the proposed measures would be sufficient to prevent a severe adverse effect on the use of the paths. The recent pandemic has highlighted the valuable and regular use of these footpaths, promoting and fostering good mental health. An extensive network of public footpaths is within the application site, and there are many in the near vicinity. The footpaths are well used and highly valued as an amenity. Public footpaths this development would surely take away the enjoyment of what countryside walks we have left around. The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. The footpaths that cross the land have amazing views and are used regularly by residents and visitors. The recent pandemic years have shown us that we need space to exercise and be at peace with ourselves and nature, for our own mental wellbeing. It is the wrong model in the wrong place to meet the EBCs housing needs when existing Brownfield sites exist within EBC being of a scale that is ultimately det</p>

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	Cate May	Response-01518	<p>rimental to the local landscape and will harm the countryside, wildlife and impact irreversibly upon the area. Our local surroundings will become dominated by this housing development and will blight the local walks along the Public Right of Way which connect our Village. The NPPF includes an overarching objective to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment, including making effective use of land. There are 109 existing Brownfield sites within the EBC that should be prioritised before the Green Belt land south west of Draycott is used. Historic structures act as a focal point in countryside views and make a huge contribution to environmental quality. Their setting is often a major part of their significance. The proposed housing development to the land South West of Draycott deprives them of their context. The proposed development is considered to have an adverse impact on the setting of local heritage assets. This would have a detrimental and cumulative impact which would be harmful to local heritage assets. The use of long/heavy goods vehicles should be prohibited due to the significant amount of Grade I and II listed buildings in the vicinity of the proposed development on land south west of Draycott. Historic England show 14 listed building in Draycott: - Victoria Mill Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1281333 / Church of St Chads, Church Wilne, Grade 1 listed building, list entry number 1281336 / Cart Shed and Stable at Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1140155 / Cedars Farm House, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1087964 / The Cotton Processing and Storage Building at Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1329376 / Doubling Mill at Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1140154 / Draycott Hall and Outbuildings, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1334834 / Front Range Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1334835 / Levers Machine Shed, Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1250092 / Cotton warehouse, chimney and outbuilding, Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1250121 / Cotton spinning mill and office block, Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1250046 / Potter Lane Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1087966 / Nooning Lane Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1417622 / Hopwell Road Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1087963 NPPF states that infrastructure must come first, yet the outline ideas to provide infrastructure are either not in place or are no timeline in advance of the proposed developments. There are currently no plans to develop new healthcare or improved infrastructure with these significant scale extensions of population. The amenity value of the footpaths through the application site would be entirely lost, and that of the surrounding footpaths greatly diminished due to the change from a beautiful rural landscape to a vast housing estate, with high fences/walls and a significant amount of houses adding to this negative impact. It is the wrong model in the wrong place to deliver the EBCs housing needs being of a scale that is ultimately detrimental to the local landscape and will harm the countryside, wildlife and impact irreversibly upon the area and its residents. Unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape when existing Br</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	Cate May	Response-01518	<p>ownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised before the Greenbelt land south west of Draycott. NPPF 8. Promoting healthy and safe communities:- 104. Planning policies and decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and access, including taking opportunities to provide better facilities for users, this area has significant amount of footpaths that will be affected by the development of 190 houses. NPPF states that sustainable development should be achieved. There is an obvious lack of definition of why this site is a ?sustainable location?. The introduction of 190 houses will increase waste, carbon footprint and impact the areas future biodiversity needs. NPPF 150. States that if it is necessary to restrict development in a village primarily because of the important contribution which the open character of the village makes to the openness of the Green Belt, the village should be included in the Green Belt. If, however, the character of the village needs to be protected for other reasons, other means should be used, such as conservation area or normal development management policies, and the village should be excluded from the Green Belt. The land south west of Draycott significantly contributes to the village and its character. This village is a part of this land and the Green Belt status allows villagers to access green spaces and enhances the village feel of the area which is rural. NPPF 151. States that once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. This development will remove existing green spaces forever which residents currently have access to including footpath, walks and visual vistas and spatial openness. "NPPF 207. States in determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets? importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation. Yet development on the land south west of Draycott will significantly impact and later the heritage of the Village including the destruction of unspoilt Green Belt land, the adjacent conservation site of the canal and other listed heritage sites that surround the identified area. " "NPPF 208. States the local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between</p>



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	Steve May	Response-01518	the heritage asset?s conservation and any aspect of the proposal. This development will impact Nooning Lane Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1417622." NPPF 102. Access to a network of high quality open spaces would be reduced by this application and our opportunities for physical activity and health and wellbeing would be adversely affected There would be a detrimental effect on the Carbon Sink opportunities by the loss of open land and the effects of a housing development of this size. To improve local accessibility to healthcare, education, employment, retail facilities and recreational resources including open spaces to enhance wellbeing and promote healthy and sustainable lifestyles. This application will have a negative effect on both wellbeing and health including mental and emotional wellbeing. To create safe and attractive places which contribute towards quality of life and community cohesion. This project will significantly detrimentally impact on the quality of life and fragment the community who use this area as a community facility. Including educational opportunities for local schools. To conserve and enhance the Borough landscape character. This proposal does not promote the conservation or enhancement of the local landscape and is an inappropriate development.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	Kelly Walker	Response-00911	This land is rural in character, providing a tranquil transitional landscape between the rural areas of Draycott Parish, and the villages surrounding it of Borrowash and Breaston. The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate when existing Brownfield sites are available within EBC. The footpaths that cross the land have amazing views and are used regularly by residents and visitors. The recent pandemic years have shown us that we need space to exercise and be at peace with ourselves and nature, for our own mental wellbeing. This development will have the effect, that anyone using the path would feel imprisoned by a housing estate. These decisions are irreversible, and our children will have less open countryside to explore and play in. Losing safe connecting space between locations. This when existing and available Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised over Greenbelt. The sheer scale of the proposed site will have such an irreversible effect on the landscape. The land/footpaths will be surrounded by housing which will render the land unusable by residents whom rely on it as an area to escape and relax. These footpaths are well-used by many people for physical and mental health. This may seem insignificant to others however, residents rely on this land to enable freedom and a work life balance, which will be lost as result of this development. Footpaths, the Amenity and enjoyment of the use of these pathways which cross through and around this site which provide an important means by which residents of the local villages can get access to the countryside with substantial benefits for their physical and mental health as well as providing means of sustainable transport. For the people of Draycott and other areas, this will have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, replacing green space with 190 houses. These plans plus the plans for National Grid to install super pylons only circa 600 meters away means the south west area of Draycott, will be hugely impacted from both a conservation and natural environment perspective. This area of the village will be unrealistically overburdened with development on Green Belt and green spaces. The development of 190 homes will have a significantly negative impact of the visual openness of the area. This development will interrupt and spoil the landscape, negatively impacting the perceptual qualities of the area. The development will significantly obstruct and diminish the visual experience of the open countryside. The development of 190 homes will have a significantly negative impact on the spatial openness of the area, impacting both the physical and geographical characteristics of the open land, which prevents urban sprawl and maintains the separation between settlements. It will overwhelmingly impact the natural and undeveloped nature of the Green Belt area. The NPPF includes an overarching objective to protect a
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	Kelly Walker	Response-00911	nd enhance our natural, built and historic environment, including making effective use of land. There are 109 existing Brownfield sites within the EBC that should be prioritised before the Green Belt land south west of Draycott is used. Historic structures act as a focal point in countryside views and make a huge contribution to environmental quality. Their setting is often a major part of their significance. The proposed housing development to the land South West of Draycott deprives them of their context. NPPF states that sustainable development should be achieved. There is an obvious lack of definition of why this site is a ?sustainable location?. The introduction of 190 houses will increase waste, carbon footprint and impact the areas future biodiversity needs. NPPF 102. Access to a network of high quality open spaces would be reduced by this application and our opportunities for physical activity and health and wellbeing would be adversely affected NPPF 150. States that if it is necessary to restrict development in a village primarily because of the important contribution which the open character of the village makes to the openness of the Green Belt, the village should be included in the Green Belt. If, however, the character of the village needs to be protected for other reasons, other means should be used, such as conservation area or normal development management policies, and the village should be excluded from the Green Belt. The land south west of Draycott significantly contributes to the village and its character. This village is a part of this land and the Green Belt status allows villagers to access green spaces and enhances the village feel of the area which is rural. NPPF 151. States that once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. This development will remove existing green spaces forever which residents currently have access to including footpath, walks and visual vistas and spatial openness.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	Kerry Naylor	Response-00993	Nature is grass, soil, landscapes to help with water, animals, food for wildlife. To change the current landscape will change the who ethos of Draycott. It is a village with green boundaries, it must remain so.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Laura Charier	Response-01218	These decisions are irreversible, and our children will have less open countryside to explore and play in. Losing safe connecting space between locations. This when existing and available Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised over Greenbelt. This proposal does not promote the conservation or enhancement of the local landscape and is an inappropriate development.
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Laura Roffey	Response-01479	The landscape of Draycott would not benefit by stretching and extending the the houses further. This is a village, not a town.
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Lee	Response-00742	1. A development as big as this only negatively impacts the existing natural environment. The village and residents will suffer loss of trees or hedgerows ? which is the rural visual landscape the village is known for. No design can compensate for green belt? it is irreplaceable. 2. The proposed maintenance of the public walking path is a pointless gesture you will ruin the landscape and walk for all. Who wants to walk around a building site or estate? Why ruin greenbelt and public walkways build in a more suitable location? Loss of privacy, personal & public visual amenity. 3. I and many other residents on Derby Road & Lime Grove would suffer a major Loss of visual amenity. I bought a house with greenbelt on the back and paid a premium. This development will change the pleasantness of views and surroundings, affecting the quality of life for residents such as me. What will be done for residents whose lives, health and wellbeing that will be directly impacted? 4. Permission has already been granted to the rear left of my garden causing much stress and anxiety. You have ruined views, wildlife habitat, ripped out a large volume of trees and de-valued my house. Encroaching on our properties further and blocking us in is an invasion of privacy. How can this even be considered when other plots are already available? 5. The overall aesthetic quality and enjoyment of an area's landscape and surrounding will be affected for all walkers, visitors and residents. Why punish the enjoyment of all these beneficiaries? 6. You are blocking my views I sort after and paid for and worked extremely hard for. My reasons for picking Draycott as a semi-rural location. The scale is excessive estate you would be blocking in my / our properties and removing a key reason for living here. The significant impact to the enjoyment of my property and other residence on Derby Road needs careful consideration. If plans go through, a compensation scheme should be set up for directly affected residence to cover losses. This development will drastically overwhelm mine & other's views, it will be inescapably dominant and will be unpleasantly encroaching on Derby Road & Lime Grove residence. Why are other needs be considered over ours? 7. If this development is passed all properties with green belt views will see a reduction in value some huge & a key sort after attribute being needlessly taken away. The council should have to pay the difference between the value of the property before and after the development. This is the only fair compensation for this rushed and cobbled together development plan. Will a scheme be set up to compensate residents so they can sell without losing financially what they have worked so hard for? 8. We planned to do a loft extension at some point to take further benefit of our views. Many houses on derby road & Lime Groove have made improvements or alterations to take advantage of these views. For me this is no longer an option as all I do is overlook other houses. Why is the council supportive of taking away views?
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Louise and Shane Foster	Response-01219	The trails and footpaths are vital to residents to enjoy the outdoors with the positive impact this has on physical and mental health.
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Luke Hatch	Response-00160	The site forms part of the rural edge of the village. Building here would change the character of Draycott permanently replacing green fields with dense housing and concrete. It'd also be an obvious and ugly new build area to replace the views of fields on both sides. It doesn't seem to be in the spirit of the "Grey Belt" legislation changes.
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Maggie Murphy	Response-00833	NPPF states the development of homes, commercial and other development in the Green Belt should not be regarded as inappropriate where the development would utilise Grey Belt land and would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan. It is clear the authority is now altering existing and acceptable Green Belt land to suit this paragraph/approach of the NPPF by converting it to Grey Belt. This is an inappropriate interpretation of what Grey Belt land is. NPPF 8. Promoting healthy and safe communities:- 104. Planning policies and decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and access, including taking opportunities to provide better facilities for users. The existing footpaths and access to the small wood, brings great enjoyment to all who walk these trails and it provides an important means by which residents of the local villages can get access to the countryside locally with substantial benefits for their physical and mental health . The development on the land south west of Draycott for the people of Draycott and other areas, will have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, replacing green space with an initial 190 houses.
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Martin Fawcett	Response-01077	Having lived in the village for 60yrs I'm familiar with flooding that occurs and certain wildlife that is rare. We have owls, herons and bats and building more homes in the proposed area will affect these animals. There are plenty of other non green belt areas that should seriously be considered first

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Martin Kilcoyne	Response-01460	<p>Under S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended, contributions can be sought from developers towards the costs of providing community and social infrastructure, the need for which has arisen as a result of new development taking place. No additional open space opportunities, protection of the public right of way or indeed to better facilities. If S106 funding is available for an application of this type this must be considered. This land is rural in character, providing a tranquil transitional landscape between the rural areas of Draycott Parish, and the villages surrounding it of Borrowwash and Breaston. The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate when existing Brownfield sites are available within EBC. The footpaths that cross the land have amazing views and are used regularly by residents and visitors. The recent pandemic years have shown us that we need space to exercise and be at peace with ourselves and nature, for our own mental wellbeing. This development will have the effect, that anyone using the path would feel imprisoned by a housing estate. Loss of open land frequently used These decisions are irreversible, and our children will have less open countryside to explore and play in. Losing safe connecting space between locations. This when existing and available Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised over Greenbelt. Our local surroundings will become dominated by housing estates and will blight the local walks along the Public Right of Way which connect our Village. The sheer scale of the proposed site will have such an irreversible effect on the landscape. The land/footpaths will be surrounded by housing which will render the land unusable by residents whom rely on it as an area to escape and relax. These footpaths are well-used by many people for physical and mental health. This may seem insignificant to others however, residents rely on this land to enable freedom and a work life balance, which will be lost as result of this development. Footpaths although still evident on the plan will no longer be enjoyed by families maintaining their ongoing mental health, health and well-being as they will not have the same enjoyment having to walk through a housing estate. Footpaths, the Amenity and enjoyment of the use of these pathways which cross through and around this site which provide an important means by which residents of the local villages can get access to the countryside with substantial benefits for their physical and mental health as well as providing means of sustainable transport. For the people of Draycott and other areas, this will have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, replacing green space with 190 houses. Unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape. These plans plus the plans for National Grid to install super pylons only circa 600 meters away means the s</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Martin Kilcoyne	Response-01460	<p>South west area of Draycott, will be hugely impacted from both a conservation and natural environment perspective. This area of the village will be unrealistically overburdened with development on Green Belt and green spaces. The development of 190 homes will have a significantly negative impact of the visual openness of the area. This development will interrupt and spoil the landscape, negatively impacting the perceptual qualities of the area. The development will significantly obstruct and diminish the visual experience of the open countryside. The development of 190 homes will have a significantly negative impact on the spatial openness of the area, impacting both the physical and geographical characteristics of the open land, which prevents urban sprawl and maintains the separation between settlements. It will overwhelmingly impact the natural and undeveloped nature of the Green Belt area. Protecting public rights of way and access, footpaths would be affected by this development. Increased harm to the character of Public Rights of Way. Boundaries are changed by fencing and walls. The NPPF includes an overarching objective to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment, including making effective use of land. Strongly object to this application the amenity and enjoyment of the use of the paths which cross the site will be severely compromised by the development. These paths provide an important means by which residents from the local area can get access to the countryside with substantial benefits for their physical and mental health. The suggested 190 houses to the land south west of Draycott would enclose the paths, which would have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, as would the replacement of green fields with 190 houses. We acknowledge it is a balance between the adverse effects on the footpaths against the desirability of the development taking place, but question if the proposed measures would be sufficient to prevent a severe adverse effect on the use of the paths. The recent pandemic has highlighted the valuable and regular use of these footpaths, promoting and fostering good mental health. An extensive network of public footpaths is within the application site, and there are many in the near vicinity. The footpaths are well used and highly valued as an amenity. Public footpaths this development would surely take away the enjoyment of what countryside walks we have left around. The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. The footpaths that cross the land have amazing views and are used regularly by residents and visitors. The recent pandemic years have shown us that we need space to exercise and be at peace with ourselves and nature, for our own mental wellbeing. It is the wrong model in the wrong place to meet the EBCs housing needs when existing Brownfield sites exist within EBC being of a scale that is ultimately det</p>

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Martin Kilcoyne	Response-01460	<p>rimental to the local landscape and will harm the countryside, wildlife and impact irreversibly upon the area. Our local surroundings will become dominated by this housing development and will blight the local walks along the Public Right of Way which connect our Village. The NPPF includes an overarching objective to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment, including making effective use of land. There are 109 existing Brownfield sites within the EBC that should be prioritised before the Green Belt land south west of Draycott is used. Historic structures act as a focal point in countryside views and make a huge contribution to environmental quality. Their setting is often a major part of their significance. The proposed housing development to the land South West of Draycott deprives them of their context. The proposed development is considered to have an adverse impact on the setting of local heritage assets. This would have a detrimental and cumulative impact which would be harmful to local heritage assets. The use of long/heavy goods vehicles should be prohibited due to the significant amount of Grade I and II listed buildings in the vicinity of the proposed development on land south west of Draycott. Historic England show 14 listed building in Draycott: - Victoria Mill Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1281333 / Church of St Chads, Church Wilne, Grade 1 listed building, list entry number 1281336 / Cart Shed and Stable at Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1140155 / Cedars Farm House, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1087964 / The Cotton Processing and Storage Building at Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1329376 / Doubling Mill at Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1140154 / Draycott Hall and Outbuildings, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1334834 / Front Range Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1334835 / Levers Machine Shed, Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1250092 / Cotton warehouse, chimney and outbuilding, Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1250121 / Cotton spinning mill and office block, Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1250046 / Potter Lane Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1087966 / Nooning Lane Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1417622 / Hopwell Road Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1087963 NPPF states that infrastructure must come first, yet the outline ideas to provide infrastructure are either not in place or are no timeline in advance of the proposed developments. There are currently no plans to develop new healthcare or improved infrastructure with these significant scale extensions of population. The amenity value of the footpaths through the application site would be entirely lost, and that of the surrounding footpaths greatly diminished due to the change from a beautiful rural landscape to a vast housing estate, with high fences/walls and a significant amount of houses adding to this negative impact. It is the wrong model in the wrong place to deliver the EBCs housing needs being of a scale that is ultimately detrimental to the local landscape and will harm the countryside, wildlife and impact irreversibly upon the area and its residents. Unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape when existing Br</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Martin Kilcoyne	Response-01460	<p>ownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised before the Greenbelt land south west of Draycott. NPPF 8. Promoting healthy and safe communities:- 104. Planning policies and decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and access, including taking opportunities to provide better facilities for users, this area has significant amount of footpaths that will be affected by the development of 190 houses. NPPF states that sustainable development should be achieved. There is an obvious lack of definition of why this site is a ?sustainable location?. The introduction of 190 houses will increase waste, carbon footprint and impact the areas future biodiversity needs. NPPF 150. States that if it is necessary to restrict development in a village primarily because of the important contribution which the open character of the village makes to the openness of the Green Belt, the village should be included in the Green Belt. If, however, the character of the village needs to be protected for other reasons, other means should be used, such as conservation area or normal development management policies, and the village should be excluded from the Green Belt. The land south west of Draycott significantly contributes to the village and its character. This village is a part of this land and the Green Belt status allows villagers to access green spaces and enhances the village feel of the area which is rural. NPPF 151. States that once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. This development will remove existing green spaces forever which residents currently have access to including footpath, walks and visual vistas and spatial openness. "NPPF 207. States in determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets? importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation. Yet development on the land south west of Draycott will significantly impact and later the heritage of the Village including the destruction of unspoilt Green Belt land, the adjacent conservation site of the canal and other listed heritage sites that surround the identified area. " "NPPF 208. States the local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between</p>

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Martin Kilcoyne	Response-01460	the heritage asset?s conservation and any aspect of the proposal. This development will impact Nooning Lane Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1417622." NPPF 102. Access to a network of high quality open spaces would be reduced by this application and our opportunities for physical activity and health and wellbeing would be adversely affected There would be a detrimental effect on the Carbon Sink opportunities by the loss of open land and the effects of a housing development of this size. To improve local accessibility to healthcare, education, employment, retail facilities and recreational resources including open spaces to enhance wellbeing and promote healthy and sustainable lifestyles. This application will have a negative effect on both wellbeing and health including mental and emotional wellbeing. To create safe and attractive places which contribute towards quality of life and community cohesion. This project will significantly detrimentally impact on the quality of life and fragment the community who use this area as a community facility. Including educational opportunities for local schools. To conserve and enhance the Borough landscape character. This proposal does not promote the conservation or enhancement of the local landscape and is an inappropriate development.
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Mary Walsh	Response-01197	Unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape. These plans plus the plans for National Grid to install super pylons only circa 600 meters away means the south west area of Draycott, will be hugely It is the wrong model in the wrong place to deliver the EBCs housing needs being of a scale that is ultimately detrimental to the local landscape and will harm the countryside, wildlife and impact irreversibly upon the area and its residents.
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Matthew Walker	Response-01313	The NPPF includes an overarching objective to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment, including making effective use of land. The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate when existing Brownfield sites are available within EBC. The footpaths that cross the land have amazing views and are used regularly by residents and visitors. The recent pandemic years have shown us that we need space to exercise and be at peace with ourselves and nature, for our own mental wellbeing. This development will have the effect, that anyone using the path would feel imprisoned by a housing estate. These decisions are irreversible, and our children will have less open countryside to explore and play in. Losing safe connecting space between locations. This when existing and available Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised over Greenbelt. Our local surroundings will become dominated by housing estates and will blight the local walks along the Public Right of Way which connect our Village. The sheer scale of the proposed site will have such an irreversible effect on the landscape. The land/footpaths will be surrounded by housing which will render the land unusable by residents whom rely on it as an area to escape and relax. These footpaths are well-used by many people for physical and mental health. This may seem insignificant to others however, residents rely on this land to enable freedom and a work life balance, which will be lost as result of this development. Footpaths, the Amenities and enjoyment of the use of these pathways which cross through and around this site which provide an important means by which residents of the local villages can get access to the countryside with substantial benefits for their physical and mental health as well as providing means of sustainable transport. For the people of Draycott and other areas, this will have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, replacing green space with 190 houses. These plans plus the plans for National Grid to install super pylons only circa 600 meters away means the south west area of Draycott, will be hugely impacted from both a conservation and natural environment perspective. This area of the village will be unrealistically overburdened with development on Green Belt and green spaces. The development of 190 homes will have a significantly negative impact of the visual openness of the area. This development will interrupt and spoil the landscape, negatively impacting the perceptual qualities of the area. The development will significantly obstruct and diminish the visual experience of the open countryside. The development of 190 homes will have a significantly negative impact on the spatial openness of the area, impacting both the physical and geographical characteristics of the open land, which prevents urban sprawl and maintains the separation between settlements. It will overwhelming

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	Matthew Walker	Response-01313	ly impact the natural and undeveloped nature of the Green Belt area. It is the wrong model in the wrong place to meet the EBCs housing needs when existing Brownfield sites exist within EBC being of a scale that is ultimately detrimental to the local landscape and will harm the countryside, wildlife and impact irreversibly upon the area. Historic structures act as a focal point in countryside views and make a huge contribution to environmental quality. Their setting is often a major part of their significance. The proposed housing development to the land South West of Draycott deprives them of their context. The proposed development is considered to have an adverse impact on the setting of local heritage assets. This would have a detrimental and cumulative impact which would be harmful to local heritage assets. The use of long/heavy goods vehicles should be prohibited due to the significant amount of Grade I and II listed buildings in the vicinity of the proposed development on land south west of Draycott. Historic England show 14 listed building in Draycott: - Victoria Mill Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1281333 / Church of St Chads, Church Wilne, Grade 1 listed building, list entry number 1281336 / Cart Shed and Stable at Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1140155 / Cedars Farm House, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1087964 / The Cotton Processing and Storage Building at Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1329376 / Doubling Mill at Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1140154 / Draycott Hall and Outbuildings, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1334834 / Front Range Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1334835 / Levers Machine Shed, Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1250092 / Cotton warehouse, chimney and outbuilding, Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1250121 / Cotton spinning mill and office block, Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1250046 / Potter Lane Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1087966 / Nooning Lane Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1417622 / Hopwell Road Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1087963 NPPF states that infrastructure must come first, yet the outline ideas to provide infrastructure are either not in place or are no timeline in advance of the proposed developments. There are currently no plans to develop new healthcare or improved infrastructure with these significant scale extensions of population. NPPF 8. Promoting healthy and safe communities:- 104. Planning policies and decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and access, including taking opportunities to provide better facilities for users, this area has significant amount of footpaths that will be affected by the development of 190 houses. NPPF states that sustainable development should be achieved. There is an obvious lack of definition of why this site is a ?sustainable location?. The introduction of 190 houses will increase waste, carbon footprint and impact the areas future biodiversity needs. NPPF 150. States that if it is necessary to restrict development in a village primarily because of the important contribution which the open character of the village makes to the openness of the Green Belt, the village should be included in the Green Belt. If, however, the character of the village needs to
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	Matthew Walker	Response-01313	be protected for other reasons, other means should be used, such as conservation area or normal development management policies, and the village should be excluded from the Green Belt. The land south west of Draycott significantly contributes to the village and its character. This village is a part of this land and the Green Belt status allows villagers to access green spaces and enhances the village feel of the area which is rural. NPPF 151. States that once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. This development will remove existing green spaces forever which residents currently have access to including footpath, walks and visual vistas and spatial openness. NPPF 207. States in determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets? importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation. Yet development on the land south west of Draycott will significantly impact and later the heritage of the Village including the destruction of unspoilt Green Belt land, the adjacent conservation site of the canal and other listed heritage sites that surround the identified area. NPPF 208. States the local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset?s conservation and any aspect of the proposal. This development will impact Nooning Lane Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1417622. NPPF 102. Access to a network of high quality open spaces would be reduced by this application and our opportunities for physical activity and health and wellbeing would be adversely affected.
			Melanie Wilson	Response-00974	The development will have a detrimental effect on the Landscape of Draycott

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Michael Thirtwall	Response-01196	The sheer scale of the proposed site will have such an irreversible effect on the landscape. The land/footpaths will be surrounded by housing which will render the land unusable by residents whom rely on it as an area to escape and relax. These footpaths are well-used by many people for physical and mental health. This may seem insignificant to others however, residents rely on this land to enable freedom and a work life balance, which will be lost as result of development on this green belt. It is the wrong model in the wrong place to meet the EBCs housing needs when existing Brownfield sites exist within EBC . The proposed site south west of Draycott and the second phase of the development which would mean that in addition to the initial 190 houses, the development of an additional c70 dwellings would be undertaken on the identified safeguarded land on Banksfield Farm, would result in the removal of several TPO trees which contribute to the visual amenity of the area. The removal of these trees would detrimentally impact upon Lime Grove and Derby Road character and appearance.
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Michelle Marks	Response-00924	Draycott is a historic village with a strong sense of community and a distinct rural character. The addition of 190 houses would fundamentally alter the village's landscape, effectively turning it into a town and undermining the reasons many people choose to live here. Furthermore, this proposal is in direct conflict with local and national planning policies: Local authorities must demonstrate a five-year housing land supply before considering Green Belt release. There is no evidence that all suitable brownfield and non-Green Belt land options have been exhausted. The UK's Climate Change Act 2008 aims to reduce carbon emissions, yet this development would increase pollution and car dependency due to inadequate transport links
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Miss Ella Meredith	Response-01850	The existing footpaths and access to the small wood bring great enjoyment to all who walk these trails, providing substantial benefits for physical and mental health. The development will have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, replacing green space with 190 houses. The proposal is far too big and overpowering for the village, impacting its heritage and cherished greenbelt landscape.
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Miss Natalie Walsh	Response-01846	The existing footpaths and access to the small wood bring great enjoyment to all who walk these trails, providing substantial benefits for physical and mental health. The development will have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, replacing green space with 190 houses. The proposal is far too big and overpowering for the village, impacting its heritage and cherished greenbelt landscape.
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Miss Paige Murray	Response-01842	The existing footpaths and access to the small wood bring great enjoyment to all who walk these trails, providing substantial benefits for physical and mental health. The development will have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, replacing green space with 190 houses. The proposal is far too big and overpowering for the village, impacting its heritage and cherished greenbelt landscape.
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Mr Scott Walsh	Response-01844	The existing footpaths and access to the small wood bring great enjoyment to all who walk these trails, providing substantial benefits for physical and mental health. The development will have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, replacing green space with 190 houses. The proposal is far too big and overpowering for the village, impacting its heritage and cherished greenbelt landscape.
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Mrs Maria E Hardy	Response-00614	Ruin the countryside feel.
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Mrs Mary Walsh	Response-01845	The existing footpaths and access to the small wood bring great enjoyment to all who walk these trails, providing substantial benefits for physical and mental health. The development will have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, replacing green space with 190 houses. The proposal is far too big and overpowering for the village, impacting its heritage and cherished greenbelt landscape.
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Mr Tony Walsh	Response-01849	The existing footpaths and access to the small wood bring great enjoyment to all who walk these trails, providing substantial benefits for physical and mental health. The development will have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, replacing green space with 190 houses. The proposal is far too big and overpowering for the village, impacting its heritage and cherished greenbelt landscape.
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Nigel morton	Response-01351	The proposed site is everything that greenbelt is about and why it needs to be protected,views ,walks ,wildlife and helping mental health

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	Nikki Riches	Response-00950	<p>? Under S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended, contributions can be sought from developers towards the costs of providing community and social infrastructure, the need for which has arisen as a result of new development taking place. ? No additional open space opportunities, protection of the public right of way or indeed to better facilities. If S106 funding is available for an application of this type this must be considered. ? This land is rural in character, providing a tranquil transitional landscape between the rural areas of Draycott Parish, and the villages surrounding it of Borrowash and Breaston. ? The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate when existing Brownfield sites are available within EBC. ? The footpaths that cross the land have amazing views and are used regularly by residents and visitors. The recent pandemic years have shown us that we need space to exercise and be at peace with ourselves and nature, for our own mental wellbeing. This development will have the effect, that anyone using the path would feel imprisoned by a housing estate. ? These decisions are irreversible, and our children will have less open countryside to explore and play in. Losing safe connecting space between locations. This when existing and available Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised over Greenbelt. ? Our local surroundings will become dominated by housing estates and will blight the local walks along the Public Right of Way which connect our Village. ? The sheer scale of the proposed site will have such an irreversible effect on the landscape. The land/footpaths will be surrounded by housing which will render the land unusable by residents whom rely on it as an area to escape and relax. These footpaths are well-used by many people for physical and mental health. This may seem insignificant to others however, residents rely on this land to enable freedom and a work life balance, which will be lost as result of this development. ? Footpaths although still evident on the plan will no longer be enjoyed by families maintaining their ongoing mental health, health and well-being as they will not have the same enjoyment having to walk through a housing estate. ? Footpaths, the Amenity and enjoyment of the use of these pathways which cross through and around this site which provide an important means by which residents of the local villages can get access to the countryside with substantial benefits for their physical and mental health as well as providing means of sustainable transport. For the people of Draycott and other areas, this will have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, replacing green space with 190 houses. ? Unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape. ? These plans plus the plans for National Grid to install super pylons only circa 600 meters away means the south west</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	Nikki Riches	Response-00950	<p>area of Draycott, will be hugely impacted from both a conservation and natural environment perspective. This area of the village will be unrealistically overburdened with development on Green Belt and green spaces. ? The development of 190 homes will interrupt and spoil the landscape, negatively impacting the perceptual qualities of the area. The development will significantly obstruct and diminish the visual experience of the open countryside. It will have a significantly negative impact on the spatial openness of the area, impacting both the physical and geographical characteristics of the open land, which prevents urban sprawl and maintains the separation between settlements. It will overwhelmingly impact the natural and undeveloped nature of the Green Belt area. ? The NPPF includes an overarching objective to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment, including making effective use of land. ? Strongly object to this application the amenity and enjoyment of the use of the paths which cross the site will be severely compromised by the development. These paths provide an important means by which residents from the local area can get access to the countryside with substantial benefits for their physical and mental health. ? The suggested 190 houses to the land south west of Draycott would enclose the paths, which would have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, as would the replacement of green fields with 190 houses. ? We acknowledge it is a balance between the adverse effects on the footpaths against the desirability of the development taking place, but question if the proposed measures would be sufficient to prevent a severe adverse effect on the use of the paths. ? The recent pandemic has highlighted the valuable and regular use of these footpaths, promoting and fostering good mental health. ? An extensive network of public footpaths is within the application site, and there are many in the near vicinity. The footpaths are well used and highly valued as an amenity. ? Public footpaths this development would surely take away the enjoyment of what countryside walks we have left around. ? The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. ? The footpaths that cross the land have amazing views and are used regularly by residents and visitors. The recent pandemic years have shown us that we need space to exercise and be at peace with ourselves and nature, for our own mental wellbeing. ? It is the wrong model in the wrong place to meet the EBCs housing needs when existing Brownfield sites exist within EBC being of a scale that is ultimately detrimental to the local landscape and will harm the countryside, wildlife and impact irreversibly upon the area. ? Our local surroundings will become dominated by this housing development and will blight the local walks along the Public Right of Way which connect our Village. ? The NPPF includes an overar</p>



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	Nikki Riches	Response-00950	<p>ching objective to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment, including making effective use of land. There are 109 existing Brownfield sites within the EBC that should be prioritised before the Green Belt land south west of Draycott is used. ? Historic structures act as a focal point in countryside views and make a huge contribution to environmental quality. Their setting is often a major part of their significance. The proposed housing development to the land South West of Draycott deprives them of their context. ? The proposed development is considered to have an adverse impact on the setting of local heritage assets. ? This would have a detrimental and cumulative impact which would be harmful to local heritage assets. ? The use of long/heavy goods vehicles should be prohibited due to the significant amount of Grade I and II listed buildings in the vicinity of the proposed development on land south west of Draycott. ? Historic England show 14 listed building in Draycott: - Victoria Mill Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1281333 / Church of St Chads, Church Wilne, Grade 1 listed building, list entry number 1281336 / Cart Shed and Stable at Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1140155 / Cedars Farm House, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1087964 / The Cotton Processing and Storage Building at Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1329376 / Doubling Mill at Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1140154 / Draycott Hall and Outbuildings, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1334834 / Front Range Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1334835 / Levers Machine Shed, Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1250092 / Cotton warehouse, chimney and outbuilding, Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1250121 / Cotton spinning mill and office block, Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1250046 / Potter Lane Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1087966 / Nooning Lane Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1417622 / Hopwell Road Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1087963 ? NPPF states that infrastructure must come first, yet the outline ideas to provide infrastructure are either not in place or are no timeline in advance of the proposed developments. There are currently no plans to develop new healthcare or improved infrastructure with these significant scale extensions of population. ? The amenity value of the footpaths through the application site would be entirely lost, and that of the surrounding footpaths greatly diminished due to the change from a beautiful rural landscape to a vast housing estate, with high fences/walls and a significant amount of houses adding to this negative impact. ? It is the wrong model in the wrong place to deliver the EBCs housing needs being of a scale that is ultimately detrimental to the local landscape and will harm the countryside, wildlife and impact irreversibly upon the area and its residents. ? Unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape when existing Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised before the Greenbelt land south west of Draycott. ? NPPF 8. Promoting healthy and safe communities:- 104. Planning policies and decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and access, including taking opportunities to pr</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	Nikki Riches	Response-00950	<p>ovide better facilities for users, this area has significant amount of footpaths that will be affected by the development of 190 houses. ? NPPF states that sustainable development should be achieved. There is an obvious lack of definition of why this site is a ?sustainable location?. The introduction of 190 houses will increase waste, carbon footprint and impact the areas future biodiversity needs. ? NPPF 150. States that if it is necessary to restrict development in a village primarily because of the important contribution which the open character of the village makes to the openness of the Green Belt, the village should be included in the Green Belt. If, however, the character of the village needs to be protected for other reasons, other means should be used, such as conservation area or normal development management policies, and the village should be excluded from the Green Belt. The land south west of Draycott significantly contributes to the village and its character. This village is a part of this land and the Green Belt status allows villagers to access green spaces and enhances the village feel of the area which is rural. ? NPPF 151. States that once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. This development will remove existing green spaces forever which residents currently have access to including footpath, walks and visual vistas and spatial openness. ? NPPF 207. States in determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets? importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation. Yet development on the land south west of Draycott will significantly impact and later the heritage of the Village including the destruction of unspoilt Green Belt land, the adjacent conservation site of the canal and other listed heritage sites that surround the identified area. ? NPPF 208. States the local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset?s conservation and any aspect of the proposal. This development will impact Nooning Lane Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1417622. ? NPPF 102. Access to a network of high quality open spaces would be reduced by this application and our o</p>

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	SINKI RICHES	Response-00950	opportunities for physical activity and health and wellbeing would be adversely affected ? There would be a detrimental effect on the Carbon Sink opportunities by the loss of open land and the effects of a housing development of this size. ? To improve local accessibility to healthcare, education, employment, retail facilities and recreational resources including open spaces to enhance wellbeing and promote healthy and sustainable lifestyles. This application will have a negative effect on both wellbeing and health including mental and emotional wellbeing. ? To create safe and attractive places which contribute towards quality of life and community cohesion. This project will significantly detrimentally impact on the quality of life and fragment the community who use this area as a community facility. Including educational opportunities for local schools. ? To conserve and enhance the Borough landscape character. This proposal does not promote the conservation or enhancement of the local landscape and is an inappropriate development.
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	paul butcher	Response-01154	The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate when existing Brownfield sites are available within EBC. The footpaths that cross the land have amazing views and are used regularly by residents and visitors. The recent pandemic years have shown us that we need space to exercise and be at peace with ourselves and nature, for our own mental wellbeing. This development will have the effect, that anyone using the path would feel imprisoned by a housing estate. These decisions are irreversible, and our children will have less open countryside to explore and play in. Losing safe connecting space between locations. This when existing and available Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised over Greenbelt. The sheer scale of the proposed site will have such an irreversible effect on the landscape. The land/footpaths will be surrounded by housing which will render the land unusable by residents whom rely on it as an area to escape and relax. These footpaths are well-used by many people for physical and mental health. This may seem insignificant to others however, residents rely on this land to enable freedom and a work life balance, which will be lost as result of this development. Footpaths although still evident on the plan will no longer be enjoyed by families maintaining their ongoing mental health, health and well-being as they will not have the same enjoyment having to walk through a housing estate. The development of 190 homes will have a significantly negative impact of the visual openness of the area. This development will interrupt and spoil the landscape, negatively impacting the perceptual qualities of the area. The development will significantly obstruct and diminish the visual experience of the open countryside. An extensive network of public footpaths is within the application site, and there are many in the near vicinity. The footpaths are well used and highly valued as an amenity. The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. NPPF states that infrastructure must come first, yet the outline ideas to provide infrastructure are either not in place or are no timeline in advance of the proposed developments. There are currently no plans to develop new healthcare or improved infrastructure with these significant scale extensions of population. The amenity value of the footpaths through the
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	paul butcher	Response-01154	application site would be entirely lost, and that of the surrounding footpaths greatly diminished due to the change from a beautiful rural landscape to a vast housing estate, with high fences/walls and a significant amount of houses adding to this negative impact. It is the wrong model in the wrong place to deliver the EBCs housing needs being of a scale that is ultimately detrimental to the local landscape and will harm the countryside, wildlife and impact irreversibly upon the area and its residents. NPPF 150. States that if it is necessary to restrict development in a village primarily because of the important contribution which the open character of the village makes to the openness of the Green Belt, the village should be included in the Green Belt. If, however, the character of the village needs to be protected for other reasons, other means should be used, such as conservation area or normal development management policies, and the village should be excluded from the Green Belt. The land south west of Draycott significantly contributes to the village and its character. This village is a part of this land and the Green Belt status allows villagers to access green spaces and enhances the village feel of the area which is rural. NPPF 207. States in determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets? importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation. Yet development on the land south west of Draycott will significantly impact and later the heritage of the Village including the destruction of unspoilt Green Belt land, the adjacent conservation site of the canal and other listed heritage sites that surround the identified area.
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	R Beresford	Response-01907	Our house (owning it for 58 years) is next to the footpath on Lime Grove, and it is very well used by people /ramblers. dog walkers all wanting to enjoy the beautiful scenery and peaceful countryside.. This will soon be concrete and noise if Erewash council have their way.
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Richard Keith Hanbury	Response-01087	Please explain what you are building and how it looks

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Richard Syson	Response-01317	The sheer scale of the proposed site would have an irreversible effect on the landscape. The land/footpaths will be surrounded by housing which will render the land unusable by residents whom rely on it as an area to escape and relax. These footpaths are well-used by many people for physical and mental health. This may seem insignificant to others however, residents rely on this land to enable freedom and a work life balance, which will be lost as result of development on this green belt. This is the wrong model in the wrong place to deliver the EBCs housing needs being of a scale that is ultimately detrimental to the local landscape and will harm the countryside, wildlife and impact irreversibly upon the area and its residents. There is no guarantee that if this proposal did go ahead, Erewash Borough Council would not try to reclassify more of Draycott's Green Belt into Grey Belt in future years
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Rick Howden	Response-01421	Under S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended, contributions can be sought from developers towards the costs of providing community and social infrastructure, the need for which has arisen as a result of new development taking place. This land is rural in character, providing a tranquil transitional landscape between the rural areas of Draycott Parish, and the villages surrounding it of Borrowash and Breaston.
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Roger Brown	Response-00999	The village feel of Draycott will inevitably change with an addition of 20% more residents of a younger cross-section. Many of the existing residents (average aged is apparently about 58) moved to the village for a slower, quieter and more relaxed village life, the village does not therefore have many of the attractions that this younger population might desire without some radical change to its character.
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Ruth Hawkins	Response-01277	National planning guidance states that once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. This development will remove existing green spaces forever which residents currently have access to including footpath, walks and visual vistas and spatial openness.
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Sarah	Response-01541	We've already had some beautiful trees and privacy taken away to make room for houses joining on to this proposals. It is also going to devalue homes.
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Sarah Hargreaves	Response-01314	1.Chesterfield to Willington: The route for the Pylon's is not yet confirmed. Any changes to the Greenbelt should be considered alongside the already detrimental impact of these proposals. Residents in this area of the village face been overwhelmed with development. The impact on wellbeing and mental health of many should not be underestimated. I will be clear; this is already impacting people.
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Scott Gardner	Response-01554	The proposed desecration of Green Belt land west of Draycott is an environmental outrage. The loss of this protected land will rob our community of vital green spaces for recreation and irrevocably scar the visual character of our village. This development will irrevocably damage the unique character and landscape of Draycott. Building on this Green Belt site will destroy the visual amenity that residents cherish. Policy P3 of the Erewash Borough Core Strategy explicitly states that development proposals that negatively impact the character or appearance of an area will not be permitted. This proposal is a clear violation of this policy.
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Sean Peace	Response-01347	Under S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended, contributions can be sought from developers towards the costs of providing community and social infrastructure, the need for which has arisen as a result of new development taking place. 5 2 No additional open space opportunities, protection of the public right of way or indeed to better facilities. If S106 funding is available for an application of this type this must be considered. 6 3 This land is rural in character, providing a tranquil transitional landscape between the rural areas of Draycott Parish, and the villages surrounding it of Borrowash and Breaston. 7 4 The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate when existing Brownfield sites are available within EBC. 8 5 The footpaths that cross the land have amazing views and are used regularly by residents and visitors. The recent pandemic years have shown us that we need space to exercise and be at peace with ourselves and nature, for our own mental wellbeing. This development will have the effect, that anyone using the path would feel imprisoned by a housing estate. 9 6 Loss of open land frequently used 10 7 These decisions are irreversible, and our children will have less open countryside to explore and play in. Losing safe connecting space between locations. This when existing and available Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised over Greenbelt. 11 8 Our local surroundings will become dominated by housing estates and will blight the local walks along the Public Right of Way which connect our Village. 12 9 The sheer scale of the proposed site will have such an irreversible effect on the landscape. The land/footpaths will be surrounded by housing which will render the land unusable by residents whom rely on it as an area to escape and relax. These footpaths are well-used by many people for physical and mental health. This may seem insignificant to others however, residents rely on this land to enable freedom and a work life balance, which will be lost as result of this development. 13 10 Footpaths although still evident on the plan will no longer be enjoyed by families maintaining their ongoing mental health, health and well-being as they will not have the same enjoyment having to walk through a housing estate. 14 11 Footpaths, the Amenity and enjoyment of the use of these pathways which cross through and around this site which provide an important means by which residents of the local villages can get access to the countryside with substantial benefits for their physical and mental health as well as providing means of sustainable transport. For the people of Draycott and other areas, this will have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, replacing green space with 190 houses. 15 12 Unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape. 16 13 These plans plus the plans for National Grid to

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	Sean Peace	Response-01347	<p>install super pylons only circa 600 meters away means the south west area of Draycott, will be hugely impacted from both a conservation and natural environment perspective. This area of the village will be unrealistically overburdened with development on Green Belt and green spaces. 17 14 The development of 190 homes will have a significantly negative impact of the visual openness of the area. This development will interrupt and spoil the landscape, negatively impacting the perceptual qualities of the area. The development will significantly obstruct and diminish the visual experience of the open countryside. 18 15 The development of 190 homes will have a significantly negative impact on the spatial openness of the area, impacting both the physical and geographical characteristics of the open land, which prevents urban sprawl and maintains the separation between settlements. It will overwhelmingly impact the natural and undeveloped nature of the Green Belt area. 19 16 Protecting public rights of way and access, footpaths would be affected by this development. 20 17 Increased harm to the character of Public Rights of Way. 21 18 Boundaries are changed by fencing and walls. 22 19 The NPPF includes an overarching objective to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment, including making effective use of land. 23 20 Strongly object to this application the amenity and enjoyment of the use of the paths which cross the site will be severely compromised by the development. These paths provide an important means by which residents from the local area can get access to the countryside with substantial benefits for their physical and mental health. 24 21 The suggested 190 houses to the land south west of Draycott would enclose the paths, which would have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, as would the replacement of green fields with 190 houses. 25 22 We acknowledge it is a balance between the adverse effects on the footpaths against the desirability of the development taking place, but question if the proposed measures would be sufficient to prevent a severe adverse effect on the use of the paths. 26 23 The recent pandemic has highlighted the valuable and regular use of these footpaths, promoting and fostering good mental health. 27 24 An extensive network of public footpaths is within the application site, and there are many in the near vicinity. The footpaths are well used and highly valued as an amenity. 28 25 Public footpaths this development would surely take away the enjoyment of what countryside walks we have left around. 29 27 The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. 30 28 The footpaths that cross the land have amazing views and are used regularly by residents and visitors. The recent pandemic years have shown us that we need space to exercise and be at peace with ourselves and nature, for our own mental wellbeing. 31 29 It is the</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	Sean Peace	Response-01347	<p>wrong model in the wrong place to meet the EBCs housing needs when existing Brownfield sites exist within EBC being of a scale that is ultimately detrimental to the local landscape and will harm the countryside, wildlife and impact irreversibly upon the area. 32 30 Our local surroundings will become dominated by this housing development and will blight the local walks along the Public Right of Way which connect our Village. 33 32 The NPPF includes an overarching objective to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment, including making effective use of land. There are 109 existing Brownfield sites within the EBC that should be prioritised before the Green Belt land south west of Draycott is used. 34 33 Historic structures act as a focal point in countryside views and make a huge contribution to environmental quality. Their setting is often a major part of their significance. The proposed housing development to the land South West of Draycott deprives them of their context. 35 34 The proposed development is considered to have an adverse impact on the setting of local heritage assets. 36 35 This would have a detrimental and cumulative impact which would be harmful to local heritage assets. 37 36 The use of long/heavy goods vehicles should be prohibited due to the significant amount of Grade I and II listed buildings in the vicinity of the proposed development on land south west of Draycott. 38 37 Historic England show 14 listed building in Draycott: - Victoria Mill Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1281333 / Church of St Chads, Church Wilne, Grade 1 listed building, list entry number 1281336 / Cart Shed and Stable at Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1140155 / Cedars Farm House, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1087964 / The Cotton Processing and Storage Building at Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1329376 / Doubling Mill at Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1140154 / Draycott Hall and Outbuildings, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1334834 / Front Range Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1334835 / Levers Machine Shed, Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1250092 / Cotton warehouse, chimney and outbuilding, Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1250121 / Cotton spinning mill and office block, Draycott Mills, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1250046 / Potter Lane Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1087966 / Nooning Lane Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1417622 / Hopwell Road Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1087963 39 38 NPPF states that infrastructure must come first, yet the outline ideas to provide infrastructure are either not in place or are no timeline in advance of the proposed developments. There are currently no plans to develop new healthcare or improved infrastructure with these significant scale extensions of population. 40 41 The amenity value of the footpaths through the application site would be entirely lost, and that of the surrounding footpaths greatly diminished due to the change from a beautiful rural landscape to a vast housing estate, with high fences/walls and a significant amount of houses adding to this negative impact. 41 45 It is the wrong model in the wrong place to deliver the EBCs housing needs being of a scale that is ultimately detrimental to the local landsc</p>

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	Sean Peace	Response-01347	pe and will harm the countryside, wildlife and impact irreversibly upon the area and its residents. 42 46 Unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape when existing Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised before the Greenbelt land south west of Draycott. 43 47 NPPF 8. Promoting healthy and safe communities:- 104. Planning policies and decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and access, including taking opportunities to provide better facilities for users, this area has significant amount of footpaths that will be affected by the development of 190 houses. 44 48 NPPF states that sustainable development should be achieved. There is an obvious lack of definition of why this site is a ?sustainable location?. The introduction of 190 houses will increase waste, carbon footprint and impact the areas future biodiversity needs. 45 49 NPPF 150. States that if it is necessary to restrict development in a village primarily because of the important contribution which the open character of the village makes to the openness of the Green Belt, the village should be included in the Green Belt. If, however, the character of the village needs to be protected for other reasons, other means should be used, such as conservation area or normal development management policies, and the village should be excluded from the Green Belt. The land south west of Draycott significantly contributes to the village and its character. This village is a part of this land and the Green Belt status allows villagers to access green spaces and enhances the village feel of the area which is rural. 46 50 NPPF 151. States that once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. This development will remove existing green spaces forever which residents currently have access to including footpath, walks and visual vistas and spatial openness. 47 51 NPPF 207. States in determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets? importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation. Yet development on the land south west of Draycott will significantly impact and later the heritage of the Village including the destruction of unspoilt Green Belt land, the adjacent conservation site of the canal and other listed heritage sites that surround the identified area. 48 52 NPPF 208. States the local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affect
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	Sean Peace	Response-01347	ing the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset?s conservation and any aspect of the proposal. This development will impact Nooning Lane Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1417622. 49 53 NPPF 102. Access to a network of high quality open spaces would be reduced by this application and our opportunities for physical activity and health and wellbeing would be adversely affected 50 54 There would be a detrimental effect on the Carbon Sink opportunities by the loss of open land and the effects of a housing development of this size. 51 55 To improve local accessibility to healthcare, education, employment, retail facilities and recreational resources including open spaces to enhance wellbeing and promote healthy and sustainable lifestyles. This application will have a negative effect on both wellbeing and health including mental and emotional wellbeing. 52 56 To create safe and attractive places which contribute towards quality of life and community cohesion. This project will significantly detrimentally impact on the quality of life and fragment the community who use this area as a community facility. Including educational opportunities for local schools. 53 57 To conserve and enhance the Borough landscape character. This proposal does not promote the conservation or enhancement of the local landscape and is an inappropriate development.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	Simon Jenkins	Response-01287	Who put this together ??? OVIOUSLY TOTALLY RUINED !!!!!
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	S M Beresford	Response-01851	The existing footpaths and access to the small wood bring great enjoyment to all who walk these trails, providing substantial benefits for physical and mental health. The development will have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, replacing green space with 190 houses. The proposal is far too big and overpowering for the village, impacting its heritage and cherished greenbelt landscape. Our house (owning it for 58 years) is next to the footpath on Lime Grove, and it is very well used by people /ramblers. dog walkers all wanting to enjoy the beautiful scenery and peaceful countryside.. This will soon be concrete and noise if Erewash council have their way.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	Susan Baker	Response-01316	We?re already facing the looming threat of pylons from Chesterfield to Willington. Now this? It?s too much. People here are already feeling overwhelmed, and the toll on mental health is real. This isn?t just about land?it?s about lives
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	Susan Foster	Response-00824	A blot on the landscape for those who already live in that area, their hopes and dreams shattered of having a beautiful view from their present properties and the ultimate reduction of value. What a legacy for their family!
1.14	South West of Draycott	Landscape	Teresa Batchelor	Response-01240	Again, residents of Draycott want to see green areas where they can walk and enjoy nature. The proposed development will destroy a natural and beautiful area of the village which generations of families know well and have loved and enjoyed for decades. This lovely entrance to the village, if replaced by modern housing, will be a total eyesore.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Teresa Shaw	Response-01309	1. A developments as big as this only negatively impacts the existing natural environment. The village and residents will suffer loss of trees or hedgerows ? which is the rural visual landscape the villages are known for. No design can compensate for green belt? it is irreplaceable. 2. The proposed maintenance of the public walking paths in Draycott is a pointless gesture you will ruin the landscape and walk for all. Who wants to walk around a building site or estate? Why ruin greenbelt and public walkways build in a more suitable location? 3. Visual amenity the development will change the pleasantness of views and surroundings, affecting the quality of life for all village residents. What will be done for residents whose lives, health and wellbeing that will be directly impacted? 4. The overall aesthetic quality and enjoyment of an area's landscape and surrounding will be affected for all walkers, visitors and residents. Why punish the enjoyment of all these beneficiaries? 5. The scale project is excessively large estate you are blocking all beautiful views into the village. The significant reducers enjoyment of the drive into Draycott for residence and all users of Derby Road for the wrong reasons. This development will drastically overwhelm the landscape and other?s views, it will be inescapably dominant and will be unpleasantly encroaching into Borrowash. Why are other people?s needs be considered over residents? 6. If this development is passed all properties with green belt views will see a reduction in value some huge & a key sort after attribute being needlessly taken away. The council should have to pay the difference between the value of the property before and after the development.
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Tim Hawkins	Response-00661	How this development can said to enhance the landscape is certainly a mystery. The claim in the sustainability assessment that at present is a small industrial estate is false, it is a farmhouse with outbuildings, small cropped fields and grazing land. The current vista of sparse housing will be blighted on the entry to the village by a new estate. There are other sites around the village which could be used with almost no impact on the current landscape.
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Tracey Morton	Response-00968	Area is rural and beautiful and should remain as greenbelt land
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	T Shields	Response-00570	Green spaces can be provided within the development site, and the site boundaries can be planted with native trees/hedgerow so that the visual impact of the site on the surrounding green belt/landscape beyond is adequately mitigated. The housing would also be opposite existing housing on the north side of the Derby Road and immediately adjacent existing housing on the south side, so it would not appear as being out of context with the village edge.
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Viv Wright	Response-00035	On a personal level our immediate outlook changes from open fields to a housing estate. Our outside spaces , country walks on the doorstep will totally disappear. While accepting we need more housing, there are brownfield sites, old industrial sites laying abandoned which could be utilised. A lot more effort required on the councils part to look to alternative sites away from green belt.
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	Wilfred Boone	Response-01424	The development of 190 homes will have a significantly negative impact of the visual openness of the area. This development will interrupt and spoil the landscape, negatively impacting the perceptual qualities of the area. The development will significantly obstruct and diminish the visual experience of the open countryside. Protecting public rights of way and access, footpaths would be affected by this development. Strongly object to this application the amenity and enjoyment of the use of the paths which cross the site will be severely compromised by the development. These paths provide an important means by which residents from the local area can get access to the countryside with substantial benefits for their physical and mental health.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	zak butcher	Response-01156	<p>The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate when existing Brownfield sites are available within EBC. The footpaths that cross the land have amazing views and are used regularly by residents and visitors. The recent pandemic years have shown us that we need space to exercise and be at peace with ourselves and nature, for our own mental wellbeing. This development will have the effect, that anyone using the path would feel imprisoned by a housing estate. These decisions are irreversible, and our children will have less open countryside to explore and play in. Losing safe connecting space between locations. This when existing and available Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised over Greenbelt. The sheer scale of the proposed site will have such an irreversible effect on the landscape. The land/footpaths will be surrounded by housing which will render the land unusable by residents whom rely on it as an area to escape and relax. These footpaths are well-used by many people for physical and mental health. This may seem insignificant to others however, residents rely on this land to enable freedom and a work life balance, which will be lost as result of this development. Footpaths although still evident on the plan will no longer be enjoyed by families maintaining their ongoing mental health, health and well-being as they will not have the same enjoyment having to walk through a housing estate. The development of 190 homes will have a significantly negative impact of the visual openness of the area. This development will interrupt and spoil the landscape, negatively impacting the perceptual qualities of the area. The development will significantly obstruct and diminish the visual experience of the open countryside. An extensive network of public footpaths is within the application site, and there are many in the near vicinity. The footpaths are well used and highly valued as an amenity. The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. NPPF states that infrastructure must come first, yet the outline ideas to provide infrastructure are either not in place or are no timeline in advance of the proposed developments. There are currently no plans to develop new healthcare or improved infrastructure with these significant scale extensions of population. The amenity value of the footpaths through the</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	landscape	zak butcher	Response-01156	<p>application site would be entirely lost, and that of the surrounding footpaths greatly diminished due to the change from a beautiful rural landscape to a vast housing estate, with high fences/walls and a significant amount of houses adding to this negative impact. It is the wrong model in the wrong place to deliver the EBCs housing needs being of a scale that is ultimately detrimental to the local landscape and will harm the countryside, wildlife and impact irreversibly upon the area and its residents. NPPF 150. States that if it is necessary to restrict development in a village primarily because of the important contribution which the open character of the village makes to the openness of the Green Belt, the village should be included in the Green Belt. If, however, the character of the village needs to be protected for other reasons, other means should be used, such as conservation area or normal development management policies, and the village should be excluded from the Green Belt. The land south west of Draycott significantly contributes to the village and its character. This village is a part of this land and the Green Belt status allows villagers to access green spaces and enhances the village feel of the area which is rural. NPPF 207. States in determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets? importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation. Yet development on the land south west of Draycott will significantly impact and later the heritage of the Village including the destruction of unspoilt Green Belt land, the adjacent conservation site of the canal and other listed heritage sites that surround the identified area.</p>

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	adrian leeming	Response-01249	NPPF 223. States that planning policies should set out criteria or requirements to ensure that permitted and proposed operations do not have unacceptable adverse impacts on the natural and historic environment or human health, taking into account the cumulative effects of multiple impacts from individual sites and/or a number of sites in a locality. The EBC are proposing a combined number of nearly 700 houses in the locality of Draycott, Borrowwash and Breaston which is significantly overbearing and unrealistic when considering infrastructure, road networks and amenity. The scale of the development is completely NOT in keeping with the character of the village. The proposed development should follow existing settlement patterns. New buildings and the volume of housing should harmonise with the neighbourhood. Retain local character and the retention of open spaces as is the character of the village. Views into and out of the village should be preserved. Clear lines of hills and spatial openness must be preserved. NPPF 61. States that to support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay. The overall aim should be to meet an area's identified housing need, including with an appropriate mix of housing types for the local community. The land identified south west of Draycott is Green Belt and Grade 2 quality land. This development neither looks to protect the BMV nor does it look to bring forward the 109 existing Brownfield sites within the EBC that has full planning consent.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Alison Bowley	Response-01174	The proposal by EBC To build 700 houses in Draycott, Borrowwash and Breaston will absolutely change the village's look and it will become combined with Borrowwash hugely impacting Draycott's rural identity.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Alison Thirlwall	Response-01390	The proposal for 190 houses to begin, which will increase to c.240 once the safeguarded land has been developed, is far too big and overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. NPPF 73. States that the authority should identify, through the development plan and brownfield registers, land to accommodate at least 10% of their housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare; unless it can be shown, through the preparation of relevant plan policies, that there are strong reasons why this 10% target cannot be achieved. Within the EBC there are 109 Brownfield sites as detailed on the last EBC Brownfield Register 2024, with 103 of these having full planning consent. Of these sites, 8 are over 1H each, giving the ability to develop over 500 houses. Why are these sites not being prioritised first over Green Belt land. If the issue with brownfield sites is cost, this issue should be raised with the government and additional funding sought.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	A Northeast	Response-01848	EBC is proposing nearly 700 houses in Draycott, Borrowwash, and Breaston, which is significantly overbearing and unrealistic considering infrastructure, road networks, and amenities. The proposal for 190 houses will change the villages look and feel, impacting its rural identity and risking morphing into a combined town with Breaston and Borrowwash.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Anthony Bradley	Response-01442	Far too many houses, almost a quarter the size of the village the roads and services in the village cannot support this.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Anthony Lawton-Reeve	Response-00971	NPPF 223. States that planning policies should set out criteria or requirements to ensure that permitted and proposed operations do not have unacceptable adverse impacts on the natural and historic environment or human health, taking into account the cumulative effects of multiple impacts from individual sites and/or a number of sites in a locality. The EBC are proposing a combined number of nearly 700 houses in the locality of Draycott, Borrowwash and Breaston which is significantly overbearing and unrealistic when considering infrastructure, road networks and amenity. The proposal for 190 houses to begin, which will increase to c.240 once the safeguarded land has been developed, is far too big and overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Anthony Walsh	Response-00992	The proposal for 190 houses to begin, which will increase to c.240 once the safeguarded land has been developed, is far too big and overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. NPPF 61. States that to support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay. The overall aim should be to meet an area's identified housing need, including with an appropriate mix of housing types for the local community. The land identified south west of Draycott is Green Belt and Grade 2 quality land. This development neither looks to protect the BMV not does it look to bring forward the 109 existing Brownfield sites within the EBC that has full planning consent. The current housing target which drives the need to develop on the Green Belt is flawed and needs to be changed. It is based on over inflated housing targets that are not realistic, which puts pressure on local authorities to disregard the impact such developments have on local communities and villages to purely meet statistical objectives. This can be seen with the c.17% increase in the population of Draycott if the development of 190 houses goes ahead. This would also be further compounded when the safeguarded land is developed adding an additional c70 houses. This increase and expansion is unrealistic and reckless.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Avice Boyle	Response-01427	The proposal for 190 houses to begin, which will increase to c.240 once the safeguarded land has been developed, is far too big and overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. NPPF 223. States that planning policies should set out criteria or requirements to ensure that permitted and proposed operations do not have unacceptable adverse impacts on the natural and historic environment or human health, taking into account the cumulative effects of multiple impacts from individual sites and/or a number of sites in a locality. The EBC are proposing a combined number of nearly 700 houses in the locality of Draycott, Borrowwash and Breaston which is significantly overbearing and unrealistic when considering infrastructure, road networks and amenity. The scale and massing of the development, which will begin with 190 houses but will significantly increase when the identified safeguarded land is developed in the future, is completely out of character with its surroundings and would be incredibly overbearing on the village and neighbourhood I strongly believe that there are better suited brownfield sites and genuine Grey Belt sites with land that is of poor quality. The land south west of Draycott is Grade 2 land (very good) and should be protected.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Barbara Crane	Response-00268	Draycott has been allocated more housing than other areas yet has fewer facilities. Makes no sense at all.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Ben Marshall	Response-01212	NPPF 223. States that planning policies should set out criteria or requirements to ensure that permitted and proposed operations do not have unacceptable adverse impacts on the natural and historic environment or human health, taking into account the cumulative effects of multiple impacts from individual sites and/or a number of sites in a locality. The EBC are proposing a combined number of nearly 700 houses in the locality of Draycott, Borrowwash and Breaston which is significantly overbearing and unrealistic when considering infrastructure, road networks and amenity. The proposal for 190 houses to begin, which will increase to c.240 once the safeguarded land has been developed, is far too big and overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. The potential harm caused by the application far outweighs the potential public benefit. NPPF 73. States that the authority should identify, through the development plan and brownfield registers, land to accommodate at least 10% of their housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare; unless it can be shown, through the preparation of relevant plan policies, that there are strong reasons why this 10% target cannot be achieved. Within the EBC there are 109 Brownfield sites as detailed on the last EBC Brownfield Register 2024, with 103 of these having full planning consent. Of these sites, 8 are over 1H each, giving the ability to develop over 500 houses. Why are these sites not being prioritised first over Green Belt land. The current housing target which drives the need to develop on the Green Belt is flawed and needs to be changed. It is based on over inflated housing targets that are not realistic, which puts pressure on local authorities to disregard the impact such developments have on local communities and villages to purely meet statistical objectives. This can be seen with the c.17% increase in the population of Draycott if the development of 190 houses goes ahead. This would also be further compounded when the safeguarded land is developed adding an additional c70 houses. This increase and expansion is unrealistic and completely reckless.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Bernadette Rothwell	Response-00998	It's a huge amount of houses for a village.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Bradley Peace	Response-01348	NPPF 223. States that planning policies should set out criteria or requirements to ensure that permitted and proposed operations do not have unacceptable adverse impacts on the natural and historic environment or human health, taking into account the cumulative effects of multiple impacts from individual sites and/or a number of sites in a locality. The EBC are proposing a combined number of nearly 700 houses in the locality of Draycott, Borrowwash and Breaston which is significantly overbearing and unrealistic when considering infrastructure, road networks and amenity. 5 2 The proposal for 190 houses to begin, which will increase to c.240 once the safeguarded land has been developed, is far too big and overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. 6 3 The potential harm caused by the application far outweighs the potential public benefit. 7 4 The scale of the development is completely NOT in keeping with the character of the village. The proposed development should follow existing settlement patterns. New buildings and the volume of housing should harmonise with the neighbourhood. Retain local character and the retention of open spaces as is the character of the village. Views into and out of the village should be preserved. Clear lines of hills and spatial openness must be preserved. 8 5 This out of scale development rides roughshod over the NPPF and other relating policies and guidelines with the barest of lip service paid, with the minimum consultation being undertaken with residents which is compounded by the lack of information available and transparency. 9 6 The scale and massing of the development, which will begin with 190 houses but will significantly increase when the identified safeguarded land is developed in the future, is completely out of character with its surroundings and would be incredibly overbearing on the village and neighbourhood I strongly believe that there are better suited brownfield sites and genuine Grey Belt sites with land that is of poor quality. The land south west of Draycott is Grade 2 land (very good) and should be protected. 10 7 NPPF 61. States that to support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay. The overall aim should be to meet an area's identified housing need, including with an appropriate mix of housing types for the local community. The land identified south west of Draycott is Green Belt and Grade 2 quality land. This development neither looks to protect the BMV nor does it look to bring forward the 109 existing Brownfield sites within the EBC that has full planning consent. 11 8 NPPF 73. States that the authority should identify, through the development plan and brownfield r
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Bradley Peace	Response-01348	egisters, land to accommodate at least 10% of their housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare; unless it can be shown, through the preparation of relevant plan policies, that there are strong reasons why this 10% target cannot be achieved. Within the EBC there are 109 Brownfield sites as detailed on the last EBC Brownfield Register 2024, with 103 of these having full planning consent. Of these sites, 8 are over 1H each, giving the ability to develop over 500 houses. Why are these sites not being prioritised first over Green Belt land. 12 9 The current housing target which drives the need to develop on the Green Belt is flawed and needs to be changed. It is based on over inflated housing targets that are not realistic, which puts pressure on local authorities to disregard the impact such developments have on local communities and villages to purely meet statistical objectives. This can be seen with the c.17% increase in the population of Draycott if the development of 190 houses goes ahead. This would also be further compounded when the safeguarded land is developed adding an additional c70 houses. This increase and expansion is unrealistic and reckless.
			Caroline and John Thirwell	Response-01001	The character of the village would also be changed irrevocably giving it a more urban feel
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Colin & Cynthia Green	Response-00922	190 I believe on this green belt land initially with ability to increase number of houses on safeguarded land marked out. This figure is not set in stone & just wonder how many many will be added in future. Madness.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	David and Mary Murden	Response-01898	In recent years Draycott has added to its housing stock in very inventive ways. Wisely, using brownfield sites, we have added many homes at the large Mill, known as Parrys, and also at the smaller Mill in Market Street. Cowslip Meadow is also a large estate of mixed social and private housing which has been added to the village. In all, I believe we now have around 1,500 homes. Adding another 190 (or is the rumour right that it will be more than that?), is a large addition, about 8% that will alter the nature of our rural village. This land is one of the few remaining fields that separate us from Borrowwash, we feel that before long the three communities of Borrowwash, Draycott and Breaston will be strung together into one unit. This is not what we want. It is difficult to know how our medical services will manage with this increase. Having no actual doctor's surgery or dentist in Draycott, we already struggle to find appointments in Breaston or Borrowwash, and this will clearly be a problem.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	David and Nicala O'Leary	Response-00822	Draycott is a historic rural village with a strong sense of community and a unique character. The scale and nature of this proposed development would fundamentally alter that character, turning our village into a suburban extension of nearby towns. This loss of identity and community cohesion is unacceptable.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	David Atchison	Response-01247	NPPF 61. States that to support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay. The overall aim should be to meet an area's identified housing need, including with an appropriate mix of housing types for the local community. The land identified south west of Draycott is Green Belt and Grade 2 quality land. This development neither looks to protect the BMV not does it look to bring forward the 109 existing Brownfield sites within the EBC that has full planning consent. The current housing target which drives the need to develop on the Green Belt is flawed and needs to be changed. It is based on over inflated housing targets that are not realistic, which puts pressure on local authorities to disregard the impact such developments have on local communities and villages to purely meet statistical objectives. This can be seen with the c.17% increase in the population of Draycott if the development of 190 houses goes ahead. This would also be further compounded when the safeguarded land is developed adding an additional c70 houses. This increase and expansion is unrealistic and reckless.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	David Boyle	Response-01426	NPPF 73. States that the authority should identify, through the development plan and brownfield registers, land to accommodate at least 10% of their housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare; unless it can be shown, through the preparation of relevant plan policies, that there are strong reasons why this 10% target cannot be achieved. Within the EBC their are 109 Brownfield sites as detailed on the last EBC Brownfield Register 2024, with 103 of these having full planning consent. Of these sites, 8 are over 1H each, giving the ability to develop over 500 houses. Why are these sites not being prioritised first over Green Belt land. The scale of the development is completely NOT in keeping with the character of the village. The proposed development should follow existing settlement patterns. New buildings and the volume of housing should harmonise with the neighbourhood. Retain local character and the retention of open spaces as is the character of the village. Views into and out of the village should be preserved. Clear lines of hills and spatial openness must be preserved.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	David G York	Response-01843	EBC is proposing nearly 700 houses in Draycott, Borrowash, and Breaston, which is significantly overbearing and unrealistic considering infrastructure, road networks, and amenities. The proposal for 190 houses will change the villages look and feel, impacting its rural identity and risking morphing into a combined town with Breaston and Borrowash.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	David Webster	Response-01113	This out of scale development rides roughshod over the NPPF and other relating policies and guidelines with the barest of lip service paid, with the minimum consultation being undertaken with residents which is compounded by the lack of information available and transparency. The scale and massing of the development, which will begin with 190 houses but will significantly increase when the identified safeguarded land is developed in the future, is completely out of character with its surroundings and would be incredibly overbearing on the village and neighbourhood I strongly believe that there are better suited brownfield sites and genuine Grey Belt sites with land that is of poor quality. The land south west of Draycott is Grade 2 land (very good) and should be protected. NPPF 61. States that to support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay. The overall aim should be to meet an area's identified housing need, including with an appropriate mix of housing types for the local community. The land identified south west of Draycott is Green Belt and Grade 2 quality land. This development neither looks to protect the BMV not does it look to bring forward the 109 existing Brownfield sites within the EBC that has full planning consent. NPPF 73. States that the authority should identify, through the development plan and brownfield registers, land to accommodate at least 10% of their housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare; unless it can be shown, through the preparation of relevant plan policies, that there are strong reasons why this 10% target cannot be achieved. Within the EBC their are 109 Brownfield sites as detailed on the last EBC Brownfield Register 2024, with 103 of these having full planning consent. Of these sites, 8 are over 1H each, giving the ability to develop over 500 houses. Why are these sites not being prioritised first over Green Belt land. The current housing target which drives the need to develop on the Green Belt is flawed and needs to be changed. It is based on over inflated housing targets that are not realistic, which puts pressure on local authorities to disregard the impact such developments have on local communities and villages to purely meet statistical objectives. This can be seen with the c.17% increase in the population of Draycott if the development of 190 houses goes ahead. This would also be further compounded when the safeguarded land is developed adding an additional c70 houses. This increase and expansion is unrealistic and reckless.
			Dexter Codrington	Response-00986	190 + 60 houses is a 17% increase in homes in Draycott. This is too many and it is a development in the wrong place

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Diane Webster	Response-01177	<p>The proposal for 190 houses to begin, which will increase to c.240 once the safeguarded land has been developed, is far too big and overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. The potential harm caused by the application far outweighs the potential public benefit. The scale of the development is completely NOT in keeping with the character of the village. The proposed development should follow existing settlement patterns. New buildings and the volume of housing should harmonise with the neighbourhood. Retain local character and the retention of open spaces as is the character of the village. Views into and out of the village should be preserved. Clear lines of hills and spatial openness must be preserved. This out of scale development rides roughshod over the NPPF and other relating policies and guidelines with the barest of lip service paid, with the minimum consultation being undertaken with residents which is compounded by the lack of information available and transparency. The scale and massing of the development, which will begin with 190 houses but will significantly increase when the identified safeguarded land is developed in the future, is completely out of character with its surroundings and would be incredibly overbearing on the village and neighbourhood I strongly believe that there are better suited brownfield sites and genuine Grey Belt sites with land that is of poor quality. The land south west of Draycott is Grade 2 land (very good) and should be protected. NPPF 73. States that the authority should identify, through the development plan and brownfield registers, land to accommodate at least 10% of their housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare; unless it can be shown, through the preparation of relevant plan policies, that there are strong reasons why this 10% target cannot be achieved. Within the EBC there are 109 Brownfield sites as detailed on the last EBC Brownfield Register 2024, with 103 of these having full planning consent. Of these sites, 8 are over 1H each, giving the ability to develop over 500 houses. Why are these sites not being prioritised first over Green Belt land. The current housing target which drives the need to develop on the Green Belt is flawed and needs to be changed. It is based on over inflated housing targets that are not realistic, which puts pressure on local authorities to disregard the impact such developments have on local communities and villages to purely meet statistical objectives. This can be seen with the c.17% increase in the population of Draycott if the development of 190 houses goes ahead. This would also be further compounded when the safeguarded land is developed adding an additional c70 houses. This increase and expansion is unrealistic and reckless.</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Donna Butcher	Response-01155	<p>NPPF 223. States that planning policies should set out criteria or requirements to ensure that permitted and proposed operations do not have unacceptable adverse impacts on the natural and historic environment or human health, taking into account the cumulative effects of multiple impacts from individual sites and/or a number of sites in a locality. The EBC are proposing a combined number of nearly 700 houses in the locality of Draycott, Borrowwash and Breaston which is significantly overbearing and unrealistic when considering infrastructure, road networks and amenity. The proposal for 190 houses to begin, which will increase to c.240 once the safeguarded land has been developed, is far too big and overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. The potential harm caused by the application far outweighs the potential public benefit. The scale of the development is completely NOT in keeping with the character of the village. The proposed development should follow existing settlement patterns. New buildings and the volume of housing should harmonise with the neighbourhood. Retain local character and the retention of open spaces as is the character of the village. Views into and out of the village should be preserved. Clear lines of hills and spatial openness must be preserved. The scale and massing of the development, which will begin with 190 houses but will significantly increase when the identified safeguarded land is developed in the future, is completely out of character with its surroundings and would be incredibly overbearing on the village and neighbourhood I strongly believe that there are better suited brownfield sites and genuine Grey Belt sites with land that is of poor quality. The land south west of Draycott is Grade 2 land (very good) and should be protected. NPPF 61. States that to support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay. The overall aim should be to meet an area's identified housing need, including with an appropriate mix of housing types for the local community. The land identified south west of Draycott is Green Belt and Grade 2 quality land. This development neither looks to protect the BMV nor does it look to bring forward the 109 existing Brownfield sites within the EBC that has full planning consent. NPPF 73. States that the authority should identify, through the development plan and brownfield registers, land to accommodate at least 10% of their housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare; unless it can be shown, through the preparation of relevant plan policies, that there are strong reasons why this 10% target cannot be achieved. Within the EBC there are 109 Brownfield sites as detailed on the last EBC Brownfield Register 2024, with 103 of these having full planning consent. Of these sites, 8 are over 1H each, giving the ability to develop over 500 houses. Why are these sites not being prioritised first over Green Belt land. The current housing target which drives the need to develop on the Green Belt is flawed and needs to be changed. It is based on over inflated housing targets that are not realistic, which puts pressure on local authorities to disregard the impact such developments have on local communities and villages to purely meet statistical objectives. This can be seen with the c.17% increase in the population of Draycott if the development of 190 houses goes ahead. This would also be further compounded when the safeguarded land is developed adding an additional c70 houses. This increase and expansion is unrealistic and reckless.</p>

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Donna Butcher	Response-01155	ited on the last EBC Brownfield Register 2024, with 103 of these having full planning consent. Of these sites, 8 are over 1H each, giving the ability to develop over 500 houses. Why are these sites not being prioritised first over Green Belt land. The current housing target which drives the need to develop on the Green Belt is flawed and needs to be changed. It is based on over inflated housing targets that are not realistic, which puts pressure on local authorities to disregard the impact such developments have on local communities and villages to purely meet statistical objectives. This can be seen with the c.17% increase in the population of Draycott if the development of 190 houses goes ahead. This would also be further compounded when the safeguarded land is developed adding an additional c70 houses. This increase and expansion is unrealistic and reckless.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Donna Peace	Response-01344	1 NPPF 223. States that planning policies should set out criteria or requirements to ensure that permitted and proposed operations do not have unacceptable adverse impacts on the natural and historic environment or human health, taking into account the cumulative effects of multiple impacts from individual sites and/or a number of sites in a locality. The EBC are proposing a combined number of nearly 700 houses in the locality of Draycott, Borrowwash and Breaston which is significantly overbearing and unrealistic when considering infrastructure, road networks and amenity. 5 2 The proposal for 190 houses to begin, which will increase to c.240 once the safeguarded land has been developed, is far too big and overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. 6 3 The potential harm caused by the application far outweighs the potential public benefit. 7 4 The scale of the development is completely NOT in keeping with the character of the village. The proposed development should follow existing settlement patterns. New buildings and the volume of housing should harmonise with the neighbourhood. Retain local character and the retention of open spaces as is the character of the village. Views into and out of the village should be preserved. Clear lines of hills and spatial openness must be preserved. 8 5 This out of scale development rides roughshod over the NPPF and other relating policies and guidelines with the barest of lip service paid, with the minimum consultation being undertaken with residents which is compounded by the lack of information available and transparency. 9 6 The scale and massing of the development, which will begin with 190 houses but will significantly increase when the identified safeguarded land is developed in the future, is completely out of character with its surroundings and would be incredibly overbearing on the village and neighbourhood I strongly believe that there are better suited brownfield sites and genuine Grey Belt sites with land that is of poor quality. The land south west of Draycott is Grade 2 land (very good) and should be protected. 10 7 NPPF 61. States that to support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay. The overall aim should be to meet an area's identified housing need, including with an appropriate mix of housing types for the local community. The land identified south west of Draycott is Green Belt and Grade 2 quality land. This development neither looks to protect the BMV not does it look to bring forward the 109 existing Brownfield sites within the EBC that has full planning consent. 11 8 NPPF 73. States that the authority should identify, through the development plan and brownfield
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Donna Peace	Response-01344	registers, land to accommodate at least 10% of their housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare; unless it can be shown, through the preparation of relevant plan policies, that there are strong reasons why this 10% target cannot be achieved. Within the EBC their are 109 Brownfield sites as detailed on the last EBC Brownfield Register 2024, with 103 of these having full planning consent. Of these sites, 8 are over 1H each, giving the ability to

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Douglas Walker	Response-00994	The scale and massing of the development, which will begin with 190 houses but will significantly increase when the identified safeguarded land is developed in the future, is completely out of character with its surroundings and would be incredibly overbearing on the village and neighbourhood. I strongly believe that there are better suited brownfield sites and genuine Grey Belt sites with land that is of poor quality. The land south west of Draycott is Grade 2 land (very good) and should be protected. The scale of the development is completely NOT in keeping with the character of the village. The proposed development should follow existing settlement patterns. New buildings and the volume of housing should harmonise with the neighbourhood. Retain local character and the retention of open spaces as is the character of the village. Views into and out of the village should be preserved. Clear lines of hills and spatial openness must be preserved. The current housing target which drives the need to develop on the Green Belt is flawed and needs to be changed. It is based on over inflated housing targets that are not realistic, which puts pressure on local authorities to disregard the impact such developments have on local communities and villages to purely meet statistical objectives. This can be seen with the c.17% increase in the population of Draycott if the development of 190 houses goes ahead. This would also be further compounded when the safeguarded land is developed adding an additional c70 houses. This increase and expansion is unrealistic and reckless. NPPF 73. States that the authority should identify, through the development plan and brownfield registers, land to accommodate at least 10% of their housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare; unless it can be shown, through the preparation of relevant plan policies, that there are strong reasons why this 10% target cannot be achieved. Within the EBC there are 109 Brownfield sites as detailed on the last EBC Brownfield Register 2024, with 103 of these having full planning consent. Of these sites, 8 are over 1H each, giving the ability to develop over 500 houses. Why are these sites not being prioritised first over Green Belt land. NPPF 61. States that to support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay. The overall aim should be to meet an area's identified housing need, including with an appropriate mix of housing types for the local community. The land identified south west of Draycott is Green Belt and Grade 2 quality land. This development neither looks to protect the BMV not does it look to bring forward the 109 existing Brownfield sites within the EBC that has full planning consent.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Dr CJ Marvell	Response-01901	Character of the proposed development. The development is misconceived as it will change the character of the village. Draycott has a very strong community spirit but the new proposed development will not only not contribute to this but will detract from it, as it appears that the development will be constructed as a separate enclave with only one entry/exit onto Derby Road. It will in effect be a "dormitory" settlement, with very few of the new inhabitants taking part in village life because of the isolated nature of the proposed development. This sort of development is very much out of keeping with the existing mixed housing in Draycott.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Dr Shelagh Brown	Response-01158	The proposal for 190 new houses will diminish the feel of being a small village with a strong sense of community cohesion and support.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Dudley Medhurst	Response-01180	The village community will not be able to cope with another 400 people.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Francis Ian Scott	Response-01535	NPPF 223. States that planning policies should set out criteria or requirements to ensure that permitted and proposed operations do not have unacceptable adverse impacts on the natural and historic environment or human health, taking into account the cumulative effects of multiple impacts from individual sites and/or a number of sites in a locality. The EBC are proposing a combined number of nearly 700 houses in the locality of Draycott, Borrowwash and Breaston which is significantly overbearing and unrealistic when considering infrastructure, road networks and amenity. The proposal for 190 houses to begin, which will increase to c.240 once the safeguarded land has been developed, is far too big and overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. The potential harm caused by the application far outweighs the potential public benefit. The scale of the development is completely NOT in keeping with the character of the village. The proposed development should follow existing settlement patterns. New buildings and the volume of housing should harmonise with the neighbourhood. Retain local character and the retention of open spaces as is the character of the village. Views into and out of the village should be preserved. Clear lines of hills and spatial openness must be preserved. This out of scale development rides roughshod over the NPPF and other relating policies and guidelines with the barest of lip service paid, with the minimum consultation being undertaken with residents which is compounded by the lack of information available and transparency. The scale and massing of the development, which will begin with 190 houses but will significantly increase when the identified safeguarded land is developed in the future, is completely out of character with its surroundings and would be incredibly overbearing on the village and neighbourhood. I strongly believe that there are better suited brownfield sites and genuine Grey Belt sites with land that is of poor quality. The land south west of Draycott is Grade 2 land (very good) and should be protected. NPPF 61. States that to support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay. The overall aim should be to meet an area's identified housing need, including with an appropriate mix of housing types for the local community. The land identified south west of Draycott is Green Belt and Grade 2 quality land. This development neither looks to protect the BMV not does it look to bring forward the 109 existing Brownfield sites within the EBC that has full planning consent. NPPF 73. States that the authority should identify, through the development plan and brownfield registers, land to accommodate

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Francis Ian Scott	Response-01535	at least 10% of their housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare; unless it can be shown, through the preparation of relevant plan policies, that there are strong reasons why this 10% target cannot be achieved. Within the EBC there are 109 Brownfield sites as detailed on the last EBC Brownfield Register 2024, with 103 of these having full planning consent. Of these sites, 8 are over 1H each, giving the ability to develop over 500 houses. Why are these sites not being prioritised first over Green Belt land. The current housing target which drives the need to develop on the Green Belt is flawed and needs to be changed. It is based on over inflated housing targets that are not realistic, which puts pressure on local authorities to disregard the impact such developments have on local communities and villages to purely meet statistical objectives. This can be seen with the c.17% increase in the population of Draycott if the development of 190 houses goes ahead. This would also be further compounded when the safeguarded land is developed adding an additional c70 houses. This increase and expansion is unrealistic and reckless.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Gail Holdsworth	Response-00937	The proposed number of houses Will massively increase the population with all the negative outcomes that will create. There is a strong community feel in the village with volunteers maintaining its look and character and cleanliness. As it gets bigger that will be impossible to maintain.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Gary Siddall	Response-01237	The proposal for 190 houses to begin, which will increase to c.240 once the safeguarded land has been developed, is far too big and overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful countryside. And with reference to the use of the word "safeguarded", it has not gone unnoticed that an area of the proposed building site which has been marked as "safeguarded land" on the map seems to be intentionally misleading to imply that it will NOT be built on in the future, whereas the actual meaning was clearer in the original wording on the map before it was mysteriously altered recently, as it is really "safeguarded FOR future building" ! Naughty. The scale of the development is completely NOT in keeping with the character of the village. The proposed development should follow existing settlement patterns. New buildings and the volume of housing should harmonise with the neighbourhood. Retain local character and the retention of open spaces as is the character of the village. Views into and out of the village should be preserved. Clear lines of hills and spatial openness must be preserved.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Gemma Woolnough	Response-01394	The 190 houses proposed seems far too many for a village with no Doctors's, Dentist or Secondary School. The residents would need to travel out to find any of these essentials services. The primary school is only small with limited nursery spaces so parents with young families would need to travel out of the village to find a nursery with spaces if they require it. The proposed land is very close to a bridge which likely means there would be limited access roads going in and out of the development, which does not seem feasible or viable with so many houses. The road is already busy at peak times, with a high level of fatalities for a village this size, the vast increase in houses the would likely increase the traffic level significantly which may result in further fatalities.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	George Foster	Response-01199	NPPF 223. States that planning policies should set out criteria or requirements to ensure that permitted and proposed operations do not have unacceptable adverse impacts on the natural and historic environment or human health, taking into account the cumulative effects of multiple impacts from individual sites and/or a number of sites in a locality. The EBC are proposing a combined number of nearly 700 houses in the locality of Draycott, Borrowwash and Breaston which is significantly overbearing and unrealistic when considering infrastructure, road networks and amenity. The proposal for 190 houses to begin, which will increase to c.240 once the safeguarded land has been developed, is far too big and overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. The potential harm caused by the application far outweighs the potential public benefit. The scale of the development is completely NOT in keeping with the character of the village. The proposed development should follow existing settlement patterns. New buildings and the volume of housing should harmonise with the neighbourhood. Retain local character and the retention of open spaces as is the character of the village. Views into and out of the village should be preserved. Clear lines of hills and spatial openness must be preserved. This out of scale development rides roughshod over the NPPF and other relating policies and guidelines with the barest of lip service paid, with the minimum consultation being undertaken with residents which is compounded by the lack of information available and transparency. The scale and massing of the development, which will begin with 190 houses but will significantly increase when the identified safeguarded land is developed in the future, is completely out of character with its surroundings and would be incredibly overbearing on the village and neighbourhood I strongly believe that there are better suited brownfield sites and genuine Grey Belt sites with land that is of poor quality. The land south west of Draycott is Grade 2 land (very good) and should be protected. NPPF 61. States that to support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay. The overall aim should be to meet an area's identified housing need, including with an appropriate mix of housing types for the local community. The land identified south west of Draycott is Green Belt and Grade 2 quality land. This development neither looks to protect the BMV nor does it look to bring forward the 109 existing Brownfield sites within the EBC that has full planning consent. NPPF 73. States that the authority should identify, through the development plan and brownfield registers, land to accommodate

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	George Foster	Response-01199	at least 10% of their housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare; unless it can be shown, through the preparation of relevant plan policies, that there are strong reasons why this 10% target cannot be achieved. Within the EBC there are 109 Brownfield sites as detailed on the last EBC Brownfield Register 2024, with 103 of these having full planning consent. Of these sites, 8 are over 1H each, giving the ability to develop over 500 houses. Why are these sites not being prioritised first over Green Belt land. The current housing target which drives the need to develop on the Green Belt is flawed and needs to be changed. It is based on over inflated housing targets that are not realistic, which puts pressure on local authorities to disregard the impact such developments have on local communities and villages to purely meet statistical objectives. This can be seen with the c.17% increase in the population of Draycott if the development of 190 houses goes ahead. This would also be further compounded when the safeguarded land is developed adding an additional c70 houses. This increase and expansion is unrealistic and reckless.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Gill Trickitt	Response-01157	Any number of houses is unacceptable. If houses need to be built, build on greybelt areas or the edge of suburbs, towns and cities. The definition of village is rural area. If this is built on, the village no longer exists. There are other areas houses can be built that would meet the government requirements without building on greenbelt in a rural location putting a strain on all of these categories - services, road congestion etc
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Graham Wakeling	Response-01238	The proposed number of houses is ridiculous, 190... That would significantly impact local infrastructure, traffic, safety and peoples wellbeing. Destroying the local family feel to the village.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Hannah McMaster	Response-01381	The number of houses is excessive for the space and location.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Hannah Pritchard	Response-01399	A total of 190 dwellings represents a disproportionate expansion of Draycott village. During a population census done 21/03/2023, Draycott's population was noted as being 3,029 people. According to national statistics, the average occupation of dwellings in the UK is 2.4 people with the intended occupation for dwellings being 3.2; meaning that there would be a near certain population increase within the village of circa 456-608 people equating to a 15%-20% uplift. Bearing this in mind, modern property developments and affordable housing schemes design with the intention for the capability to house 5-7 people per dwelling, therefore there is also the possibility that off the back of this development, the local population could swell by 950 residents (over 30%)- an unsustainable and abrupt change for a small parish. This will strain every aspect of village life and service provision.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	James Hargreaves	Response-01315	Unrealistic Targets: The housing targets driving this proposal are flawed, placing undue pressure on local infrastructure and ignoring the village's capacity.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	James Whyman	Response-01551	1 NPPF 223. States that planning policies should set out criteria or requirements to ensure that permitted and proposed operations do not have unacceptable adverse impacts on the natural and historic environment or human health, taking into account the cumulative effects of multiple impacts from individual sites and/or a number of sites in a locality. The EBC are proposing a combined number of nearly 700 houses in the locality of Draycott, Borrowwash and Breaston which is significantly overbearing and unrealistic when considering infrastructure, road networks and amenity. 2 The proposal for 190 houses to begin, which will increase to c.240 once the safeguarded land has been developed, is far too big and overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. 3 The potential harm caused by the application far outweighs the potential public benefit. 4 The scale of the development is completely NOT in keeping with the character of the village. The proposed development should follow existing settlement patterns. New buildings and the volume of housing should harmonise with the neighbourhood. Retain local character and the retention of open spaces as is the character of the village. Views into and out of the village should be preserved. Clear lines of hills and spatial openness must be preserved. 5 This out of scale development rides roughshod over the NPPF and other relating policies and guidelines with the barest of lip service paid, with the minimum consultation being undertaken with residents which is compounded by the lack of information available and transparency. 6 The scale and massing of the development, which will begin with 190 houses but will significantly increase when the identified safeguarded land is developed in the future, is completely out of character with its surroundings and would be incredibly overbearing on the village and neighbourhood I strongly believe that there are better suited brownfield sites and genuine Grey Belt sites with land that is of poor quality. The land south west of Draycott is Grade 2 land (very good) and should be protected. 7 NPPF 61. States that to support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay. The overall aim should be to meet an area's identified housing need, including with an appropriate mix of housing types for the local community. The land identified south west of Draycott is Green Belt and Grade 2 quality land. This development neither looks to protect the BMU nor does it look to bring forward the 109 existing Brownfield sites within the EBC that has full planning consent. 8 NPPF 73. States that the authority should identify, through the development plan and brownfield registers, land



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	James Whyman	Response-01551	to accommodate at least 10% of their housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare; unless it can be shown, through the preparation of relevant plan policies, that there are strong reasons why this 10% target cannot be achieved. Within the EBC their are 109 Brownfield sites as detailed on the last EBC Brownfield Register 2024, with 103 of these having full planning consent. Of these sites, 8 are over 1H each, giving the ability to develop over 500 houses. Why are these sites not being prioritised first over Green Belt land. 9 The current housing target which drives the need to develop on the Green Belt is flawed and needs to be changed. It is based on over inflated housing targets that are not realistic, which puts pressure on local authorities to disregard the impact such developments have on local communities and villages to purely meet statistical objectives. This can be seen with the c.17% increase in the population of Draycott if the development of 190 houses goes ahead. This would also be further compounded when the safeguarded land is developed adding an additional c70 houses. This increase and expansion is unrealistic and reckless.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Jane Barker	Response-01178	I honestly don't think that the village can cope with another 190 houses considering the road networks, the drainage systems and health services are only just coping with the village residents now. It will also completely change the outlook of the village and the community atmosphere it now has.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	J Morgan	Response-01847	EBC is proposing nearly 700 houses in Draycott, Borrowwash, and Breaston, which is significantly overbearing and unrealistic considering infrastructure, road networks, and amenities. The proposal for 190 houses will change the villages look and feel, impacting its rural identity and risking morphing into a combined town with Breaston and Borrowwash.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Jonathan Childs	Response-01117	NPPF 223. States that planning policies should set out criteria or requirements to ensure that permitted and proposed operations do not have unacceptable adverse impacts on the natural and historic environment or human health, taking into account the cumulative effects of multiple impacts from individual sites and/or a number of sites in a locality. The EBC are proposing a combined number of nearly 700 houses in the locality of Draycott, Borrowwash and Breaston which is significantly overbearing and unrealistic when considering infrastructure, road networks and amenity. The proposal for 190 houses to begin, which will increase to c.240 once the safeguarded land has been developed, is far too big and overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. The potential harm caused by the application far outweighs the potential public benefit. The scale of the development is completely NOT in keeping with the character of the village. The proposed development should follow existing settlement patterns. New buildings and the volume of housing should harmonise with the neighbourhood. Retain local character and the retention of open spaces as is the character of the village. Views into and out of the village should be preserved. Clear lines of hills and spatial openness must be preserved. This out of scale development rides roughshod over the NPPF and other relating policies and guidelines with the barest of lip service paid, with the minimum consultation being undertaken with residents which is compounded by the lack of information available and transparency. The scale and massing of the development, which will begin with 190 houses but will significantly increase when the identified 'safeguarded' land is developed in the future, is completely out of character with its surroundings and would be incredibly overbearing on the village and neighbourhood I strongly believe that there are better suited brownfield sites and genuine Grey Belt sites with land that is of poor quality. The land south west of Draycott is Grade 2 land (very good) and should be protected. NPPF 61. States that to support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay. The overall aim should be to meet an area's identified housing need, including with an appropriate mix of housing types for the local community. The land identified south west of Draycott is Green Belt and Grade 2 quality land. This development neither looks to protect the BMV nor does it look to bring forward the 109 existing Brownfield sites within the EBC that has full planning consent. NPPF 73. States that the authority should identify, through the development plan and brownfield registers, land to accommodate
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Jonathan Childs	Response-01117	e at least 10% of their housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare; unless it can be shown, through the preparation of relevant plan policies, that there are strong reasons why this 10% target cannot be achieved. Within the EBC their are 109 Brownfield sites as detailed on the last EBC Brownfield Register 2024, with 103 of these having full planning consent. Of these sites, 8 are over 1H each, giving the ability to develop over 500 houses. Why are these sites not being prioritised first over Green Belt land. The current housing target which drives the need to develop on the Green Belt is flawed and needs to be changed. It is based on over inflated housing targets that are not realistic, which puts pressure on local authorities to disregard the impact such developments have on local communities and villages to purely meet statistical objectives. This can be seen with the c.17% increase in the population of Draycott if the development of 190 houses goes ahead. This would also be further compounded when the safeguarded land is developed adding an additional c70 houses. This increase and expansion is unrealistic and reckless. Whilever there is an abundance of vacant property available for sale in the immediate locality ? some of which can clearly be identified as 'affordable' ? what possible justification can be presented for the pursuit of this particular development other than perhaps using the greed of any particular individual to convert a political objective into 'low hanging fruit'?

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Judith Boyle	Response-01418	The proposal for 190 houses to begin, which will increase to c.240 once the safeguarded land has been developed, is far too big and overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. The scale and massing of the development, which will begin with 190 houses but will significantly increase when the identified safeguarded land is developed in the future, is completely out of character with its surroundings and would be incredibly overbearing on the village and neighbourhood I strongly believe that there are better suited brownfield sites and genuine Grey Belt sites with land that is of poor quality. The land south west of Draycott is Grade 2 land (very good) and should be protected.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Juliet Macve	Response-01572	The number of houses proposed is far too high for a small village. It will entirely change the nature of the village and overpower the area. Existing brownfield and greybelt areas must be prioritised for building, as well as bringing back into use the hundreds of long-term empty homes.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Karen Smith	Response-01484	I'm concerned about the lack of infrastructure to support the proposed development. The village infrastructure doesn't have capacity to support 200+ houses. You're trying to build a small town on a village sized infrastructure.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Katie May	Response-01518	NPPF 223. States that planning policies should set out criteria or requirements to ensure that permitted and proposed operations do not have unacceptable adverse impacts on the natural and historic environment or human health, taking into account the cumulative effects of multiple impacts from individual sites and/or a number of sites in a locality. The EBC are proposing a combined number of nearly 700 houses in the locality of Draycott, Borrowash and Breaston which is significantly overbearing and unrealistic when considering infrastructure, road networks and amenity. The proposal for 190 houses to begin, which will increase to c.240 once the safeguarded land has been developed, is far too big and overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. The potential harm caused by the application far outweighs the potential public benefit. The scale of the development is completely NOT in keeping with the character of the village. The proposed development should follow existing settlement patterns. New buildings and the volume of housing should harmonise with the neighbourhood. Retain local character and the retention of open spaces as is the character of the village. Views into and out of the village should be preserved. Clear lines of hills and spatial openness must be preserved. This out of scale development rides roughshod over the NPPF and other relating policies and guidelines with the barest of lip service paid, with the minimum consultation being undertaken with residents which is compounded by the lack of information available and transparency. The scale and massing of the development, which will begin with 190 houses but will significantly increase when the identified safeguarded land is developed in the future, is completely out of character with its surroundings and would be incredibly overbearing on the village and neighbourhood I strongly believe that there are better suited brownfield sites and genuine Grey Belt sites with land that is of poor quality. The land south west of Draycott is Grade 2 land (very good) and should be protected. NPPF 61. States that to support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay. The overall aim should be to meet an area's identified housing need, including with an appropriate mix of housing types for the local community. The land identified south west of Draycott is Green Belt and Grade 2 quality land. This development neither looks to protect the BMV nor does it look to bring forward the 109 existing Brownfield sites within the EBC that has full planning consent. NPPF 73. States that the authority should identify, through the development plan and brownfield registers, land to accommodate
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Katie May	Response-01518	at least 10% of their housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare; unless it can be shown, through the preparation of relevant plan policies, that there are strong reasons why this 10% target cannot be achieved. Within the EBC there are 109 Brownfield sites as detailed on the last EBC Brownfield Register 2024, with 103 of these having full planning consent. Of these sites, 8 are over 1H each, giving the ability to develop over 500 houses. Why are these sites not being prioritised first over Green Belt land. The current housing target which drives the need to develop on the Green Belt is flawed and needs to be changed. It is based on over inflated housing targets that are not realistic, which puts pressure on local authorities to disregard the impact such developments have on local communities and villages to purely meet statistical objectives. This can be seen with the c.17% increase in the population of Draycott if the development of 190 houses goes ahead. This would also be further compounded when the safeguarded land is developed adding an additional c70 houses. This increase and expansion is unrealistic and reckless.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Kelly Walker	Response-00911	The proposal for 190 houses to begin, which will increase to c.240 once the safeguarded land has been developed, is far too big and overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. The scale of the development is completely NOT in keeping with the character of the village. The proposed development should follow existing settlement patterns. New buildings and the volume of housing should harmonise with the neighbourhood. Retain local character and the retention of open spaces as is the character of the village. Views into and out of the village should be preserved. Clear lines of hills and spatial openness must be preserved. The scale and massing of the development, which will begin with 190 houses but will significantly increase when the identified safeguarded land is developed in the future, is completely out of character with its surroundings and would be incredibly overbearing on the village and neighbourhood I strongly believe that there are better suited brownfield sites and genuine Grey Belt sites with land that is of poor quality. The land south west of Draycott is Grade 2 land (very good) and should be protected. NPPF 61. States that to support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay. The overall aim should be to meet an area's identified housing need, including with an appropriate mix of housing types for the local community. The land identified south west of Draycott is Green Belt and Grade 2 quality land. This development neither looks to protect the BMV not does it look to bring forward the 109 existing Brownfield sites within the EBC that has full planning consent. NPPF 73. States that the authority should identify, through the development plan and brownfield registers, land to accommodate at least 10% of their housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare; unless it can be shown, through the preparation of relevant plan policies, that there are strong reasons why this 10% target cannot be achieved. Within the EBC their are 109 Brownfield sites as detailed on the last EBC Brownfield Register 2024, with 103 of these having full planning consent. Of these sites, 8 are over 1H each, giving the ability to develop over 500 houses. Why are these sites not being prioritised first over Green Belt land. The current housing target which drives the need to develop on the Green Belt is flawed and needs to be changed. It is based on over inflated housing targets that are not realistic, which puts pressure on local authorities to disregard the impact such developments have on local communities and villages to purely meet statistical objectives. This can be seen with the c.17% increase in the population of Draycott if
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Kelly Walker	Response-00911	the development of 190 houses goes ahead. This would also be further compounded when the safeguarded land is developed adding an additional c70 houses. This increase and expansion is unrealistic and reckless.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Laura Charier	Response-01218	The proposal for 190 houses to begin, which will increase to c.240 once the safeguarded land has been developed, is far too big and overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The EBC are proposing a combined number of nearly 700 houses in the locality of Draycott, Borrowash and Breaston which is significantly overbearing and unrealistic when considering infrastructure, road networks and amenity.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Laura Roffey	Response-01479	Whilst there is obviously a need for more housing, one main objection is to the number of houses - 190- that are planned. Squashing this many houses in on the green belt will have a detrimental effect on all the people in Draycott with regards to increased traffic, people, pollution and accessing healthcare. I understand that this number may be just below the number of houses needed to actually also provide supporting infrastructure eg. shops, doctors etc, but the space available would be much better suited to a small number of houses, so not to invade so much of the green belt.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Lee	Response-00742	1. The need for some houses is not in question the location & number per area is very much so. This plan seems to be persecuting certain areas to take the brunt of the burden. Why was our village singled out? Why can this strategy not share expansion equally between suitable locations? A proposal of 50 ? 60 houses not on the gateway to the village would be welcomed. 2. Nuisance factor, we have had a new build passed at 101Draycott. We've have already had 6 months of trucks, builders, cars parked over the drive. Builders have cut all the trees down and opened the back of my garden for everyone to see. I've lost my privacy, security and even kids' safety, anybody could be watching. It's been an exhausting stress just for 4 houses. My view has been ruined. Now you plan a 190 plus houses which is devastating news. So, you will turn our lovely village & Derby road into a building site for the next 5 - 10 years. My kids will only remember Draycott as a messy building site. With such a massive inconvenience planned. Why would the council consider putting such misery & inconveniences on residents? When finding a plot away from Derby Road would cause way less disruption to all?
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Louise and Shane Foster	Response-01219	The proposal for the development of 190 houses will totally change the character of the village and we have concerns that it will become a town merging with developments in Breaston and Borrowash.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Luke Hatch	Response-00160	Draycott already has a good supply of affordable and starter homes, thanks to recent developments like Cowslip Meadow and the Victoria Mill conversion - something I forgot to write in the types of houses. Why do we need 40% affordable houses in Draycott? There are plenty of places you can get for under £170k here. On numbers: 190 homes is a huge number for a village of just over 3,000 people. That's around a 15% population increase in one go. It's too much, too fast, and the village infrastructure isn't built for it. It's not just Draycott. There are also large housing developments happening in Breaston and Borrowwash, both nearby villages that share many of the same roads, schools, health services, and public transport links. Looking at Draycott in isolation ignores the cumulative impact all this extra housing will have on our local services. It feels like a building frenzy with no joined-up thinking around infrastructure.
			Lynne Dundas	Response-01198	This is an excessive amount of houses for a village
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Maggie Murphy	Response-00833	This too many houses in the wrong location
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Martin Fawcett	Response-01077	Housing development should be built on grey/brown sites of which there are plenty. Why even consider green belt and ruin a lovely backdrop for residents to enjoy
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Martin Kilcoyne	Response-01460	NPPF 223. States that planning policies should set out criteria or requirements to ensure that permitted and proposed operations do not have unacceptable adverse impacts on the natural and historic environment or human health, taking into account the cumulative effects of multiple impacts from individual sites and/or a number of sites in a locality. The EBC are proposing a combined number of nearly 700 houses in the locality of Draycott, Borrowwash and Breaston which is significantly overbearing and unrealistic when considering infrastructure, road networks and amenity. The proposal for 190 houses to begin, which will increase to c.240 once the safeguarded land has been developed, is far too big and overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. The potential harm caused by the application far outweighs the potential public benefit. The scale of the development is completely NOT in keeping with the character of the village. The proposed development should follow existing settlement patterns. New buildings and the volume of housing should harmonise with the neighbourhood. Retain local character and the retention of open spaces as is the character of the village. Views into and out of the village should be preserved. Clear lines of hills and spatial openness must be preserved. This out of scale development rides roughshod over the NPPF and other relating policies and guidelines with the barest of lip service paid, with the minimum consultation being undertaken with residents which is compounded by the lack of information available and transparency. The scale and massing of the development, which will begin with 190 houses but will significantly increase when the identified safeguarded land is developed in the future, is completely out of character with its surroundings and would be incredibly overbearing on the village and neighbourhood I strongly believe that there are better suited brownfield sites and genuine Grey Belt sites with land that is of poor quality. The land south west of Draycott is Grade 2 land (very good) and should be protected. NPPF 61. States that to support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay. The overall aim should be to meet an area's identified housing need, including with an appropriate mix of housing types for the local community. The land identified south west of Draycott is Green Belt and Grade 2 quality land. This development neither looks to protect the BMV nor does it look to bring forward the 109 existing Brownfield sites within the EBC that has full planning consent. NPPF 73. States that the authority should identify, through the development plan and brownfield registers, land to accommodate
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Martin Kilcoyne	Response-01460	at least 10% of their housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare; unless it can be shown, through the preparation of relevant plan policies, that there are strong reasons why this 10% target cannot be achieved. Within the EBC there are 109 Brownfield sites as detailed on the last EBC Brownfield Register 2024, with 103 of these having full planning consent. Of these sites, 8 are over 1H each, giving the ability to develop over 500 houses. Why are these sites not being prioritised first over Green Belt land. The current housing target which drives the need to develop on the Green Belt is flawed and needs to be changed. It is based on over inflated housing targets that are not realistic, which puts pressure on local authorities to disregard the impact such developments have on local communities and villages to purely meet statistical objectives. This can be seen with the c.17% increase in the population of Draycott if the development of 190 houses goes ahead. This would also be further compounded when the safeguarded land is developed adding an additional c70 houses. This increase and expansion is unrealistic and reckless.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Mary Walsh	Response-01197	The scale of the development is completely NOT in keeping with the character of the village. The proposed development should follow existing settlement patterns. New buildings and the volume of housing should harmonise with the neighbourhood. Retain local character and the retention of open spaces as is the character of the village. Views into and out of the village should be preserved. Clear lines of hills and spatial openness must be preserved. 6 The scale and massing of the development, which will begin with 190 houses but will significantly increase when the identified safeguarded land is developed in the future, is completely out of character with its surroundings and would be incredibly overbearing on the village and neighbourhood I strongly believe that there are better suited brownfield sites and genuine Grey Belt sites with land that is of poor quality. The land south west of Draycott is Grade 2 land (very good) and should be protected.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Matthew Walker	Response-01313	The proposal for 190 houses to begin, which will increase to c.240 once the safeguarded land has been developed, is far too big and overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. NPPF 223. States that planning policies should set out criteria or requirements to ensure that permitted and proposed operations do not have unacceptable adverse impacts on the natural and historic environment or human health, taking into account the cumulative effects of multiple impacts from individual sites and/or a number of sites in a locality. The EBC are proposing a combined number of nearly 700 houses in the locality of Draycott, Borrowwash and Breaston which is significantly overbearing and unrealistic when considering infrastructure, road networks and amenity. This number of houses needs urgent review a lower more realistic number offered. The scale of the development and proposed number of houses is completely NOT in keeping with the character of the village. The proposed development should follow existing settlement patterns. New buildings and the volume of housing should harmonise with the neighbourhood. Retain local character and the retention of open spaces as is the character of the village. Views into and out of the village should be preserved. Clear lines of hills and spatial openness must be preserved. This out of scale development rides roughshod over the NPPF and other relating policies and guidelines with the barest of lip service paid, with the minimum consultation being undertaken with residents which is compounded by the lack of information available and transparency. The scale and massing of the development, which will begin with 190 houses but will significantly increase when the identified safeguarded land is developed in the future, is completely out of character with its surroundings and would be incredibly overbearing on the village and neighbourhood I strongly believe that there are better suited brownfield sites and genuine Grey Belt sites with land that is of poor quality. The land south west of Draycott is Grade 2 land (very good) and should be protected. NPPF 61. States that to support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay. The overall aim should be to meet an area's identified housing need, including with an appropriate mix of housing types for the local community. The land identified south west of Draycott is Green Belt and Grade 2 quality land. This development neither looks to protect the BMV nor does it look to bring forward the 109 existing Brownfield sites within the EBC that has full planning consent. NPPF 73. States that the authority should identify, through the development plan and brownfield registers, l
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Matthew Walker	Response-01313	and to accommodate at least 10% of their housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare; unless it can be shown, through the preparation of relevant plan policies, that there are strong reasons why this 10% target cannot be achieved. Within the EBC there are 109 Brownfield sites as detailed on the last EBC Brownfield Register 2024, with 103 of these having full planning consent. Of these sites, 8 are over 1H each, giving the ability to develop over 500 houses. Why are these sites not being prioritised first over Green Belt land. The current housing target which drives the need to develop on the Green Belt is flawed and needs to be changed. It is based on over inflated housing targets that are not realistic, which puts pressure on local authorities to disregard the impact such developments have on local communities and villages to purely meet statistical objectives. This can be seen with the c.17% increase in the population of Draycott if the development of 190 houses goes ahead. This would also be further compounded when the safeguarded land is developed adding an additional c70 houses. This increase and expansion is unrealistic and reckless.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Matt Tovey	Response-00929	Whilst I am happy to see small developments of c 10 houses. These large developments are a detriment to the local character and feels like profiteering from the large property developers.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Melanie Wilson	Response-00974	The increase in the number of houses is excessive for the village.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Michael Atkin	Response-01872	The other amenities doctors, dentist, local school are full to capacity and will not be able to cope with the extra from this development.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Michael Thirtwall	Response-01196	190 new homes is far too many for the existing infrastructure, (roads, public transport and health care facilities for example) to cope with unless they are significantly expanded, which does not seem to be proposed.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Miss Ella Meredith	Response-01850	EBC is proposing nearly 700 houses in Draycott, Borrowwash, and Breaston, which is significantly overbearing and unrealistic considering infrastructure, road networks, and amenities. The proposal for 190 houses will change the villages look and feel, impacting its rural identity and risking morphing into a combined town with Breaston and Borrowwash.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Miss Natalie Walsh	Response-01846	EBC is proposing nearly 700 houses in Draycott, Borrowwash, and Breaston, which is significantly overbearing and unrealistic considering infrastructure, road networks, and amenities. The proposal for 190 houses will change the villages look and feel, impacting its rural identity and risking morphing into a combined town with Breaston and Borrowwash.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Miss Paige Murray	Response-01842	EBC is proposing nearly 700 houses in Draycott, Borrowwash, and Breaston, which is significantly overbearing and unrealistic considering infrastructure, road networks, and amenities. The proposal for 190 houses will change the villages look and feel, impacting its rural identity and risking morphing into a combined town with Breaston and Borrowwash.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Mr Graham Bingham and Mrs Kristine Bingham	Response-01302	Proposing to build nearly 700 houses in Draycott, Borrowwash and Breaston is significantly overbearing and unrealistic considering infrastructure, road networks, and amenities. The proposal to build 190 homes in Draycott will change the village's look and feel, impacting its rural identity and risk morphing into a combined town with Breaston and Borrowwash
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Mr R Sykes	Response-00412	Far too many, in fact none should be built.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Mr Scott Walsh	Response-01844	EBC is proposing nearly 700 houses in Draycott, Borrowwash, and Breaston, which is significantly overbearing and unrealistic considering infrastructure, road networks, and amenities. The proposal for 190 houses will change the villages look and feel, impacting its rural identity and risking morphing into a combined town with Breaston and Borrowwash.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Mrs Elizabeth White	Response-00060	When the area of Cowslip Meadow was developed the number of people went up by approximately 50 percent. I feel the village has already played its part with housing needs.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Mrs Mary Walsh	Response-01845	EBC is proposing nearly 700 houses in Draycott, Borrowwash, and Breaston, which is significantly overbearing and unrealistic considering infrastructure, road networks, and amenities. The proposal for 190 houses will change the villages look and feel, impacting its rural identity and risking morphing into a combined town with Breaston and Borrowwash.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Mr Tony Walsh	Response-01849	EBC is proposing nearly 700 houses in Draycott, Borrowwash, and Breaston, which is significantly overbearing and unrealistic considering infrastructure, road networks, and amenities. The proposal for 190 houses will change the villages look and feel, impacting its rural identity and risking morphing into a combined town with Breaston and Borrowwash.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Nat	Response-00158	The houses will all be squashed together
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Nigel morton	Response-01351	Proposed number of houses is too many for our small village with limited infrastructure
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Nikki Riches	Response-00950	? NPPF 223. States that planning policies should set out criteria or requirements to ensure that permitted and proposed operations do not have unacceptable adverse impacts on the natural and historic environment or human health, taking into account the cumulative effects of multiple impacts from individual sites and/or a number of sites in a locality. The EBC are proposing a combined number of nearly 700 houses in the locality of Draycott, Borrowwash and Breaston which is significantly overbearing and unrealistic when considering infrastructure, road networks and amenity. ? The proposal for 190 houses to begin, which will increase to c.240 once the safeguarded land has been developed, is far too big and overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. ? The potential harm caused by the application far outweighs the potential public benefit. ? The scale of the development is completely NOT in keeping with the character of the village. The proposed development should follow existing settlement patterns. New buildings and the volume of housing should harmonise with the neighbourhood. Retain local character and the retention of open spaces as is the character of the village. Views into and out of the village should be preserved. Clear lines of hills and spatial openness must be preserved. ? This out of scale development rides roughshod over the NPPF and other relating policies and guidelines with the barest of lip service paid, with the minimum consultation being undertaken with residents which is compounded by the lack of information available and transparency. ? The scale and massing of the development, which will begin with 190 houses but will significantly increase when the identified safeguarded land is developed in the future, is completely out of character with its surroundings and would be incredibly overbearing on the village and neighbourhood I strongly believe that there are better suited brownfield sites and genuine Grey Belt sites with land that is of poor quality. The land south west of Draycott is Grade 2 land (very good) and should be protected. ? NPPF 61. States that to support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay. The overall aim should be to meet an area's identified housing need, including with an appropriate mix of housing types for the local community. The land identified south west of Draycott is Green Belt and Grade 2 quality land. This development neither looks to protect the BMV nor does it look to bring forward the 109 existing Brownfield sites within the EBC that has full planning consent. ? NPPF 73. States that the authority should identify, through the development plan and brownfield registers, land
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Nikki Riches	Response-00950	to accommodate at least 10% of their housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare; unless it can be shown, through the preparation of relevant plan policies, that there are strong reasons why this 10% target cannot be achieved. Within the EBC there are 109 Brownfield sites as detailed on the last EBC Brownfield Register 2024, with 103 of these having full planning consent. Of these sites, 8 are over 1H each, giving the ability to develop over 500 houses. Why are these sites not being prioritised first over Green Belt land. ? The current housing target which drives the need to develop on the Green Belt is flawed and needs to be changed. It is based on over inflated housing targets that are not realistic, which puts pressure on local authorities to disregard the impact such developments have on local communities and villages to purely meet statistical objectives. This can be seen with the c.17% increase in the population of Draycott if the development of 190 houses goes ahead. This would also be further compounded when the safeguarded land is developed adding an additional c70 houses. This increase and expansion is unrealistic and reckless.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	paul butcher	Response-01154	NPPF 223. States that planning policies should set out criteria or requirements to ensure that permitted and proposed operations do not have unacceptable adverse impacts on the natural and historic environment or human health, taking into account the cumulative effects of multiple impacts from individual sites and/or a number of sites in a locality. The EBC are proposing a combined number of nearly 700 houses in the locality of Draycott, Borrowash and Breaston which is significantly overbearing and unrealistic when considering infrastructure, road networks and amenity. The proposal for 190 houses to begin, which will increase to c.240 once the safeguarded land has been developed, is far too big and overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. The potential harm caused by the application far outweighs the potential public benefit. The scale of the development is completely NOT in keeping with the character of the village. The proposed development should follow existing settlement patterns. New buildings and the volume of housing should harmonise with the neighbourhood. Retain local character and the retention of open spaces as is the character of the village. Views into and out of the village should be preserved. Clear lines of hills and spatial openness must be preserved. The scale and massing of the development, which will begin with 190 houses but will significantly increase when the identified safeguarded land is developed in the future, is completely out of character with its surroundings and would be incredibly overbearing on the village and neighbourhood I strongly believe that there are better suited brownfield sites and genuine Grey Belt sites with land that is of poor quality. The land south west of Draycott is Grade 2 land (very good) and should be protected. NPPF 61. States that to support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay. The overall aim should be to meet an area's identified housing need, including with an appropriate mix of housing types for the local community. The land identified south west of Draycott is Green Belt and Grade 2 quality land. This development neither looks to protect the BMV not does it look to bring forward the 109 existing Brownfield sites within the EBC that has full planning consent. NPPF 73. States that the authority should identify, through the development plan and brownfield registers, land to accommodate at least 10% of their housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare; unless it can be shown, through the preparation of relevant plan policies, that there are strong reasons why this 10% target cannot be achieved. Within the EBC there are 109 Brownfield sites as deta
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	paul butcher	Response-01154	iled on the last EBC Brownfield Register 2024, with 103 of these having full planning consent. Of these sites, 8 are over 1H each, giving the ability to develop over 500 houses. Why are these sites not being prioritised first over Green Belt land. The current housing target which drives the need to develop on the Green Belt is flawed and needs to be changed. It is based on over inflated housing targets that are not realistic, which puts pressure on local authorities to disregard the impact such developments have on local communities and villages to purely meet statistical objectives. This can be seen with the c.17% increase in the population of Draycott if the development of 190 houses goes ahead. This would also be further compounded when the safeguarded land is developed adding an additional c70 houses. This increase and expansion is unrealistic and reckless.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Pauline Marks	Response-00927	Draycott is a rural village with a close-knit community and a distinct heritage. Introducing nearly 200 new homes would transform the scale and feel of the area, undermining its character and appeal.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	R Fazackerley	Response-01415	The scale and nature of this development is out of character based on the existing properties in the area. The scale will adversely impact the local amenities and services in the community
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Richard Keith Hanbury	Response-01087	190 houses are proposed. Having looked at the map how are you going to fit that number in the space. We have a lovely characterful village and we don't want this ruined.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Richard Syson	Response-01317	The 2021 Census shows the population of Draycott to be just over 3,000 people. Using the logic of 2 children per household on average, this suggests there are currently c. 1,000 houses in Draycott. This proposed development would add c. 20-25% more homes. The scale of the proposed development is completely NOT in keeping with the character of the village. The proposed development should follow existing settlement patterns. New buildings and the volume of housing should harmonise with the neighbourhood. Erewash Borough Council must make all efforts to retain local character and the retention of open spaces as is the character of the village. Views into and out of the village should be preserved. Clear lines of hills and spatial openness must be preserved. NPPF 61. States that to support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay. The overall aim should be to meet an area's identified housing need, including with an appropriate mix of housing types for the local community. The land identified south west of Draycott is Green Belt and Grade 2 quality land. This development neither looks to protect the BMV nor does it look to bring forward the 109 existing Brownfield sites within the EBC that has full planning consent.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Rick Howden	Response-01421	The potential harm caused by the application far outweighs the potential public benefit. NPPF 61. States that to support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay. The overall aim should be to meet an area's identified housing need, including with an appropriate mix of housing types for the local community. The land identified south west of Draycott is Green Belt and Grade 2 quality land. This development neither looks to protect the BMV nor does it look to bring forward the 109 existing Brownfield sites within the EBC that has full planning consent.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Robert Alan Duncanson	Response-00855	190 HOUSES IS TOO MUCH FOR A VILLAGE OUR SIZE WITH NO PROPER FACILITIES
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Roger Brown	Response-00999	190 homes with a plan to increase this to 260 homes is an increase of between 13 and 17% to the existing housing capacity of the village and a population increase of around 20%, this is a substantial increase with no suggested provision for improving local facilities in terms of health, leisure, retail or recreation.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Ruth Hawkins	Response-01277	The scale of the development, which will begin with 190 houses but will significantly increase when the identified safeguarded land is developed in the future, is completely out of character with its surroundings and would be incredibly overbearing on the village and neighbourhood. I believe that there are better suited brownfield sites and genuine Grey Belt sites with land that is of poor quality. The land south west of Draycott is Grade 2 land (very good) and should be protected. NPPF 73. States that the authority should identify, through the development plan and brownfield registers, land to accommodate at least 10% of their housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare; unless it can be shown, through the preparation of relevant plan policies, that there are strong reasons why this 10% target cannot be achieved. Within the EBC there are 109 Brownfield sites as detailed on the last EBC Brownfield Register 2024, with 103 of these having full planning consent. Of these sites, 8 are over 1H each, giving the ability to develop over 500 houses. Why are these sites not being prioritised first over Green Belt land.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Sarah	Response-01541	Over population of the village and more in the pipe line.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Sarah Hargreaves	Response-01314	3. Housing Targets: The current housing targets driving this development are flawed and unrealistic, leading to overburdening local communities and disregarding the impact on the village.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Sara Walker-Bradley	Response-01440	Too many taking up fields that absorb flood water
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Sean Peace	Response-01347	NPPF 223. States that planning policies should set out criteria or requirements to ensure that permitted and proposed operations do not have unacceptable adverse impacts on the natural and historic environment or human health, taking into account the cumulative effects of multiple impacts from individual sites and/or a number of sites in a locality. The EBC are proposing a combined number of nearly 700 houses in the locality of Draycott, Borrowash and Breaston which is significantly overbearing and unrealistic when considering infrastructure, road networks and amenity. 5 2 The proposal for 190 houses to begin, which will increase to c.240 once the safeguarded land has been developed, is far too big and overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. 6 3 The potential harm caused by the application far outweighs the potential public benefit. 7 4 The scale of the development is completely NOT in keeping with the character of the village. The proposed development should follow existing settlement patterns. New buildings and the volume of housing should harmonise with the neighbourhood. Retain local character and the retention of open spaces as is the character of the village. Views into and out of the village should be preserved. Clear lines of hills and spatial openness must be preserved. 8 5 This out of scale development rides roughshod over the NPPF and other relating policies and guidelines with the barest of lip service paid, with the minimum consultation being undertaken with residents which is compounded by the lack of information available and transparency. 9 6 The scale and massing of the development, which will begin with 190 houses but will significantly increase when the identified safeguarded land is developed in the future, is completely out of character with its surroundings and would be incredibly overbearing on the village and neighbourhood I strongly believe that there are better suited brownfield sites and genuine Grey Belt sites with land that is of poor quality. The land south west of Draycott is Grade 2 land (very good) and should be protected. 10 7 NPPF 61. States that to support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay. The overall aim should be to meet an area's identified housing need, including with an appropriate mix of housing types for the local community. The land identified south west of Draycott is Green Belt and Grade 2 quality land. This development neither looks to protect the BMV nor does it look to bring forward the 109 existing Brownfield sites within the EBC that has full planning consent. 11 8 NPPF 73. States that the authority should identify, through the development plan and brownfield r



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Sean Peace	Response-01347	registers, land to accommodate at least 10% of their housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare; unless it can be shown, through the preparation of relevant plan policies, that there are strong reasons why this 10% target cannot be achieved. Within the EBC there are 109 Brownfield sites as detailed on the last EBC Brownfield Register 2024, with 103 of these having full planning consent. Of these sites, 8 are over 1H each, giving the ability to develop over 500 houses. Why are these sites not being prioritised first over Green Belt land. 12.9 The current housing target which drives the need to develop on the Green Belt is flawed and needs to be changed. It is based on over inflated housing targets that are not realistic, which puts pressure on local authorities to disregard the impact such developments have on local communities and villages to purely meet statistical objectives. This can be seen with the c.17% increase in the population of Draycott if the development of 190 houses goes ahead. This would also be further compounded when the safeguarded land is developed adding an additional c70 houses. This increase and expansion is unrealistic and reckless.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Simon Jenkins	Response-01287	NONE !!!!!
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	S M Beresford	Response-01851	EBC is proposing nearly 700 houses in Draycott, Borrowash, and Breaston, which is significantly overbearing and unrealistic considering infrastructure, road networks, and amenities. The proposal for 190 houses will change the villages look and feel, impacting its rural identity and risking morphing into a combined town with Breaston and Borrowash.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Susan Baker	Response-01316	The housing targets being used to justify this development don't reflect the reality on the ground. They're pushing too much, too fast, and our village is paying the price
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Susan Foster	Response-00824	Smaller enclaves would cause less disruption and stress for current villagers. Too many houses, crammed into the area, less houses in a brown field site would be a better option.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Teresa Batchelor	Response-01240	I believe the number of houses is far more than the village can cope with, both from the perspective of health care support, schooling, transport and impact on the environment because of the loss of green space, extra vehicles and emissions they will produce. Plus the intrusion on existing residents by the increased traffic.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Teresa Shaw	Response-01309	1. The need for some houses is not in question the location & number per area is very much so. This plan seems to be persecuting certain areas to take the brunt of the burden. Why was our village singled out? Why can this strategy not share expansion equally between suitable locations? A proposal of 50 ? 60 houses in Draycott not on the gateway to the village would be welcomed. 2. Nuisance factor. Now you plan a 190 in Draycott & 400 in Borrowash which is a huge expansion. So, you will turn our lovely village & Derby road into a building site for the next 5 - 10 years. Why would the council consider putting such misery & inconveniences on residents? When finding a plot away from Derby Road Draycott would cause way less disruption?
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Tim Hawkins	Response-00661	190 houses will, by expanding onto the duplicitously named safeguarded land, become 260. Too many for the current population and services as they are. However, as I have not been permitted to see EBC's master plan for the development it's difficult to say.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Tracey Morton	Response-00968	Number of houses are too many Draycott as a small rural village doesn't have the infrastructure to cope with this increase 2 This will not be houses for that will be affordable for Draycott residents
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	T Shields	Response-00570	8.3 Ha for 190 houses is a LOW density of approximately 23 houses per Ha. This should be increased to make more efficient use of the land and provide more homes.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Viv Wright	Response-00035	It appears the numbers are not capped, once started a great fear of more and more houses until no more land.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	Wilfred Boone	Response-01424	The current housing target which drives the need to develop on the Green Belt is flawed and needs to be changed. It is based on over inflated housing targets that are not realistic, which puts pressure on local authorities to disregard the impact such developments have on local communities and villages to purely meet statistical objectives. This can be seen with the c.17% increase in the population of Draycott if the development of 190 houses goes ahead. This would also be further compounded when the safeguarded land is developed adding an additional c70 houses. This increase and expansion is unrealistic and reckless.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	William Batchelor	Response-01210	Draycott doesn't need this amount of additional houses. Infrastructure is not suited and the village will cease to exist as a community as this will create a pocket of residents remote to the village itself

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	zak butcher	Response-01156	<p>NPPF 223. States that planning policies should set out criteria or requirements to ensure that permitted and proposed operations do not have unacceptable adverse impacts on the natural and historic environment or human health, taking into account the cumulative effects of multiple impacts from individual sites and/or a number of sites in a locality. The EBC are proposing a combined number of nearly 700 houses in the locality of Draycott, Borrowash and Breaston which is significantly overbearing and unrealistic when considering infrastructure, road networks and amenity. The proposal for 190 houses to begin, which will increase to c.240 once the safeguarded land has been developed, is far too big and overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. The potential harm caused by the application far outweighs the potential public benefit. The scale of the development is completely NOT in keeping with the character of the village. The proposed development should follow existing settlement patterns. New buildings and the volume of housing should harmonise with the neighbourhood. Retain local character and the retention of open spaces as is the character of the village. Views into and out of the village should be preserved. Clear lines of hills and spatial openness must be preserved. The scale and massing of the development, which will begin with 190 houses but will significantly increase when the identified safeguarded land is developed in the future, is completely out of character with its surroundings and would be incredibly overbearing on the village and neighbourhood I strongly believe that there are better suited brownfield sites and genuine Grey Belt sites with land that is of poor quality. The land south west of Draycott is Grade 2 land (very good) and should be protected. NPPF 61. States that to support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay. The overall aim should be to meet an area's identified housing need, including with an appropriate mix of housing types for the local community. The land identified south west of Draycott is Green Belt and Grade 2 quality land. This development neither looks to protect the BMV nor does it look to bring forward the 109 existing Brownfield sites within the EBC that has full planning consent. NPPF 73. States that the authority should identify, through the development plan and brownfield registers, land to accommodate at least 10% of their housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare; unless it can be shown, through the preparation of relevant plan policies, that there are strong reasons why this 10% target cannot be achieved. Within the EBC there are 109 Brownfield sites as deta</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	Number of Houses	zak butcher	Response-01156	<p>iled on the last EBC Brownfield Register 2024, with 103 of these having full planning consent. Of these sites, 8 are over 1H each, giving the ability to develop over 500 houses. Why are these sites not being prioritised first over Green Belt land. The current housing target which drives the need to develop on the Green Belt is flawed and needs to be changed. It is based on over inflated housing targets that are not realistic, which puts pressure on local authorities to disregard the impact such developments have on local communities and villages to purely meet statistical objectives. This can be seen with the c.17% increase in the population of Draycott if the development of 190 houses goes ahead. This would also be further compounded when the safeguarded land is developed adding an additional c70 houses. This increase and expansion is unrealistic and reckless.</p>

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	adrian leeming	Response-01249	<p>As simple matter of principal please recognise that people move to rural village locations in order to escape the city and towns, it's not possible to develop hundreds of new homes in these villages and retain or extend the rural escape, instead it inevitably removes this benefit. The British village concept is one worth protecting for mental health and cultural benefit. Rather than destroy village life new housing developments should be adjacent to existing towns, like Long Eaton or Ilkeston, to strengthen their position and would have less negative impact than adjacent to a smaller village. It is also a Government ambition to reduce unnecessary/extra vehicle journeys. By building substantial numbers of houses miles away from commercial centres and supermarkets this will encourage more journeys. Draycott does have a bus service but the reality is that most of the 190 new families will jump in the car rather than catch a bus because that's the society we now live in. I strongly object to the Sustainability Assessment which was undertaken by the EBC when assessing the land south west of Draycott. The EBC assessment scored this land as +3 with a ranking of joint 3rd place, when our independent review using professionals and informed local residents resulted in a score of -6 placing this land ran 20th. When reviewed, clear and obvious errors have been made where the EBC has underplayed and positively scored key questions incorrectly to achieve a desired outcome. For example, 9.1: Will it make efficient use of brownfield land? the EBC states that it will not as the site is entirely Greenfield and we know there over 109 Brownfield sites in EBC. Yet the EBC only gives this question a -1 when it should surely receive an at least a Minor Negative -2 score. Question 16.5: Will it protect the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land? the EBC itself states the land south west of Draycott 'Agricultural Land Classification Grade 2 so is of reasonable quality' and this scheme will not therefore protect the BMV. Yet the EBC has scored it only -1. This in our view should be a Minor Negative -2 as there is limited Grade 2 land within the area with most being Grade 3 &amp; 4. Furthermore, question 16.6: Will it prevent the loss of greenfield land to development? the EBC itself states that 'No, the site is Greenfield in its classification so development would not prevent the loss of greenfield land. The limited scale of site limits this negative impact', yet the site is over 8H of Greenfield Grade 2 quality land and only awards a -1. This is our view should received a -2 or even a -3 as this development will have a significant impact on the Greenfield land and its surrounding areas. Questions 2.2 and 2.1 relate to employment and EBC advises that this scheme will not boost employment in the local area due to its limited scale yet award neutral 0' to both questions. Surely these questions should receive -1 as they fail to deliver on the question. Furthermore, questions such as 14.4, 15.2, 15.3, 15.4, 16.1 and 16.2 are all speculative in their answer as they relate to the developer delivering on certain sustainable aspects which can not possibly be scored at this time. Overall, we strongly object to the EBC Sustainability Assessment and would call for this to be independently reviewed. I strongly do not believe these plans are in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, and the Erewash Borough Councils (EBC) Local Plan 2022. I also do</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	adrian leeming	Response-01249	<p>not believe that adequate consultation has been undertaken by EBC with the Draycott Local Parish Council or residents on these plans, and the impact they will have on the local community, wider village and amenity. Furthermore, the development plans plus the proposed National Grids pylon corridor which has been identified as only being circa 600 meters away from this development, will mean the south west of Draycott will be unrealistically overburdened with development impacting Green Belt land. I strongly object to the significant changes EBC plan to make to its Core Strategy and the reclassification of the land south west of Draycott to Grey Belt. It is widely accepted that the Grey Belt policy has been implemented in a rushed and incoherent manner, which is reflected in the EBCs hastily revised Core Strategic Review and a clear lack of transparency and community consultation. The policy is likely to have little to no impact on achieving the government's target of 1.5 million new homes by the end of the current Parliament but threatens to destroy currently protected green spaces. Only the bare minimum consultation has been undertaken by EBC with the local residence of Draycott. The six week consultation period is not sufficient when considering the share size of the development and impact on the village, and is not sufficient time for the local parish and residence to develop a set of objections. When two weeks of the consultation period was across easter half term and the consultation window included 4 Bank Holidays. This when much of the information required was not available and FOI requests were submitted and took 20 working days for a response to be received, when the government agencies contacted themselves did not work the said Bank Holidays. This has meant important information has not been received by residents when developing objections. This action by the EBC was irresponsible, some may say planned, and not acting in the interests of the local communities this plan impacts.</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Alison Bowley	Response-01174	<p>Draycott has little in the way of facilities no large supermarket, just a few independent coffee shops, hairdressers, a newsagents and small corner shops. I attended the meeting held at Long Eaton Town Hall when the proposals first came to light in March. It was obvious that EBC had already pre-determined to limit the public consultation period to an absolute minimum. Our local Parish council, never mind the residents, were completely unaware of the magnitude of the proposed changes. I found out about that meeting through social media, but as you know, many people choose not to use, or do not have access to social media, so it appeared that EBC did not want to engage with the public, i.e. the people who had voted them in. The meeting itself was shameful, with party politics being played out in full. It has been a very rushed consultation process, especially considering two Bank Holidays have occurred during the 6 week period. I feel the whole so-called consultation process has been a box-ticking exercise by EBC. The proposals will undoubtedly get the green light despite how the majority of residents (VOTERS) feel. Many people have already witnessed workmen measuring up/surveying the proposed land and I know of a company who have already been approached regarding the site. The Government are going to railroad these proposals through no matter what and I strongly suspect I have wasted the last few weeks trying to find out facts.</p>

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Alison Thirlwall	Response-01390	Noise and Vibration consultation should be undertaken to consider impacts during construction on nearby noise sensitive properties and ongoing management of a solar farm and the impact of noise and disturbance. An environment noise assessment needs to be carried out, particularly for the residents directly opposite the site entrance; but also the whole route that the construction traffic will take. This passes through Draycott, Borrow ash and Beaston villages. Passing busy junctions, Doctor's surgeries, public car parks, Primary schools, local cricket clubs as well as numerous resident's homes.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Andrew and Jane Gilmour	Response-01329	I strongly object to the consultation process which as best can be described as limited and not fully transparent when engaging with the local community. EBC has only given local residents 6 weeks to submit objections to what is an incredibly important change to the original Local Plan and Core Strategy. This is simply not enough time for residents to review and analyse the magnitude of information and formulate objections, this when significant information is also missing which includes the master plan for the land south west of Draycott. The manner in which EBC has undertaken the 6 week consultation is not inclusive and does not allow non internet users to be aware of the consultation and changes to the Core Strategy. The average age within Draycott and Church Wilne Parish is 58 and there is a large proportion of the community that was not aware of this important change. We fully object to the whole process and in particular the 6 week consultation period. I do not believe these plans are in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, and the Erewash Borough Councils (EBC) Local Plan 2022. I also do not believe that adequate consultation has been undertaken by EBC with the Draycott Local Parish Council or residents on these plans, and the impact they will have on the local community, wider village and amenities. Furthermore, the development plans plus the proposed National Grids pylon corridor which has been identified as only being approx. 600 meters away from this development, will mean the south west of Draycott will be unrealistically overburdened with development impacting Green Belt land.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	A Northeast	Response-01848	We strongly object to the consultation process, which has been limited and not fully transparent. Erewash Borough Council (EBC) has only given local residents the minimum six-week period to submit objections to this significant change to the Local Plan and Core Strategy. This timeframe is insufficient for residents to review and understand the magnitude of the change and formulate objections, especially given the missing details such as the master plan for the land south west of Draycott. These plans do not align with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024 and EBC Local Plan 2022. Furthermore, adequate consultation has not been undertaken with the Draycott Local Parish Council or residents regarding the impact of these plans on the local community, village, and amenity. Noise from construction and operational phases of the development has not been adequately addressed. An environmental noise assessment needs to be carried out, particularly for residents living adjacent and opposite the site entrance.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Anthony Lawton-Reeve	Response-00971	As residents living next to the site of the proposed change in Green Belt status and future housing development, we are of the view that these proposals will have a serious negative impact on the village, visual openness, spatial openness, the local community and our standard of living. The current housing target which drives the need to develop on the Green Belt is flawed and needs to be changed. It is based on over inflated housing targets that are not realistic, which puts pressure on local authorities to disregard the impact such developments have on local communities and villages to purely meet statistical objectives. This can be seen with the c.17% increase in the population of Draycott if the development of 190 houses goes ahead. This would also be further compounded when the safeguarded land is developed adding an additional c70 houses. This increase and expansion is unrealistic and reckless.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Anthony Walsh	Response-00992	Loss of open space and green spaces ? this is vital for our community?s wellbeing Primary School affected with noise and traffic The footpaths that cross the land have amazing views and are used regularly by residents and visitors. The recent pandemic years have shown us that we need space to exercise and be at peace with ourselves and nature, for our own mental wellbeing. This development will have the effect, that anyone using the path would not benefit from the current sprawling Greenbelt views as it will be gone forever. It will have a detrimental effect on the wellbeing of people who enjoy the countryside, not to mention wildlife habitats, which are already under extreme pressure. The recent pandemic has highlighted the valuable and regular use of these footpaths, promoting and fostering good mental health. This land is rural in character, providing a tranquil transitional landscape between the rural areas of Draycott Parish, and the small villages surrounding it of Borrowash and Breaston. It is the wrong model in the wrong place to deliver the EBCs housing needs being of a scale that is ultimately detrimental to the local landscape and will harm the countryside, wildlife and impact irreversibly upon the area and its residents. Footpaths, the Amenity and enjoyment of the use of these pathways which cross through and around this site which provide an important means by which residents of the local villages can get access to the countryside with substantial benefits for their physical and mental health as well as providing means of sustainable transport. For the people of Draycott and other areas, this will have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, replacing green space with 190 houses. The sheer scale of the proposed site will have such an irreversible effect on the landscape. The land/footpaths will be surrounded by housing which will render the land unusable by residents whom rely on it as an area to escape and relax. These footpaths are well-used by many people for physical and mental health. This may seem insignificant to others however, residents rely on this land to enable freedom and a work life balance, which will be lost as result of development on this green belt. Footpaths although still evident on the plan will no longer be enjoyed by families maintaining their ongoing mental health, health and well-being as they will not have the same enjoyment having to walk through a housing estate. NPPF 8. Promoting healthy and safe communities:- 104. Planning policies and decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and access, including taking opportunities to provide better facilities for users, this area has significant lengths of footpaths that will be affected by the development of 190 houses on land south west of Draycott. Promoting healthy and safe communities the effect on our healthy lifestyles, especially our local health and well-being needs ? taking away our green space and facility would be detrimental to our community and our day to day needs would fall short by the loss of our valued facilities Open space and recreation. NPPF102. Access to a network of high quality open spaces would be reduced by this application and our opportunities for physical activity and health and wellbeing would be adversely affected There would be a detrimental effect on the Carbon Sink opportunities by the loss of open land and the effects of a housing development Only the bare minimum consultation has been undertaken
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Anthony Walsh	Response-00992	by EBC with the local residence of Draycott. The six week consultation period is not sufficient when considering the share size of the development and impact on the village, and is not sufficient time for the local parish and residence to develop a set of objections. When two weeks of the consultation period was across easter. This action by the EBC was irresponsible and not acting in the interests of the local communities this plan impacts. To improve local accessibility to healthcare, education, employment, retail facilities and recreational resources including open spaces to enhance wellbeing and promote healthy and sustainable lifestyles. This application will have a negative effect on both wellbeing and health including mental and emotional wellbeing. To create safe and attractive places which contribute towards quality of life and community cohesion. This project will significantly detrimentally impact on the quality of life and fragment the community who use this area as a community facility. Including educational opportunities for local schools.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Avice Boyle	Response-01427	Primary School affected with noise and traffic The footpaths that cross the land have amazing views and are used regularly by residents and visitors. The recent pandemic years have shown us that we need space to exercise and be at peace with ourselves and nature, for our own mental wellbeing. This development will have the effect, that anyone using the path would not benefit from the current sprawling Greenbelt views as it will be gone forever. The recent pandemic has highlighted the valuable and regular use of these footpaths, promoting and fostering good mental health. Footpaths, the Amenity and enjoyment of the use of these pathways which cross through and around this site which provide an important means by which residents of the local villages can get access to the countryside with substantial benefits for their physical and mental health as well as providing means of sustainable transport. For the people of Draycott and other areas, this will have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, replacing green space with 190 houses. Only the bare minimum consultation has been undertaken by EBC with the local residence of Draycott. The six week consultation period is not sufficient when considering the share size of the development and impact on the village, and is not sufficient time for the local parish and residence to develop a set of objections. When two weeks of the consultation period was across easter. This action by the EBC was irresponsible and not acting in the interests of the local communities this plan impacts. To improve local accessibility to healthcare, education, employment, retail facilities and recreational resources including open spaces to enhance wellbeing and promote healthy and sustainable lifestyles. This application will have a negative effect on both wellbeing and health including mental and emotional wellbeing.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Barbara Crane	Response-00268	I have no doubt that this will be pushed through to meet the government?s target. The public?s objections made in the consultation will be treated as nimbyism. Shame on you as a council for not listening to your community. It will rebound on you.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Bev Marvell	Response-01892	The public footpath across this proposed development is old, it is marked on the oldest maps I can find (Bennetts 1841) and was a route to the nearby important 'Ambaston Ford' over the Derwent. This footpath is now part of the 'Nomad Way - Circling Derby'. This footpath should not be re-routed or downgraded. I am unhappy with this consultation process. I attended the Council meeting at Long Eaton Town Hall 27th March, when an extension from 6 to 12 weeks consultation was denied. 6 weeks maybe appropriate for a new garage application, but not for a large development on Green Belt for 190 houses (also considering the Easter break). Some online sources of information do not appear to work. Such as the 'Mapping Portal' and other pages like: <a href="http://erewash.gov.uk/images/green_belt_review.pdf">erewash.gov.uk/images/green_belt_review.pdf</a> January 2025 'Page not found'. Also, I cannot find the Council's biodiversity report. I would have liked to consult these.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Bradley Peace	Response-01348	Loss of open space and green spaces ? this is vital for our community?s wellbeing 5 2 Primary School affected with noise and traffic 6 3 The footpaths that cross the land have amazing views and are used regularly by residents and visitors. The recent pandemic years have shown us that we need space to exercise and be at peace with ourselves and nature, for our own mental wellbeing. This development will have the effect, that anyone using the path would not benefit from the current sprawling Greenbelt views as it will be gone forever. 7 4 It will have a detrimental effect on the wellbeing of people who enjoy the countryside, not to mention wildlife habitats, which are already under extreme pressure. 8 6 The recent pandemic has highlighted the valuable and regular use of these footpaths, promoting and fostering good mental health. 9 7 This land is rural in character, providing a tranquil transitional landscape between the rural areas of Draycott Parish, and the small villages surrounding it of Borrowash and Breaston. 10 8 It is the wrong model in the wrong place to deliver the EBCs housing needs being of a scale that is ultimately detrimental to the local landscape and will harm the countryside, wildlife and impact irreversibly upon the area and its residents. 11 9 Footpaths, the Amenity and enjoyment of the use of these pathways which cross through and around this site which provide an important means by which residents of the local villages can get access to the countryside with substantial benefits for their physical and mental health as well as providing means of sustainable transport. For the people of Draycott and other areas, this will have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, replacing green space with 190 houses. 12 10 The sheer scale of the proposed site will have such an irreversible effect on the landscape. The land/footpaths will be surrounded by housing which will render the land unusable by residents whom rely on it as an area to escape and relax. These footpaths are well-used by many people for physical and mental health. This may seem insignificant to others however, residents rely on this land to enable freedom and a work life balance, which will be lost as result of development on this green belt. 13 11 Footpaths although still evident on the plan will no longer be enjoyed by families maintaining their ongoing mental health, health and well-being as they will not have the same enjoyment having to walk through a housing estate. 14 12 NPPF 8. Promoting healthy and safe communities:- 104. Planning policies and decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and access, including taking opportunities to provide better facilities for users, this area has significant lengths of footpaths that will be affected by the development of 190 houses on land south west of Draycott. 15 13 Promoting healthy and safe communities the effect on our healthy lifestyles, especially our local health and well-being needs ? taking away our green space and facility would be detrimental to our community and our day to day needs would fall short by the loss of our valued facilities 16 14 Open space and recreation. NPPF102. Access to a network of high quality open spaces would be reduced by this application and our opportunities for physical activity and health and wellbeing would be adversely affected 17 15 There would be a detrimental effect on the Carbon Sink opportunities by the loss of open land and the effects of a housing
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Bradley Peace	Response-01348	development 18 16 Only the bare minimum consultation has been undertaken by EBC with the local residence of Draycott. The six week consultation period is not sufficient when considering the share size of the development and impact on the village, and is not sufficient time for the local parish and residence to develop a set of objections. When two weeks of the consultation period was across easter. This action by the EBC was irresponsible and not acting in the interests of the local communities this plan impacts. 19 17 To improve local accessibility to healthcare, education, employment, retail facilities and recreational resources including open spaces to enhance wellbeing and promote healthy and sustainable lifestyles. This application will have a negative effect on both wellbeing and health including mental and emotional wellbeing. 20 18 To create safe and attractive places which contribute towards quality of life and community cohesion. This project will significantly detrimentally impact on the quality of life and fragment the community who use this area as a community facility. Including educational opportunities for local schools.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Caroline and John Thirwell	Response-01001	We are always being told to walk for our health. There are many pleasant walks in the proposed development area which would be taken away by the huge influx of 190 houses (and maybe more). These plans do not seem to follow the NPPF 2024 and Erewash Borough Council's Local Plan 2022 and seem rushed with little thought to the residents of our village and the changes it will bring.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Charlotte Brennan	Response-00931	Footpaths although still evident on the plan will no longer be enjoyed by families maintaining their ongoing mental health, health and well-being as they will not have the same enjoyment having to walk through a housing estate.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Colin & Cynthia Green	Response-00922	We strongly disagree with this planning application, using Green Belt when other areas down as Brownfield areas could & should be considered. Concerns over proposed Pylons coming through this area, flooding/drainage unable to cope. Wildlife & trees/hedgerows removed probably or severely affected, species of bats recorded may be wiped out. Infrastructure unsuitable & unable to cope, school places not available, health facilities eg GP appointments or Surgery not able to cope now never mind extra influx of adults & children say 400+ for 190 new homes. Worries over extra vehicles on unsuitable road 30mph should be but speeding due to nature of road set up, railway bridge & incline goes from 30-40 mph where a motorcyclist was killed a couple of years ago towards Derby. We suggest if new homes to be build, EBC consider brownfield areas never Greenbelt .

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	David and Mary Murden	Response-01898	Lastly we feel we must comment on the unreasonably short amount of time that has been allowed for consultation. None of the local councillors have shown their face for public discussion or to answer questions. We always thought that the local Council was there to protect the rights of the local people and its land, so we hope you will reconsider this decision,
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	David Atchison	Response-01247	I strongly object to the significant changes EBC plan to make to its Core Strategy and the reclassification of the land south west of Draycott to Grey Belt. It is widely accepted that the Grey Belt policy has been implemented in a rushed and incoherent manner, which is reflected in the EBCs hastily revised Core Strategic Review and a clear lack of transparency and community consultation. The policy is likely to have little to no impact on achieving the government's target of 1.5 million new homes by the end of the current Parliament but threatens to destroy currently protected green spaces. I strongly do not believe these plans are in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, and the Erewash Borough Councils (EBC) Local Plan 2022. I also do not believe that adequate consultation has been undertaken by EBC with the Draycott Local Parish Council or residents on these plans, and the impact they will have on the local community, wider village and amenity. Furthermore, the development plans plus the proposed National Grids pylon corridor which has been identified as only being circa 600 meters away from this development, will mean the south west of Draycott will be unrealistically overburdened with development impacting Green Belt land. There are around 2000 vacant social housing in Derbyshire County. Why are these houses not being prioritised ahead of this land being used for development.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	David Boyle	Response-01426	Require the submission of an environmental noise assessment, prior to development works commencing, to rate and assess operational sound from all fixed installations comprising mechanical and electrical plant and equipment, with a scheme of mitigation measures where necessary; that all site preparation and construction to comply with specified working hours and limits to noise and dust emissions, waste disposal and lighting; and the submission of proposals, including the design and operating times, of any permanent external lighting on site. The use of long/heavy goods vehicles should be prohibited due to the significant amount of Grade I and II listed buildings in the vicinity of the proposed development on land south west of Draycott. This will include Nooning Lane Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1417622 and Hopwell Road Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1087963. An environment noise assessment needs to be carried out, particularly for the residents directly opposite the site entrance; but also the whole route that the construction traffic will take. This passes through Draycott, Borrow ash and Beaston villages. Passing busy junctions, Doctor?s surgeries, public car parks, Primary schools, local cricket clubs as well as numerous resident?s homes.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	David G York	Response-01843	We strongly object to the consultation process, which has been limited and not fully transparent. Erewash Borough Council (EBC) has only given local residents the minimum six-week period to submit objections to this significant change to the Local Plan and Core Strategy. This timeframe is insufficient for residents to review and understand the magnitude of the change and formulate objections, especially given the missing details such as the master plan for the land south west of Draycott. These plans do not align with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024 and EBC Local Plan 2022. Furthermore, adequate consultation has not been undertaken with the Draycott Local Parish Council or residents regarding the impact of these plans on the local community, village, and amenity. Noise from construction and operational phases of the development has not been adequately addressed. An environmental noise assessment needs to be carried out, particularly for residents living adjacent and opposite the site entrance.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	David Thompson	Response-00654	Crime Rates - Draycott has seen increased crime in the form of break ins, theft of motorcycles / vehicles, van break-ins, anti-social behavior etc. Additional housing is going to attract more thieves into the area and if social housing is required as part of any development, this could also create unwanted crime. I experienced this personally whilst being a resident of Cowslip Meadow when it was developed!
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	David Thurgood	Response-01195	Loss of caravan and motorhome storage facilities - It is likely that future associated developments could see the closure of the existing local secure storage compound which will mean that alternative facilities further afield (outside Draycott) will have to be found. The additional travelling will have an impact with additional fuel costs, journey times and less convenience than the current situation. Similarly closure or relocation of the current caravan and motorhome service / repair business will reduce the business diversity and capability within Draycott as well as negatively impacting current business users. The loss of safe and convenient horse stabling and pasturing will negatively effect local users.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	David Webster	Response-01113	There are around 2000 vacant social housing in Derbyshire County. Why are these houses not being prioritised ahead of this land being used for development. I strongly object to the Sustainability Assessment which was undertaken by the EBC when assessing the land south west of Draycott. The EBC assessment scored this land as +3 with a ranking of joint 3rd place, when our independent review using professionals and informed local residents resulted in a score of -6 placing this land ran 20th. When reviewed, clear and obvious errors have been made where the EBC has underplayed and positively scored key questions incorrectly to achieve a desired outcome. For example, 9.1: Will it make efficient use of brownfield land? the EBC states that it will not as the site is entirely Greenfield and we know there over 109 Brownfield sites in EBC. Yet the EBC only gives this question a -1 when it should surely receive an at least a Minor Negative -2 score. Question 16.5: Will it protect the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land? the EBC itself states the land south west of Draycott 'Agricultural Land Classification Grade 2 so is of reasonable quality' and this scheme will not therefore protect the BMV. Yet the EBC has scored it only -1. This in our view should be a Minor Negative -2 as there is limited Grade 2 land within the area with most being Grade 3 & 4. Furthermore, question 16.6: Will it prevent the loss of greenfield land to development? the EBC itself states that 'No, the site is Greenfield in its classification so development would not prevent the loss of greenfield land. The limited scale of site limits this negative impact', yet the site is over 8H of Greenfield Grade 2 quality land and only awards a -1. This is our view should received a -2 or even a -3 as this development will have a significant impact on the Greenfield land and its surrounding areas. Questions 2.2 and 2.1 relate to employment and EBC advises that this scheme will not boost employment in the local area due to its limited scale yet award neutral 0' to both questions. Surely these questions should receive -1 as they fail to deliver on the question. Furthermore, questions such as 14.4, 15.2, 15.3, 15.4, 16.1 and 16.2 are all speculative in their answer as they relate to the developer delivering on certain sustainable aspects which can not possibly be scored at this time. Overall, we strongly object to the EBC Sustainability Assessment and would call for this to be independently reviewed. I would like the EBC to confirm that if this does go ahead that they would pay for any damages that accrue due any flooding to my house and pay any house insurance increase that is if i can get home insurance as residents on Lime Grove are not able to obtain flood damage cover due to flooding Who ever gave the go ahead with this proposal should be remove from there job
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Dexter Codrington	Response-00986	I strongly object to the whole application for the proposed development on Green Belt land south west of Draycott. This location is inappropriate for development due to its impact on the village, its residents, the environment, and local wildlife. Consultation Process I strongly object to the consultation process, which has been limited and not fully transparent. Erewash Borough Council (EBC) has only given local residents the minimum six-week period to submit objections to this significant change to the Local Plan and Core Strategy. This timeframe is insufficient for residents to review and understand the magnitude of the change and formulate objections, especially given the missing details such as the master plan for the land south west of Draycott. These plans do not align with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024 and EBC's Local Plan 2022. Furthermore, adequate consultation has not been undertaken with the Draycott Local Parish Council or residents regarding the impact of these plans on the local community, village, and amenity
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Diane Webster	Response-01177	Only the bare minimum consultation has been undertaken by EBC with the local residence of Draycott. The six week consultation period is not sufficient when considering the share size of the development and impact on the village, and is not sufficient time for the local parish and residence to develop a set of objections. When two weeks of the consultation period was across easter half term and the consultation window included 4 Bank Holidays. This when much of the information required was not available and FOI requests were submitted and took 20 working days for a response to be received, when the government agencies contacted themselves did not work the said Bank Holidays. This has meant important information has not been received by residents when developing objections. This action by the EBC was irresponsible, some may say planned, and not acting in the interests of the local communities this plan impacts. I strongly object to the consultation process which as best can be described as limited and not fully transparent when engaging with the local community. EBC has only given local residents mere 6 weeks to submit objections to what is an incredibly important change to the original Local Plan and Core Strategy. This is simply not enough time for residents to review and analysis the share magnitude of information and formulate objections, this when significant information is also missing which includes the master plan for the land south west of Draycott. The manner in which EBC has undertaken the 6 week consultation is not inclusive and does not allow non internet users to be aware of the consultation and changes to the Core Strategy. The average age within Draycott and Church Wile Parish is 58 and there is a large proportion of the community that was not aware of this important change. We fully object to the whole process and in particular the 6 week consultation period. I strongly object to the significant changes EBC plan to make to its Core Strategy and the reclassification of the land south west of Draycott to Grey Belt. It is widely accepted that the Grey Belt policy has been implemented in a rushed and incoherent manner, which is reflected in the EBCs hastily revised Core Strategic Review and a clear lack of transparency and community consultation. The policy is likely to have little to no impact on achieving the government's target of 1.5 million new homes by the end of the current Parliament but threatens to destroy currently protected green spaces. I strongly do not believe these plans are in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, and the Erewash Borough Councils (EBC) Local Plan 2022. I also do not believe that adequate consultation has been undertaken by EBC with the Draycott Local Parish Council or residents on these plans, and the impact they will have on the local community, wider village and amenity. Furthermore, the development plans plus the proposed National Grids pylon corridor which has been identified as only being circa 600 meters away from this development, will mean the south west of Draycott will be unrealistically overburdened with development impacting Green Belt land. I strongly object to the Sustainability Assessment which was undertaken by the EBC when assessing the land south west of Draycott. The EBC assessment scored this land as +3 with a ranking of joint 3rd place, when our independent review using professionals and informed local residents resulted in a score of -6 placing th



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Diane Webster	Response-01177	<p>is land ran 20th. When reviewed, clear and obvious errors have been made where the EBC has underplayed and positively scored key questions incorrectly to achieve a desired outcome. For example, 9.1: Will it make efficient use of brownfield land? the EBC states that it will not as the site is entirely Greenfield and we know there over 109 Brownfield sites in EBC. Yet the EBC only gives this question a -1 when it should surely receive an at least a Minor Negative -2 score. Question 16.5: Will it protect the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land? the EBC itself states the land south west of Draycott 'Agricultural Land Classification Grade 2 so is of reasonable quality' and this scheme will not therefore protect the BMV. Yet the EBC has scored it only -1. This in our view should be a Minor Negative -2 as there is limited Grade 2 land within the area with most being Grade 3 &amp; 4. Furthermore, question 16.6: Will it prevent the loss of greenfield land to development? the EBC itself states that 'No, the site is Greenfield in its classification so development would not prevent the loss of greenfield land. The limited scale of site limits this negative impact', yet the site is over 8H of Greenfield Grade 2 quality land and only awards a -1. This is our view should received a -2 or even a -3 as this development will have a significant impact on the Greenfield land and its surrounding areas. Questions 2.2 and 2.1 relate to employment and EBC advises that this scheme will not boost employment in the local area due to its limited scale yet award neutral 0' to both questions. Surely these questions should receive -1 as they fail to deliver on the question. Furthermore, questions such as 14.4, 15.2, 15.3, 15.4, 16.1 and 16.2 are all speculative in their answer as they relate to the developer delivering on certain sustainable aspects which can not possibly be scored at this time. Overall, we strongly object to the EBC Sustainability Assessment and would call for this to be independently reviewed. The current housing target which drives the need to develop on the Green Belt is flawed and needs to be changed. It is based on over inflated housing targets that are not realistic, which puts pressure on local authorities to disregard the impact such developments have on local communities and villages to purely meet statistical objectives. This can be seen with the c.17% increase in the population of Draycott if the development of 190 houses goes ahead. This would also be further compounded when the safeguarded land is developed adding an additional c70 houses. This increase and expansion is unrealistic and reckless. There are around 2000 vacant social housing in Derbyshire County. Why are these houses not being prioritised ahead of this land being used for development. I assume that if this goes ahead and additional flooding accrues EBC will be liable and pay for any repair cost to the house holder</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Donna Butcher	Response-01155	<p>Only the bare minimum consultation has been undertaken by EBC with the local residence of Draycott. The six week consultation period is not sufficient when considering the share size of the development and impact on the village, and is not sufficient time for the local parish and residence to develop a set of objections. When two weeks of the consultation period was across easter half term and the consultation window included 4 Bank Holidays. This when much of the information required was not available and FOI requests were submitted and took 20 working days for a response to be received, when the government agencies contacted themselves did not work the said Bank Holidays. This has meant important information has not been received by residents when developing objections. This action by the EBC was irresponsible, some may say planned, and not acting in the interests of the local communities this plan impacts. I strongly object to the consultation process which as best can be described as limited and not fully transparent when engaging with the local community. EBC has only given local residents mere 6 weeks to submit objections to what is an incredibly important change to the original Local Plan and Core Strategy. This is simply not enough time for residents to review and analysis the share magnitude of information and formulate objections, this when significant information is also missing which includes the master plan for the land south west of Draycott. I strongly object to the significant changes EBC plan to make to its Core Strategy and the reclassification of the land south west of Draycott to Grey Belt. It is widely accepted that the Grey Belt policy has been implemented in a rushed and incoherent manner, which is reflected in the EBCs hastily revised Core Strategic Review and a clear lack of transparency and community consultation. The policy is likely to have little to no impact on achieving the government's target of 1.5 million new homes by the end of the current Parliament but threatens to destroy currently protected green spaces. I strongly do not believe these plans are in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, and the Erewash Borough Councils (EBC) Local Plan 2022. I also do not believe that adequate consultation has been undertaken by EBC with the Draycott Local Parish Council or residents on these plans, and the impact they will have on the local community, wider village and amenity. Furthermore, the development plans plus the proposed National Grids pylon corridor which has been identified as only being circa 600 meters away from this development, will mean the south west of Draycott will be unrealistically overburdened with development impacting Green Belt land. As residents living next to the site of the proposed change in Green Belt status and future housing development, we are of the view that these proposals will have a serious negative impact on the village, visual openness, spatial openness, the local community and our standard of living. I strongly object to the Sustainability Assessment which was undertaken by the EBC when assessing the land south west of Draycott. The EBC assessment scored this land as +3 with a ranking of joint 3rd place, when our independent review using professionals and informed local residents resulted in a score of -6 placing this land ran 20th. When reviewed, clear and obvious errors have been made where the EBC has underplayed and positively scored key questions</p>

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Donna Butcher	Response-01155	Incorrectly to achieve a desired outcome. For example, 9.1: Will it make efficient use of brownfield land? the EBC states that it will not as the site is entirely Greenfield and we know there over 109 Brownfield sites in EBC. Yet the EBC only gives this question a -1 when it should surely receive an at least a Minor Negative -2 score. Question 16.5: Will it protect the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land? the EBC itself states the land south west of Draycott 'Agricultural Land Classification Grade 2 so is of reasonable quality' and this scheme will not therefore protect the BMV. Yet the EBC has scored it only -1. This in our view should be a Minor Negative -2 as there is limited Grade 2 land within the area with most being Grade 3 & 4. Furthermore, question 16.6: Will it prevent the loss of greenfield land to development? the EBC itself states that 'No, the site is Greenfield in its classification so development would not prevent the loss of greenfield land. The limited scale of site limits this negative impact', yet the site is over 8H of Greenfield Grade 2 quality land and only awards a -1. This is our view should received a -2 or even a -3 as this development will have a significant impact on the Greenfield land and its surrounding areas. Questions 2.2 and 2.1 relate to employment and EBC advises that this scheme will not boost employment in the local area due to its limited scale yet award neutral 0' to both questions. Surely these questions should receive -1 as they fail to deliver on the question. Furthermore, questions such as 14.4, 15.2, 15.3, 15.4, 16.1 and 16.2 are all speculative in their answer as they relate to the developer delivering on certain sustainable aspects which can not possibly be scored at this time. Overall, we strongly object to the EBC Sustainability Assessment and would call for this to be independently reviewed.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Donna Peace	Response-01344	1 Loss of open space and green spaces ? this is vital for our community?s wellbeing 5 2 Primary School affected with noise and traffic 6 3 The footpaths that cross the land have amazing views and are used regularly by residents and visitors. The recent pandemic years have shown us that we need space to exercise and be at peace with ourselves and nature, for our own mental wellbeing. This development will have the effect, that anyone using the path would not benefit from the current sprawling Greenbelt views as it will be gone forever. 7 4 It will have a detrimental effect on the wellbeing of people who enjoy the countryside, not to mention wildlife habitats, which are already under extreme pressure. 8 6 The recent pandemic has highlighted the valuable and regular use of these footpaths, promoting and fostering good mental health. 9 7 This land is rural in character, providing a tranquil transitional landscape between the rural areas of Draycott Parish, and the small villages surrounding it of Borrowash and Breaston. 10 8 It is the wrong model in the wrong place to deliver the EBCs housing needs being of a scale that is ultimately detrimental to the local landscape and will harm the countryside, wildlife and impact irreversibly upon the area and its residents. 11 9 Footpaths, the Amenity and enjoyment of the use of these pathways which cross through and around this site which provide an important means by which residents of the local villages can get access to the countryside with substantial benefits for their physical and mental health as well as providing means of sustainable transport. For the people of Draycott and other areas, this will have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, replacing green space with 190 houses. 12 10 The sheer scale of the proposed site will have such an irreversible effect on the landscape. The land/footpaths will be surrounded by housing which will render the land unusable by residents whom rely on it as an area to escape and relax. These footpaths are well-used by many people for physical and mental health. This may seem insignificant to others however, residents rely on this land to enable freedom and a work life balance, which will be lost as result of development on this green belt. 13 11 Footpaths although still evident on the plan will no longer be enjoyed by families maintaining their ongoing mental health, health and well-being as they will not have the same enjoyment having to walk through a housing estate. 14 12 NPPF 8. Promoting healthy and safe communities:- 104. Planning policies and decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and access, including taking opportunities to provide better facilities for users, this area has significant lengths of footpaths that will be affected by the development of 190 houses on land south west of Draycott. 15 13 Promoting healthy and safe communities the effect on our healthy lifestyles, especially our local health and well-being needs ? taking away our green space and facility would be detrimental to our community and our day to day needs would fall short by the loss of our valued facilities 16 14 Open space and recreation. NPPF102. Access to a network of high quality open spaces would be reduced by this application and our opportunities for physical activity and health and wellbeing would be adversely affected 17 15 There would be a detrimental effect on the Carbon Sink opportunities by the loss of open land and the effects of a housin
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Donna Butcher	Response-01344	g development 18 16 Only the bare minimum consultation has been undertaken by EBC with the local residence of Draycott. The six week consultation period is not sufficient when considering the share size of the development and impact on the village, and is not sufficient time for the local parish and residence to develop a set of objections. When two weeks of the consultation period was across easter. This action by the EBC was irresponsible and not acting in the interests of the local communities this plan impacts. 19 17 To improve local accessibility to healthcare, education, employment, retail facilities and recreational resources including open spaces to enhance wellbeing and promote healthy and sustainable lifestyles. This application will have a negative effect on both wellbeing and health including mental and emotional wellbeing. 20 18 To create safe and attractive places which contribute towards quality of life and community cohesion. This project will significantly detrimentally impact on the quality of life and fragment the community who use this area as a community facility. Including educational opportunities for local schools.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Douglas Walker	Response-00994	<p>I strongly object to the significant changes EBC plan to make to its Core Strategy and the reclassification of the land south west of Draycott to Grey Belt. It is widely accepted that the Grey Belt policy has been implemented in a rushed and incoherent manner, which is reflected in the EBCs hastily revised Core Strategic Review and a clear lack of transparency and community consultation. The policy is likely to have little to no impact on achieving the government's target of 1.5 million new homes by the end of the current Parliament but threatens to destroy currently protected green spaces. Only the bare minimum consultation has been undertaken by EBC with the local residence of Draycott. The six week consultation period is not sufficient when considering the share size of the development and impact on the village, and is not sufficient time for the local parish and residence to develop a set of objections. When two weeks of the consultation period was across easter half term and the consultation window included 4 Bank Holidays. This when much of the information required was not available and FOI requests were submitted and took 20 working days for a response to be received, when the government agencies contacted themselves did not work the said Bank Holidays. This has meant important information has not been received by residents when developing objections. This action by the EBC was irresponsible, some may say planned, and not acting in the interests of the local communities this plan impacts. The manner in which EBC has undertaken the 6 week consultation is not inclusive and does not allow non internet users to be aware of the consultation and changes to the Core Strategy. The average age within Draycott and Church Wile Parish is 58 and there is a large proportion of the community that was not aware of this important change. We fully object to the whole process and in particular the 6 week consultation period. I strongly object to the significant changes EBC plan to make to its Core Strategy and the reclassification of the land south west of Draycott to Grey Belt. It is widely accepted that the Grey Belt policy has been implemented in a rushed and incoherent manner, which is reflected in the EBCs hastily revised Core Strategic Review and a clear lack of transparency and community consultation. The policy is likely to have little to no impact on achieving the government's target of 1.5 million new homes by the end of the current Parliament but threatens to destroy currently protected green spaces. I strongly do not believe these plans are in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, and the Erewash Borough Councils (EBC) Local Plan 2022. I also do not believe that adequate consultation has been undertaken by EBC with the Draycott Local Parish Council or residents on these plans, and the impact they will have on the local community, wider village and amenity. Furthermore, the development plans plus the proposed National Grids pylon corridor which has been identified as only being circa 600 meters away from this development, will mean the south west of Draycott will be unrealistically overburdened with development impacting Green Belt land. I strongly object to the Sustainability Assessment which was undertaken by the EBC when assessing the land south west of Draycott. The EBC assessment scored this land as +3 with a ranking of joint 3rd place, when our independent review using professionals and informed local reside</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Douglas Walker	Response-00994	<p>nts resulted in a score of -6 placing this land ran 20th. When reviewed, clear and obvious errors have been made where the EBC has underplayed and positively scored key questions incorrectly to achieve a desired outcome. For example, 9.1: Will it make efficient use of brownfield land? the EBC states that it will not as the site is entirely Greenfield and we know there over 109 Brownfield sites in EBC. Yet the EBC only gives this question a -1 when it should surely receive an at least a Minor Negative -2 score. Question 16.5: Will it protect the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land? the EBC itself states the land south west of Draycott 'Agricultural Land Classification Grade 2 so is of reasonable quality' and this scheme will not therefore protect the BMV. Yet the EBC has scored it only -1. This in our view should be a Minor Negative -2 as there is limited Grade 2 land within the area with most being Grade 3 &amp; 4. Furthermore, question 16.6: Will it prevent the loss of greenfield land to development? the EBC itself states that 'No, the site is Greenfield in its classification so development would not prevent the loss of greenfield land. The limited scale of site limits this negative impact', yet the site is over 8H of Greenfield Grade 2 quality land and only awards a -1. This is our view should received a -2 or even a -3 as this development will have a significant impact on the Greenfield land and its surrounding areas. Questions 2.2 and 2.1 relate to employment and EBC advises that this scheme will not boost employment in the local area due to its limited scale yet award neutral 0' to both questions. Surely these questions should receive -1 as they fail to deliver on the question. Furthermore, questions such as 14.4, 15.2, 15.3, 15.4, 16.1 and 16.2 are all speculative in their answer as they relate to the developer delivering on certain sustainable aspects which can not possibly be scored at this time. Overall, we strongly object to the EBC Sustainability Assessment and would call for this to be independently reviewed. The current housing target which drives the need to develop on the Green Belt is flawed and needs to be changed. It is based on over inflated housing targets that are not realistic, which puts pressure on local authorities to disregard the impact such developments have on local communities and villages to purely meet statistical objectives. This can be seen with the c.17% increase in the population of Draycott if the development of 190 houses goes ahead. This would also be further compounded when the safeguarded land is developed adding an additional c70 houses. This increase and expansion is unrealistic and reckless. There are around 2000 vacant social housing in Derbyshire County. Why are these houses not being prioritised ahead of this land being used for development. An environment noise assessment needs to be carried out, particularly for the residents directly opposite the site entrance; but also the whole route that the construction traffic will take. This passes through Draycott, Borrow ash and Beaston villages. Passing busy junctions, Doctor?s surgeries, public car parks, Primary schools, local cricket clubs as well as numerous resident?s homes. The use of long/heavy goods vehicles should be prohibited due to the significant amount of Grade I and II listed buildings in the vicinity of the proposed development on land south west of Draycott. This will include Noonning Lane Bridge, Grade 2 listed building,</p>

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Douglas Walker	Response-00994	list entry number 1417622 and Hopwell Road Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1087963. NPPF 8. Promoting healthy and safe communities:- 104. Planning policies and decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and access, including taking opportunities to provide better facilities for users, this area has significant lengths of footpaths that will be affected by the development of 190 houses on land south west of Draycott. Open space and recreation. NPPF102. Access to a network of high quality open spaces would be reduced by this application and our opportunities for physical activity and health and wellbeing would be adversely affected
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Dr Shelagh Brown	Response-01158	The plan is being rushed through with only the minimum time allowed for public consultation.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Dudley Medhurst	Response-01180	There are much better sites that can be used especially current brownfield sites. There are also houses for sale in Draycott at the moment which you could class as affordable housing but they are not selling. It's not houses we need its cheaper taxes and energy.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Francis Ian Scott	Response-01535	Only the bare minimum consultation has been undertaken by EBC with the local residence of Draycott. The six week consultation period is not sufficient when considering the share size of the development and impact on the village, and is not sufficient time for the local parish and residence to develop a set of objections. When two weeks of the consultation period was across Easter half term and the consultation window included 4 Bank Holidays. This when much of the information required was not available and FOI requests were submitted and took 20 working days for a response to be received, when the government agencies contacted themselves did not work the said Bank Holidays. This has meant important information has not been received by residents when developing objections. This action by the EBC was irresponsible, some may say planned, and not acting in the interests of the local communities this plan impacts. I strongly object to the consultation process which as best can be described as limited and not fully transparent when engaging with the local community. EBC has only given local residents mere 6 weeks to submit objections to what is an incredibly important change to the original Local Plan and Core Strategy. This is simply not enough time for residents to review and analysis the share magnitude of information and formulate objections, this when significant information is also missing which includes the master plan for the land south west of Draycott. The manner in which EBC has undertaken the 6 week consultation is not inclusive and does not allow non internet users to be aware of the consultation and changes to the Core Strategy. The average age within Draycott and Church Wile Parish is 58 and there is a large proportion of the community that was not aware of this important change. We fully object to the whole process and in particular the 6 week consultation period. I strongly object to the significant changes EBC plan to make to its Core Strategy and the reclassification of the land south west of Draycott to Grey Belt. It is widely accepted that the Grey Belt policy has been implemented in a rushed and incoherent manner, which is reflected in the EBCs hastily revised Core Strategic Review and a clear lack of transparency and community consultation. The policy is likely to have little to no impact on achieving the government's target of 1.5 million new homes by the end of the current Parliament but threatens to destroy currently protected green spaces. I strongly do not believe these plans are in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, and the Erewash Borough Councils (EBC) Local Plan 2022. I also do not believe that adequate consultation has been undertaken by EBC with the Draycott Local Parish Council or residents on these plans, and the impact they will have on the local community, wider village and amenity. Furthermore, the development plans plus the proposed National Grids pylon corridor which has been identified as only being circa 600 meters away from this development, will mean the south west of Draycott will be unrealistically overburdened with development impacting Green Belt land. As residents living next to the site of the proposed change in Green Belt status and future housing development, we are of the view that these proposals will have a serious negative impact on the village, visual openness, spatial openness, the local community and our standard of living. I strongly object to the Sustaina

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Francis Ian Scott	Response-01535	<p>bility Assessment which was undertaken by the EBC when assessing the land south west of Draycott. The EBC assessment scored this land as +3 with a ranking of joint 3rd place, when our independent review using professionals and informed local residents resulted in a score of -6 placing this land ran 20th. When reviewed, clear and obvious errors have been made where the EBC has underplayed and positively scored key questions incorrectly to achieve a desired outcome. For example, 9.1: Will it make efficient use of brownfield land? the EBC states that it will not as the site is entirely Greenfield and we know there over 109 Brownfield sites in EBC. Yet the EBC only gives this question a -1 when it should surely receive an at least a Minor Negative -2 score. Question 16.5: Will it protect the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land? the EBC itself states the land south west of Draycott 'Agricultural Land Classification Grade 2 so is of reasonable quality' and this scheme will not therefore protect the BMV. Yet the EBC has scored it only -1. This in our view should be a Minor Negative -2 as there is limited Grade 2 land within the area with most being Grade 3 &amp; 4. Furthermore, question 16.6: Will it prevent the loss of greenfield land to development? the EBC itself states that 'No, the site is Greenfield in its classification so development would not prevent the loss of greenfield land. The limited scale of site limits this negative impact', yet the site is over 8H of Greenfield Grade 2 quality land and only awards a -1. This is our view should received a -2 or even a -3 as this development will have a significant impact on the Greenfield land and its surrounding areas. Questions 2.2 and 2.1 relate to employment and EBC advises that this scheme will not boost employment in the local area due to its limited scale yet award neutral 0' to both questions. Surely these questions should receive -1 as they fail to deliver on the question. Furthermore, questions such as 14.4, 15.2, 15.3, 15.4, 16.1 and 16.2 are all speculative in their answer as they relate to the developer delivering on certain sustainable aspects which can not possibly be scored at this time. Overall, we strongly object to the EBC Sustainability Assessment and would call for this to be independently reviewed. The current housing target which drives the need to develop on the Green Belt is flawed and needs to be changed. It is based on over inflated housing targets that are not realistic, which puts pressure on local authorities to disregard the impact such developments have on local communities and villages to purely meet statistical objectives. This can be seen with the c.17% increase in the population of Draycott if the development of 190 houses goes ahead. This would also be further compounded when the safeguarded land is developed adding an additional c70 houses. This increase and expansion is unrealistic and reckless. Noise from the construction (including vehicle movements) and operational phases of the proposed development have not been adequately addressed. An environment noise assessment needs to be carried out, particularly for the residents directly opposite the site entrance; but also the whole route that the construction traffic will take. This passes through Draycott, Borrow ash and Beaston villages. Passing busy junctions, Doctor's surgeries, public car parks, Primary schools, local cricket clubs as well as numerous resident's homes. Require the submission of</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Francis Ian Scott	Response-01535	<p>an environmental noise assessment, prior to development works commencing, to rate and assess operational sound from all fixed installations comprising mechanical and electrical plant and equipment, with a scheme of mitigation measures where necessary; that all site preparation and construction to comply with specified working hours and limits to noise and dust emissions, waste disposal and lighting; and the submission of proposals, including the design and operating times, of any permanent external lighting on site. Access and egress to the proposed housing development on Derby Road raises several issues relating to highway and pedestrian safety, ease of access and disruption from increased traffic. The use of long/heavy goods vehicles should be prohibited due to the significant amount of Grade I and II listed buildings in the vicinity of the proposed development on land south west of Draycott. This will include Nooning Lane Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1417622 and Hopwell Road Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1087963. Noise and Vibration consultation to be undertaken to consider impacts during construction on nearby noise sensitive properties and ongoing management of a solar farm and the impact of noise and disturbance. Loss of open space and green spaces ? this is vital for our community's wellbeing Primary School affected with noise and traffic The footpaths that cross the land have amazing views and are used regularly by residents and visitors. The recent pandemic years have shown us that we need space to exercise and be at peace with ourselves and nature, for our own mental wellbeing. This development will have the effect, that anyone using the path would not benefit from the current sprawling Greenbelt views as it will be gone forever. It will have a detrimental effect on the wellbeing of people who enjoy the countryside, not to mention wildlife habitats, which are already under extreme pressure. The recent pandemic has highlighted the valuable and regular use of these footpaths, promoting and fostering good mental health. This land is rural in character, providing a tranquil transitional landscape between the rural areas of Draycott Parish, and the small villages surrounding it of Borrowash and Breaston. It is the wrong model in the wrong place to deliver the EBC's housing needs being of a scale that is ultimately detrimental to the local landscape and will harm the countryside, wildlife and impact irreversibly upon the area and its residents. Footpaths, the Amenity and enjoyment of the use of these pathways which cross through and around this site which provide an important means by which residents of the local villages can get access to the countryside with substantial benefits for their physical and mental health as well as providing means of sustainable transport. For the people of Draycott and other areas, this will have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, replacing green space with 190 houses. The sheer scale of the proposed site will have such an irreversible effect on the landscape. The land/footpaths will be surrounded by housing which will render the land unusable by residents whom rely on it as an area to escape and relax. These footpaths are well-used by many people for physical and mental health. This may seem insignificant to others however, residents rely on this land to enable freedom and a work life balance, which will be lost as result of development on this g</p>

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Francis Ian Scott	Response-01535	reen belt. Footpaths although still evident on the plan will no longer be enjoyed by families maintaining their ongoing mental health, health and well-being as they will not have the same enjoyment having to walk through a housing estate. NPPF 8. Promoting healthy and safe communities:- 104. Planning policies and decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and access, including taking opportunities to provide better facilities for users, this area has significant lengths of footpaths that will be affected by the development of 190 houses on land south west of Draycott. Promoting healthy and safe communities the effect on our healthy lifestyles, especially our local health and well-being needs ? taking away our green space and facility would be detrimental to our community and our day to day needs would fall short by the loss of our valued facilities Open space and recreation. NPPF102. Access to a network of high quality open spaces would be reduced by this application and our opportunities for physical activity and health and wellbeing would be adversely affected There would be a detrimental effect on the Carbon Sink opportunities by the loss of open land and the effects of a housing development Only the bare minimum consultation has been undertaken by EBC with the local residence of Draycott. The six week consultation period is not sufficient when considering the share size of the development and impact on the village, and is not sufficient time for the local parish and residence to develop a set of objections. When two weeks of the consultation period was across easter. This action by the EBC was irresponsible and not acting in the interests of the local communities this plan impacts. To improve local accessibility to healthcare, education, employment, retail facilities and recreational resources including open spaces to enhance wellbeing and promote healthy and sustainable lifestyles. This application will have a negative effect on both wellbeing and health including mental and emotional wellbeing. To create safe and attractive places which contribute towards quality of life and community cohesion. This project will significantly detrimentally impact on the quality of life and fragment the community who use this area as a community facility. Including educational opportunities for local schools.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Gail Holdsworth	Response-00937	. This building proposal will totally change the look and community feel of Draycott. It will no longer be a village in a rural setting. It will create major negative changes to the area and I cannot see anything positive about the proposals. It is too many houses to add to such a small village. Once Draycott is destroyed by overdevelopment on protected land it will be lost forever. Plus there is the whole, probably , years long building work of noise and disruption and the possibility that the one bus we have will have to be rerouted.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Gary Siddall	Response-01237	For reasons I do not profess to understand, there are clearly brown field and grey belt sites which have apparently been skipped straight over in order to somehow attempt to justify building on wholly unsuitable beautiful Green Belt land. It is widely accepted that the Grey Belt policy has been implemented in a rushed and incoherent manner, which is reflected in the EBCs hastily revised Core Strategic Review and a clear lack of transparency and community consultation (despite claims to the contrary).. This consultation process has been "pushed through" with only the bare minimum time afforded to the residents of Draycott to absorb, investigate and comment. EBC have not exactly been "understanding" when considering residents feelings and concerns in this matter, considering that many residents who maybe don't use Social Media, etc, were unaware of all this - yet EBC still refused to allow an extended 12 weeks consultation time. Also, some of the comments about residents could be taken as disrespectful. EBC have also not been "helpful", in what could be seen as "dragging their feet" with things like taking 20 days to return FOI requests, etc. It is clear where their interests lie and they are certainly not impartial.... I strongly do not believe these plans are in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, and the Erewash Borough Councils (EBC) Local Plan 2022. I also do not believe that adequate consultation has been undertaken by EBC with the Draycott Local Parish Council or residents on these plans, and the impact they will have on the local community, wider village and amenity. Furthermore, the development plans plus the proposed National Grids pylon corridor which has been identified as only being circa 600 meters away from this development, will mean the south west of Draycott will be unrealistically overburdened with development impacting Green Belt land. Just during the construction process ("if" it should go ahead - which by now should be obvious that it really shouldn't), the sheer amount of construction traffic that will be in and around the area will be HUGE ! And not just the proposed construction in Draycott, but in the surrounding villages as well: All of the construction vehicles, delivery trucks and other site vehicles will already be giving the roads more of a pounding than they have ever had, potentially spreading mud and dirt on them too (clogging drains...?), for some distance - not to mention all the potentially damaging vibration they will bring to all the roads in the area. Which leads me to construction pollution - the dust, fumes, smoke, etc., and especially the noise which the closer residents (and wildlife) will be forced to endure for years while all this goes on (if it ever gets finished...?!). Not acceptable. It is known that there are around 2,000 vacant Social Housing properties in Derbyshire county - why are these not being prioritised over new building ???

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	George Foster	Response-01199	I strongly object to the consultation process which as best can be described as limited and not fully transparent when engaging with the local community. EBC has only given local residents mere 6 weeks to submit objections to what is an incredibly important change to the original Local Plan and Core Strategy. This is simply not enough time for residents to review and analysis the share magnitude of information and formulate objections, this when significant information is also missing which includes the master plan for the land south west of Draycott. Only the bare minimum consultation has been undertaken by EBC with the local residence of Draycott. The six week consultation period is not sufficient when considering the share size of the development and impact on the village, and is not sufficient time for the local parish and residence to develop a set of objections. When two weeks of the consultation period was across easter half term and the consultation window included 4 Bank Holidays. This when much of the information required was not available and FOI requests were submitted and took 20 working days for a response to be received, when the government agencies contacted themselves did not work the said Bank Holidays. This has meant important information has not been received by residents when developing objections. This action by the EBC was irresponsible, some may say planned, and not acting in the interests of the local communities this plan impacts. There are around 2000 vacant social housing in Derbyshire County. Why are these houses not being prioritised ahead of this land being used for development. The manner in which EBC has undertaken the 6 week consultation is not inclusive and does not allow non internet users to be aware of the consultation and changes to the Core Strategy. The average age within Draycott and Church Wile Parish is 58 and there is a large proportion of the community that was not aware of this important change. We fully object to the whole process and in particular the 6 week consultation period. I strongly object to the significant changes EBC plan to make to its Core Strategy and the reclassification of the land south west of Draycott to Grey Belt. It is widely accepted that the Grey Belt policy has been implemented in a rushed and incoherent manner, which is reflected in the EBCs hastily revised Core Strategic Review and a clear lack of transparency and community consultation. The policy is likely to have little to no impact on achieving the government's target of 1.5 million new homes by the end of the current Parliament but threatens to destroy currently protected green spaces. I strongly do not believe these plans are in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, and the Erewash Borough Councils (EBC) Local Plan 2022. I also do not believe that adequate consultation has been undertaken by EBC with the Draycott Local Parish Council or residents on these plans, and the impact they will have on the local community, wider village and amenity. Furthermore, the development plans plus the proposed National Grids pylon corridor which has been identified as only being circa 600 meters away from this development, will mean the south west of Draycott will be unrealistically overburdened with development impacting Green Belt land. As residents living next to the site of the proposed change in Green Belt status and future housing development, we are of the view that these proposals will have a
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	George Foster	Response-01199	serious negative impact on the village, visual openness, spatial openness, the local community and our standard of living. I strongly object to the Sustainability Assessment which was undertaken by the EBC when assessing the land south west of Draycott. The EBC assessment scored this land as +3 with a ranking of joint 3rd place, when our independent review using professionals and informed local residents resulted in a score of -6 placing this land ran 20th. When reviewed, clear and obvious errors have been made where the EBC has underplayed and positively scored key questions incorrectly to achieve a desired outcome. For example, 9.1: Will it make efficient use of brownfield land? the EBC states that it will not as the site is entirely Greenfield and we know there over 109 Brownfield sites in EBC. Yet the EBC only gives this question a -1 when it should surely receive an at least a Minor Negative -2 score. Question 16.5: Will it protect the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land? the EBC itself states the land south west of Draycott 'Agricultural Land Classification Grade 2 so is of reasonable quality' and this scheme will not therefore protect the BMV. Yet the EBC has scored it only -1. This in our view should be a Minor Negative -2 as there is limited Grade 2 land within the area with most being Grade 3 & 4. Furthermore, question 16.6: Will it prevent the loss of greenfield land to development? the EBC itself states that 'No, the site is Greenfield in its classification so development would not prevent the loss of greenfield land. The limited scale of site limits this negative impact', yet the site is over 8H of Greenfield Grade 2 quality land and only awards a -1. This is our view should received a -2 or even a -3 as this development will have a significant impact on the Greenfield land and its surrounding areas. Questions 2.2 and 2.1 relate to employment and EBC advises that this scheme will not boost employment in the local area due to its limited scale yet award neutral 0' to both questions. Surely these questions should receive -1 as they fail to deliver on the question. Furthermore, questions such as 14.4, 15.2, 15.3, 15.4, 16.1 and 16.2 are all speculative in their answer as they relate to the developer delivering on certain sustainable aspects which can not possibly be scored at this time. Overall, we strongly object to the EBC Sustainability Assessment and would call for this to be independently reviewed. The current housing target which drives the need to develop on the Green Belt is flawed and needs to be changed. It is based on over inflated housing targets that are not realistic, which puts pressure on local authorities to disregard the impact such developments have on local communities and villages to purely meet statistical objectives. This can be seen with the c.17% increase in the population of Draycott if the development of 190 houses goes ahead. This would also be further compounded when the safeguarded land is developed adding an additional c70 houses. This increase and expansion is unrealistic and reckless.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Gill Trickitt	Response-01157	Access to the fields, the bridge as you enter the village, the danger to add possibly 400 cars coming in and out. The site being a location for another fatal accident a few years ago when a motorcyclist died and the bridge causing a lack of visibility as people already speed in and through the village.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Gordon Dahill	Response-00690	CONNCIL COMMUNICATION WITH PUBLIC When we finaly receive information it is LATE often MISLEADING and INACCURATE. Some replys to public queries ARROGENT CODESCENDING and SMOKE and MIRRORS.This sort of treatment and attitude from the council is not acceptable and would hope measures will be taken seriously in the future. NPPF GOLDEN RULES Two of these rules appear to be relevent to the situation. 1) .To prevent unrestricted urban sprawl. 2).To assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment. Draycott is a small village .It has already had two large industrial buildings converted to housing .Also several other areas of small estates of housing within the Draycott village boundaries. This change of GREEN to GREY was the last green area within the village boundary 3)This developed area will be,apart from field between Draycott and Borrowash will complete the joining of Nottingham and Derby.
			Graham Wakeling	Response-01238	Simply this proposed development cannot be allowed to go ahead. Regards, a local resident of 16 years.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	James Hargreaves	Response-01315	I moved away from a city to live in a village- this development will impact upon my quality of life and mental and physical well being
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	James Whyman	Response-01551	1 Only the bare minimum consultation has been undertaken by EBC with the local residence of Draycott. The six week consultation period is not sufficient when considering the share size of the development and impact on the village, and is not sufficient time for the local parish and residence to develop a set of objections. When two weeks of the consultation period was across easter half term and the consultation window included 4 Bank Holidays. This when much of the information required was not available and FOI requests were submitted and took 20 working days for a response to be received, when the government agencies contacted themselves did not work the said Bank Holidays. This has meant important information has not been received by residents when developing objections. This action by the EBC was irresponsible, some may say planned, and not acting in the interests of the local communities this plan impacts. 2 I strongly object to the consultation process which as best can be described as limited and not fully transparent when engaging with the local community. EBC has only given local residents mere 6 weeks to submit objections to what is an incredibly important change to the original Local Plan and Core Strategy. This is simply not enough time for residents to review and analysis the share magnitude of information and formulate objections, this when significant information is also missing which includes the master plan for the land south west of Draycott. 3 The manner in which EBC has undertaken the 6 week consultation is not inclusive and does not allow non internet users to be aware of the consultation and changes to the Core Strategy. The average age within Draycott and Church Wile Parish is 58 and there is a large proportion of the community that was not aware of this important change. We fully object to the whole process and in particular the 6 week consultation period. 4 I strongly object to the significant changes EBC plan to make to its Core Strategy and the reclassification of the land south west of Draycott to Grey Belt. It is widely accepted that the Grey Belt policy has been implemented in a rushed and incoherent manner, which is reflected in the EBCs hastily revised Core Strategic Review and a clear lack of transparency and community consultation. The policy is likely to have little to no impact on achieving the government's target of 1.5 million new homes by the end of the current Parliament but threatens to destroy currently protected green spaces. 5 I strongly do not believe these plans are in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, and the Erewash Borough Councils (EBC) Local Plan 2022. I also do not believe that adequate consultation has been undertaken by EBC with the Draycott Local Parish Council or residents on these plans, and the impact they will have on the local community, wider village and amenity. Furthermore, the development plans plus the proposed National Grids pylon corridor which has been identified as only being circa 600 meters away from this development, will mean the south west of Draycott will be unrealistically overburdened with development impacting Green Belt land. 6 As residents living next to the site of the proposed change in Green Belt status and future housing development, we are of the view that these proposals will have a serious negative impact on the village, visual openness, spatial openness, the local community and our standard of living. I strongly object to



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	James Whyman	Response-01551	the Sustainability Assessment which was undertaken by the EBC when assessing the land south west of Draycott. The EBC assessment scored this land as +3 with a ranking of joint 3rd place, when our independent review using professionals and informed local residents resulted in a score of -6 placing this land ran 20th. When reviewed, clear and obvious errors have been made where the EBC has underplayed and positively scored key questions incorrectly to achieve a desired outcome. For example, 9.1: Will it make efficient use of brownfield land? the EBC states that it will not as the site is entirely Greenfield and we know there over 109 Brownfield sites in EBC. Yet the EBC only gives this question a -1 when it should surely receive an at least a Minor Negative -2 score. Question 16.5: Will it protect the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land? the EBC itself states the land south west of Draycott 'Agricultural Land Classification Grade 2 so is of reasonable quality' and this scheme will not therefore protect the BMV. Yet the EBC has scored it only -1. This in our view should be a Minor Negative -2 as there is limited Grade 2 land within the area with most being Grade 3 & 4. Furthermore, question 16.6: Will it prevent the loss of greenfield land to development? the EBC itself states that 'No, the site is Greenfield in its classification so development would not prevent the loss of greenfield land. The limited scale of site limits this negative impact', yet the site is over 8H of Greenfield Grade 2 quality land and only awards a -1. This is our view should received a -2 or even a -3 as this development will have a significant impact on the Greenfield land and its surrounding areas. Questions 2.2 and 2.1 relate to employment and EBC advises that this scheme will not boost employment in the local area due to its limited scale yet award neutral 0' to both questions. Surely these questions should receive -1 as they fail to deliver on the question. Furthermore, questions such as 14.4, 15.2, 15.3, 15.4, 16.1 and 16.2 are all speculative in their answer as they relate to the developer delivering on certain sustainable aspects which can not possibly be scored at this time. Overall, we strongly object to the EBC Sustainability Assessment and would call for this to be independently reviewed. 7 The current housing target which drives the need to develop on the Green Belt is flawed and needs to be changed. It is based on over inflated housing targets that are not realistic, which puts pressure on local authorities to disregard the impact such developments have on local communities and villages to purely meet statistical objectives. This can be seen with the c.17% increase in the population of Draycott if the development of 190 houses goes ahead. This would also be further compounded when the safeguarded land is developed adding an additional c70 houses. This increase and expansion is unrealistic and reckless. 8 There are around 2000 vacant social housing in Derbyshire County. Why are these houses not being prioritised ahead of this land being used for development. 9 Noise from the construction (including vehicle movements) and operational phases of the proposed development have not been adequately addressed. 10 An environment noise assessment needs to be carried out, particularly for the residents directly opposite the site entrance; but also the whole route that the construction traffic will take. This passes through Draycott, Borrow ash and Bea
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	James Whyman	Response-01551	ston villages. Passing busy junctions, Doctor?s surgeries, public car parks, Primary schools, local cricket clubs as well as numerous resident?s homes. 11 Require the submission of an environmental noise assessment, prior to development works commencing, to rate and assess operational sound from all fixed installations comprising mechanical and electrical plant and equipment, with a scheme of mitigation measures where necessary; that all site preparation and construction to comply with specified working hours and limits to noise and dust emissions, waste disposal and lighting; and the submission of proposals, including the design and operating times, of any permanent external lighting on site. 12 Access and egress to the proposed housing development on Derby Road raises several issues relating to highway and pedestrian safety, ease of access and disruption from increased traffic. 13 The use of long/heavy goods vehicles should be prohibited due to the significant amount of Grade I and II listed buildings in the vicinity of the proposed development on land south west of Draycott. This will include Nooning Lane Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1417622 and Hopwell Road Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1087963. 14 Noise and Vibration consultation to be undertaken to consider impacts during construction on nearby noise sensitive properties and ongoing management of a solar farm and the impact of noise and disturbance.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Jane Barker	Response-01178	We are forever being told that for our own health and wellbeing that we should get out into the countryside more. Our councils and government now think otherwise and want to build on it and delete all of our countryside forever. Enough is enough. We must think and do better than this.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	J Morgan	Response-01847	We strongly object to the consultation process, which has been limited and not fully transparent. Erewash Borough Council (EBC) has only given local residents the minimum six-week period to submit objections to this significant change to the Local Plan and Core Strategy. This timeframe is insufficient for residents to review and understand the magnitude of the change and formulate objections, especially given the missing details such as the master plan for the land south west of Draycott. These plans do not align with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024 and EBC Local Plan 2022. Furthermore, adequate consultation has not been undertaken with the Draycott Local Parish Council or residents regarding the impact of these plans on the local community, village, and amenity. Noise from construction and operational phases of the development has not been adequately addressed. An environmental noise assessment needs to be carried out, particularly for residents living adjacent and opposite the site entrance.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Jonathan Childs	Response-01117	<p>Only the bare minimum consultation has been undertaken by EBC with the local residents of Draycott. The six week consultation period is not sufficient when considering the sheer size of the development and its impact on the village, and does not afford sufficient time for the local parish council and residents to develop a set of objections. Two weeks of the consultation period was across Easter half term and the consultation window included 4 Bank Holidays. This when much of the information required was not available and FOI requests were submitted and took 20 working days for a response to be received, while the government agencies involved did not work the said Bank Holidays. This has meant important information has not been received by residents when developing objections. This action by the EBC was irresponsible at the very least ? some may say planned ? and clearly not acting in the interests of the local communities this plan impacts. Similarly, it would appear that the scale of response was woefully under-estimated by the council, this testified by the inability to accommodate those who attempted to attend the Special Meeting called to present the matter. Also, most of the information circulated by EBC was presented in quite an exclusive way and on the assumption that everyone interested would be both computer-literate AND have unlimited internet access and capability. I strongly do not believe these plans are in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, and the Erewash Borough Councils (EBC) Local Plan 2022. I also do not believe that adequate consultation has been undertaken by EBC with the Draycott Local Parish Council or residents on these plans, and the impact they will have on the local community, wider village and amenity. Furthermore, the development plans plus the proposed National Grids pylon corridor which has been identified as only being circa 600 meters away from this development, will mean the south west of Draycott will be unrealistically overburdened with development impacting Green Belt land. I strongly object to the Sustainability Assessment which was undertaken by the EBC when assessing the land south west of Draycott. The EBC assessment scored this land as +3 with a ranking of joint 3rd place, when our independent review using professionals and informed local residents resulted in a score of -6 placing this land ran 20th. When reviewed, clear and obvious errors have been made where the EBC has underplayed and positively scored key questions incorrectly to achieve a desired outcome. For example, 9.1: Will it make efficient use of brownfield land? the EBC states that it will not as the site is entirely Greenfield and we know there over 109 Brownfield sites in EBC. Yet the EBC only gives this question a -1 when it should surely receive an at least a Minor Negative -2 score. Question 16.5: Will it protect the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land? the EBC itself states the land south west of Draycott 'Agricultural Land Classification Grade 2 so is of reasonable quality' and this scheme will not therefore protect the BMV. Yet the EBC has scored it only -1. This in our view should be a Minor Negative -2 as there is limited Grade 2 land within the area with most being Grade 3 &amp; 4. Furthermore, question 16.6: Will it prevent the loss of greenfield land to development? the EBC itself states that 'No, the site is Greenfield in its classification so development would not prevent the loss o</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Jonathan Childs	Response-01117	<p>f greenfield land. The limited scale of site limits this negative impact', yet the site is over 8H of Greenfield Grade 2 quality land and only awards a -1. This is our view should received a -2 or even a -3 as this development will have a significant impact on the Greenfield land and its surrounding areas. Questions 2.2 and 2.1 relate to employment and EBC advises that this scheme will not boost employment in the local area due to its limited scale yet award neutral 0' to both questions. Surely these questions should receive -1 as they fail to deliver on the question. Furthermore, questions such as 14.4, 15.2, 15.3, 15.4, 16.1 and 16.2 are all speculative in their answer as they relate to the developer delivering on certain sustainable aspects which can not possibly be scored at this time. Overall, we strongly object to the EBC Sustainability Assessment and would call for this to be independently reviewed. The current housing target which drives the need to develop on the Green Belt is flawed and needs to be changed. It is based on over inflated housing targets that are not realistic, which puts pressure on local authorities to disregard the impact such developments have on local communities and villages to purely meet statistical objectives. This can be seen with the c.17% increase in the population of Draycott if the development of 190 houses goes ahead. This would also be further compounded when the safeguarded land is developed adding an additional c70 houses. This increase and expansion is unrealistic and reckless. Noise from the construction (including vehicle movements) and operational phases of the proposed development have not been adequately addressed. An environment noise assessment needs to be carried out, particularly for the residents directly opposite the site entrance; but also the whole route that the construction traffic will take. The proposal requires the submission of an environmental noise assessment, prior to development works commencing to rate and assess operational sound from all fixed installations comprising mechanical and electrical plant and equipment, with a scheme of mitigation measures where necessary; and defined conditions such that all site preparation and construction to comply with specified working hours and limits to noise and dust emissions, waste disposal and lighting; and the submission of proposals, including the design and operating times, of any permanent external lighting on site. Access and egress to the proposed housing development on Derby Road raises several issues relating to highway and pedestrian safety, ease of access and disruption from increased traffic as discussed in more detail elsewhere in my stated objections. The use of long/heavy goods vehicles should be prohibited due to the significant amount of Grade I and II listed buildings in the vicinity of the proposed development on land south west of Draycott. This will include Nooning Lane Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1417622 and Noise and Vibration consultation to be undertaken to consider impacts during construction on nearby noise sensitive properties. It is conspicuously notable that no mention has been made of any proposals for to compensate adjacent residents (should the development proceed) for loss of value to their properties, loss of visual amenity as our vistas and green spaces are destroyed and the sheer inconvenience and intrusion of large scale construction work taking place over a protracted p</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Jonathan Childs	Response-01117	<p>eriod of time. It has been bad enough at times being subjected to the ?side effects? of the private Derby Road development which will be utterly trivialised should this proposed large-scale development be allowed to proceed.</p>

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Judith Boyle	Response-01418	I strongly object to the significant changes EBC plan to make to its Core Strategy and the reclassification of the land south west of Draycott to Grey Belt. It is widely accepted that the Grey Belt policy has been implemented in a rushed and incoherent manner, which is reflected in the EBCs hastily revised Core Strategic Review and a clear lack of transparency and community consultation. The policy is likely to have little to no impact on achieving the government's target of 1.5 million new homes by the end of the current Parliament but threatens to destroy currently protected green spaces.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Juliet Macve	Response-01572	I strongly object to the consultation process which as best can be described as limited and not fully transparent when engaging with the local community. EBC has only given local residents mere 6 weeks to submit objections to what is an incredibly important change to the original Local Plan and Core Strategy. This is simply not enough time for residents to review and analysis the share magnitude of information and formulate objections, this when significant information is also missing which includes the master plan for the land south west of Draycott. As a resident living close to the site of the proposed change in Green Belt status and future housing development, I am of the view that these proposals will have a serious negative impact on the village, visual openness, spatial openness, the local community, the risk of flooding and my standard of living.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Karla Williams	Response-00077	A good size LEAP on site would be good but a LAP would be pointless and money better spent improving the existing park in the village.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Katie May	Response-01518	Only the bare minimum consultation has been undertaken by EBC with the local residence of Draycott. The six week consultation period is not sufficient when considering the share size of the development and impact on the village, and is not sufficient time for the local parish and residence to develop a set of objections. When two weeks of the consultation period was across easter half term and the consultation window included 4 Bank Holidays. This when much of the information required was not available and FOI requests were submitted and took 20 working days for a response to be received, when the government agencies contacted themselves did not work the said Bank Holidays. This has meant important information has not been received by residents when developing objections. This action by the EBC was irresponsible, some may say planned, and not acting in the interests of the local communities this plan impacts. I strongly object to the consultation process which as best can be described as limited and not fully transparent when engaging with the local community. EBC has only given local residents mere 6 weeks to submit objections to what is an incredibly important change to the original Local Plan and Core Strategy. This is simply not enough time for residents to review and analysis the share magnitude of information and formulate objections, this when significant information is also missing which includes the master plan for the land south west of Draycott. The manner in which EBC has undertaken the 6 week consultation is not inclusive and does not allow non internet users to be aware of the consultation and changes to the Core Strategy. The average age within Draycott and Church Wile Parish is 58 and there is a large proportion of the community that was not aware of this important change. We fully object to the whole process and in particular the 6 week consultation period. I strongly object to the significant changes EBC plan to make to its Core Strategy and the reclassification of the land south west of Draycott to Grey Belt. It is widely accepted that the Grey Belt policy has been implemented in a rushed and incoherent manner, which is reflected in the EBCs hastily revised Core Strategic Review and a clear lack of transparency and community consultation. The policy is likely to have little to no impact on achieving the government's target of 1.5 million new homes by the end of the current Parliament but threatens to destroy currently protected green spaces. I strongly do not believe these plans are in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, and the Erewash Borough Councils (EBC) Local Plan 2022. I also do not believe that adequate consultation has been undertaken by EBC with the Draycott Local Parish Council or residents on these plans, and the impact they will have on the local community, wider village and amenity. Furthermore, the development plans plus the proposed National Grids pylon corridor which has been identified as only being circa 600 meters away from this development, will mean the south west of Draycott will be unrealistically overburdened with development impacting Green Belt land. As residents living next to the site of the proposed change in Green Belt status and future housing development, we are of the view that these proposals will have a serious negative impact on the village, visual openness, spatial openness, the local community and our standard of living. I strongly object to the Sustaina

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Late May	Response-01518	<p>bility Assessment which was undertaken by the EBC when assessing the land south west of Draycott. The EBC assessment scored this land as +3 with a ranking of joint 3rd place, when our independent review using professionals and informed local residents resulted in a score of -6 placing this land ran 20th. When reviewed, clear and obvious errors have been made where the EBC has underplayed and positively scored key questions incorrectly to achieve a desired outcome. For example, 9.1: Will it make efficient use of brownfield land? the EBC states that it will not as the site is entirely Greenfield and we know there over 109 Brownfield sites in EBC. Yet the EBC only gives this question a -1 when it should surely receive an at least a Minor Negative -2 score. Question 16.5: Will it protect the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land? the EBC itself states the land south west of Draycott 'Agricultural Land Classification Grade 2 so is of reasonable quality' and this scheme will not therefore protect the BMV. Yet the EBC has scored it only -1. This in our view should be a Minor Negative -2 as there is limited Grade 2 land within the area with most being Grade 3 &amp; 4. Furthermore, question 16.6: Will it prevent the loss of greenfield land to development? the EBC itself states that 'No, the site is Greenfield in its classification so development would not prevent the loss of greenfield land. The limited scale of site limits this negative impact', yet the site is over 8H of Greenfield Grade 2 quality land and only awards a -1. This is our view should received a -2 or even a -3 as this development will have a significant impact on the Greenfield land and its surrounding areas. Questions 2.2 and 2.1 relate to employment and EBC advises that this scheme will not boost employment in the local area due to its limited scale yet award neutral 0' to both questions. Surely these questions should receive -1 as they fail to deliver on the question. Furthermore, questions such as 14.4, 15.2, 15.3, 15.4, 16.1 and 16.2 are all speculative in their answer as they relate to the developer delivering on certain sustainable aspects which can not possibly be scored at this time. Overall, we strongly object to the EBC Sustainability Assessment and would call for this to be independently reviewed. The current housing target which drives the need to develop on the Green Belt is flawed and needs to be changed. It is based on over inflated housing targets that are not realistic, which puts pressure on local authorities to disregard the impact such developments have on local communities and villages to purely meet statistical objectives. This can be seen with the c.17% increase in the population of Draycott if the development of 190 houses goes ahead. This would also be further compounded when the safeguarded land is developed adding an additional c70 houses. This increase and expansion is unrealistic and reckless. There are around 2000 vacant social housing in Derbyshire County. Why are these houses not being prioritised ahead of this land being used for development. Noise from the construction (including vehicle movements) and operational phases of the proposed development have not been adequately addressed. An environment noise assessment needs to be carried out, particularly for the residents directly opposite the site entrance; but also the whole route that the construction traffic will take. This passes through Draycott, Borrow ash and Beaston villages. Passin</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Late May	Response-01518	<p>g busy junctions, Doctor?s surgeries, public car parks, Primary schools, local cricket clubs as well as numerous resident?s homes. Require the submission of an environmental noise assessment, prior to development works commencing, to rate and assess operational sound from all fixed installations comprising mechanical and electrical plant and equipment, with a scheme of mitigation measures where necessary; that all site preparation and construction to comply with specified working hours and limits to noise and dust emissions, waste disposal and lighting; and the submission of proposals, including the design and operating times, of any permanent external lighting on site. Access and egress to the proposed housing development on Derby Road raises several issues relating to highway and pedestrian safety, ease of access and disruption from increased traffic. The use of long/heavy goods vehicles should be prohibited due to the significant amount of Grade I and II listed buildings in the vicinity of the proposed development on land south west of Draycott. This will include Nooning Lane Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1417622 and Hopwell Road Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1087963. Noise and Vibration consultation to be undertaken to consider impacts during construction on nearby noise sensitive properties and ongoing management of a solar farm and the impact of noise and disturbance. Loss of open space and green spaces ? this is vital for our community?s wellbeing Primary School affected with noise and traffic The footpaths that cross the land have amazing views and are used regularly by residents and visitors. The recent pandemic years have shown us that we need space to exercise and be at peace with ourselves and nature, for our own mental wellbeing. This development will have the effect, that anyone using the path would not benefit from the current sprawling Greenbelt views as it will be gone forever. It will have a detrimental effect on the wellbeing of people who enjoy the countryside, not to mention wildlife habitats, which are already under extreme pressure. The recent pandemic has highlighted the valuable and regular use of these footpaths, promoting and fostering good mental health. This land is rural in character, providing a tranquil transitional landscape between the rural areas of Draycott Parish, and the small villages surrounding it of Borrowash and Breaston. It is the wrong model in the wrong place to deliver the EBCs housing needs being of a scale that is ultimately detrimental to the local landscape and will harm the countryside, wildlife and impact irreversibly upon the area and its residents. Footpaths, the Amenity and enjoyment of the use of these pathways which cross through and around this site which provide an important means by which residents of the local villages can get access to the countryside with substantial benefits for their physical and mental health as well as providing means of sustainable transport. For the people of Draycott and other areas, this will have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, replacing green space with 190 houses. The sheer scale of the proposed site will have such an irreversible effect on the landscape. The land/footpaths will be surrounded by housing which will render the land unusable by residents whom rely on it as an area to escape and relax. These footpaths are well-used by many people for physical and mental health. This may seem i</p>

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Steve May	Response-01518	<p>nsignificant to others however, residents rely on this land to enable freedom and a work life balance, which will be lost as result of development on this green belt. Footpaths although still evident on the plan will no longer be enjoyed by families maintaining their ongoing mental health, health and well-being as they will not have the same enjoyment having to walk through a housing estate. NPPF 8. Promoting healthy and safe communities:- 104. Planning policies and decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and access, including taking opportunities to provide better facilities for users, this area has significant lengths of footpaths that will be affected by the development of 190 houses on land south west of Draycott. Promoting healthy and safe communities the effect on our healthy lifestyles, especially our local health and well-being needs ? taking away our green space and facility would be detrimental to our community and our day to day needs would fall short by the loss of our valued facilities Open space and recreation. NPPF102. Access to a network of high quality open spaces would be reduced by this application and our opportunities for physical activity and health and wellbeing would be adversely affected There would be a detrimental effect on the Carbon Sink opportunities by the loss of open land and the effects of a housing development Only the bare minimum consultation has been undertaken by EBC with the local residence of Draycott. The six week consultation period is not sufficient when considering the share size of the development and impact on the village, and is not sufficient time for the local parish and residence to develop a set of objections. When two weeks of the consultation period was across easter. This action by the EBC was irresponsible and not acting in the interests of the local communities this plan impacts. To improve local accessibility to healthcare, education, employment, retail facilities and recreational resources including open spaces to enhance wellbeing and promote healthy and sustainable lifestyles. This application will have a negative effect on both wellbeing and health including mental and emotional wellbeing. To create safe and attractive places which contribute towards quality of life and community cohesion. This project will significantly detrimentally impact on the quality of life and fragment the community who use this area as a community facility. Including educational opportunities for local schools.</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Kelly Walker	Response-00911	<p>Only the bare minimum consultation has been undertaken by EBC with the local residence of Draycott. The six week consultation period is not sufficient when considering the share size of the development and impact on the village, and is not sufficient time for the local parish and residence to develop a set of objections. When two weeks of the consultation period was across easter half term and the consultation window included 4 Bank Holidays. This when much of the information required was not available and FOI requests were submitted and took 20 working days for a response to be received, when the government agencies contacted themselves did not work the said Bank Holidays. This has meant important information has not been received by residents when developing objections. This action by the EBC was irresponsible, some may say planned, and not acting in the interests of the local communities this plan impacts. I strongly object to the consultation process which as best can be described as limited and not fully transparent when engaging with the local community. EBC has only given local residents mere 6 weeks to submit objections to what is an incredibly important change to the original Local Plan and Core Strategy. This is simply not enough time for residents to review and analysis the share magnitude of information and formulate objections, this when significant information is also missing which includes the master plan for the land south west of Draycott. The manner in which EBC has undertaken the 6 week consultation is not inclusive and does not allow non internet users to be aware of the consultation and changes to the Core Strategy. The average age within Draycott and Church Wilne Parish is 58 and there is a large proportion of the community that was not aware of this important change. We fully object to the whole process and in particular the 6 week consultation period. I strongly object to the significant changes EBC plan to make to its Core Strategy and the reclassification of the land south west of Draycott to Grey Belt. It is widely accepted that the Grey Belt policy has been implemented in a rushed and incoherent manner, which is reflected in the EBCs hastily revised Core Strategic Review and a clear lack of transparency and community consultation. The policy is likely to have little to no impact on achieving the government's target of 1.5 million new homes by the end of the current Parliament but threatens to destroy currently protected green spaces. I strongly do not believe these plans are in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, and the Erewash Borough Councils (EBC) Local Plan 2022. I also do not believe that adequate consultation has been undertaken by EBC with the Draycott Local Parish Council or residents on these plans, and the impact they will have on the local community, wider village and amenity. Furthermore, the development plans plus the proposed National Grids pylon corridor which has been identified as only being circa 600 meters away from this development, will mean the south west of Draycott will be unrealistically overburdened with development impacting Green Belt land. I strongly object to the Sustainability Assessment which was undertaken by the EBC when assessing the land south west of Draycott. The EBC assessment scored this land as +3 with a ranking of joint 3rd place, when our independent review using professionals and informed local residents resulted in a score of -6 placing t</p>

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Elly Walker	Response-00911	his land ran 20th. When reviewed, clear and obvious errors have been made where the EBC has underplayed and positively scored key questions incorrectly to achieve a desired outcome. For example, 9.1: Will it make efficient use of brownfield land? the EBC states that it will not as the site is entirely Greenfield and we know there over 109 Brownfield sites in EBC. Yet the EBC only gives this question a -1 when it should surely receive an at least a Minor Negative -2 score. Question 16.5: Will it protect the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land? the EBC itself states the land south west of Draycott 'Agricultural Land Classification Grade 2 so is of reasonable quality' and this scheme will not therefore protect the BMV. Yet the EBC has scored it only -1. This in our view should be a Minor Negative -2 as there is limited Grade 2 land within the area with most being Grade 3 & 4. Furthermore, question 16.6: Will it prevent the loss of greenfield land to development? the EBC itself states that 'No, the site is Greenfield in its classification so development would not prevent the loss of greenfield land. The limited scale of site limits this negative impact', yet the site is over 8H of Greenfield Grade 2 quality land and only awards a -1. This is our view should received a -2 or even a -3 as this development will have a significant impact on the Greenfield land and its surrounding areas. Questions 2.2 and 2.1 relate to employment and EBC advises that this scheme will not boost employment in the local area due to its limited scale yet award neutral 0' to both questions. Surely these questions should receive -1 as they fail to deliver on the question. Furthermore, questions such as 14.4, 15.2, 15.3, 15.4, 16.1 and 16.2 are all speculative in their answer as they relate to the developer delivering on certain sustainable aspects which can not possibly be scored at this time. Overall, we strongly object to the EBC Sustainability Assessment and would call for this to be independently reviewed. The current housing target which drives the need to develop on the Green Belt is flawed and needs to be changed. It is based on over inflated housing targets that are not realistic, which puts pressure on local authorities to disregard the impact such developments have on local communities and villages to purely meet statistical objectives. This can be seen with the c.17% increase in the population of Draycott if the development of 190 houses goes ahead. This would also be further compounded when the safeguarded land is developed adding an additional c70 houses. This increase and expansion is unrealistic and reckless.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Kerry Naylor	Response-00993	Its not about the loss of view from Lime Grove. Its about the wildlife, the loss of beautiful trees, the change in noise level, the change to the air quality. There has to be fields that do not affect and impact residence and wildlife as much as this development would.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Laura Charier	Response-01218	I strongly object I do not believe these plans are in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, and the Erewash Borough Councils (EBC) Local Plan 2022. I also do not believe that adequate consultation has been undertaken by EBC with the Draycott Local Parish Council or residents on these plans, and the impact they will have on the local community, wider village and amenity. Furthermore, the development plans plus the proposed National Grids pylon corridor which has been identified as only being circa 600 meters away from this development, will mean the south west of Draycott will be unrealistically overburdened with development impacting Green Belt land. There are around 2000 vacant social housing in Derbyshire County. Why are these houses not being prioritised ahead of this land being used for development.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Laura Roffey	Response-01479	Considering all the points, I realise we need more housing, but personally I feel a much smaller number of houses should be considered as it would reduce the negatives on everyone of the points. Moving houses away from the back of Lime Grove where flooding occurs, leaving space for the water to run off would be a more considered plan overall.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Lee	Response-00742	1. Will additional 10 ? 15% funds be allocated & re-distributed for Erewash Policing & Fire Services to cope with increased expansion of communities. 2. Diminution in Value: If the development is passed all properties with green belt views will be reduce in property value, The council should have to pay the difference between the value of the property before and after the development. This is the only fair compensation for this rushed development plan. Then we can sell without loss and move out of the village.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Linda Jane Jenkins	Response-01007	You will probably not care about this. I am losing my sight (by the way I cannot see what I am typing because your system does not allow me to make the type face bigger. I thought you were all into inclusivity.) We bought this house 2 years ago , because it was on the bus route, because the doctor is good and because it is near my family. What sold it to us was the beautiful space, light and view. Anyone who buys a house near green belt pays a premium. I have been told you don't care about this. Well you should. One day it might be you in our shoes. There are over 100 brown sites and probably more grey sites. Is it being lazy that makes picking on a green belt, or is it spiteful politics?
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Louise and Shane Foster	Response-01219	The consultation process has given the residents and Draycott Parish Council very limited time to absorb all the details and the changes it will bring to the Local Plan and Core Strategy.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Louise Burnell	Response-00262	Loss of village character. Does not represent sustainable development. Increased population will place significant strain on green spaces and reduce quality of life.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Luke Hatch	Response-00160	I appreciate the proactive reaching out to seek my comment this time around but this does seem to have been done deliberately under the radar and avoiding public consultation, for obvious reasons. I do understand the need for more housing. Forcing 190 new green belt houses on a village with a population of 3000 with only tickbox consultation is not the way to get people on side about it though.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Maggie Murphy	Response-00833	Public Consultation 1 The Public consultation period runs for 6 weeks. This is the minimum time frame for a Public Consultation and limits the detail that individuals and concerned groups can bring together to provide detailed and evidential responses 2 The Public consultation does not appear to be inclusive as the main mechanism for responding to the change in the New Allocations is via the Erewash Borough Council Website. This does not provide for the Erewash residents who do not have easy access to the Portal. The ability to respond via a paper based method would support a full and inclusive set of views and concerns. A good example of a recent Public consultation that was inclusive for all residents was the National Grid Chesterfield to Willington Grid Upgrade . This provided Customer engagement sessions and written documentation supported by a Web Site.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Martin Kilcoyne	Response-01460	Noise & Disturbance Noise from the construction (including vehicle movements) and operational phases of the proposed development have not been adequately addressed. An environment noise assessment needs to be carried out, particularly for the residents directly opposite the site entrance; but also the whole route that the construction traffic will take. This passes through Draycott, Borrow ash and Beaston villages. Passing busy junctions, Doctor?s surgeries, public car parks, Primary schools, local cricket clubs as well as numerous resident?s homes. Require the submission of an environmental noise assessment, prior to development works commencing, to rate and assess operational sound from all fixed installations comprising mechanical and electrical plant and equipment, with a scheme of mitigation measures where necessary; that all site preparation and construction to comply with specified working hours and limits to noise and dust emissions, waste disposal and lighting; and the submission of proposals, including the design and operating times, of any permanent external lighting on site. Access and egress to the proposed housing development on Derby Road raises several issues relating to highway and pedestrian safety, ease of access and disruption from increased traffic. The use of long/heavy goods vehicles should be prohibited due to the significant amount of Grade I and II listed buildings in the vicinity of the proposed development on land south west of Draycott. This will include Nooning Lane Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1417622 and Hopwell Road Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1087963. Noise and Vibration consultation to be undertaken to consider impacts during construction on nearby noise sensitive properties and ongoing management of a solar farm and the impact of noise and disturbance. Health & Wellbeing Loss of open space and green spaces ? this is vital for our community?s wellbeing Primary School affected with noise and traffic The footpaths that cross the land have amazing views and are used regularly by residents and visitors. The recent pandemic years have shown us that we need space to exercise and be at peace with ourselves and nature, for our own mental wellbeing. This development will have the effect, that anyone using the path would not benefit from the current sprawling Greenbelt views as it will be gone forever. It will have a detrimental effect on the wellbeing of people who enjoy the countryside, not to mention wildlife habitats, which are already under extreme pressure. The recent pandemic has highlighted the valuable and regular use of these footpaths, promoting and fostering good mental health. This land is rural in character, providing a tranquil transitional landscape between the rural areas of Draycott Parish, and the small villages surrounding it of Borrowash and Breaston. It is the wrong model in the wrong place to deliver the EBCs housing needs being of a scale that is ultimately detrimental to the local landscape and will harm the countryside, wildlife and impact irreversibly upon the area and its residents. Footpaths, the Amenity and enjoyment of the use of these pathways which cross through and around this site which provide an important means by which residents of the local villages can get access to the countryside with substantial benefits for their physical and mental health as well as providing means of sustainable transport. For the people of Draycott and ot
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Martin Kilcoyne	Response-01460	her areas, this will have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, replacing green space with 190 houses. The sheer scale of the proposed site will have such an irreversible effect on the landscape. The land/footpaths will be surrounded by housing which will render the land unusable by residents whom rely on it as an area to escape and relax. These footpaths are well-used by many people for physical and mental health. This may seem insignificant to others however, residents rely on this land to enable freedom and a work life balance, which will be lost as result of development on this green belt. Footpaths although still evident on the plan will no longer be enjoyed by families maintaining their ongoing mental health, health and well-being as they will not have the same enjoyment having to walk through a housing estate. NPPF 8. Promoting healthy and safe communities:- 104. Planning policies and decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and access, including taking opportunities to provide better facilities for users, this area has significant lengths of footpaths that will be affected by the development of 190 houses on land south west of Draycott. Promoting healthy and safe communities the effect on our healthy lifestyles, especially our local health and well-being needs ? taking away our green space and facility would be detrimental to our community and our day to day needs would fall short by the loss of our valued facilities Open space and recreation. NPPF102. Access to a network of high quality open spaces would be reduced by this application and our opportunities for physical activity and health and wellbeing would be adversely affected There would be a detrimental effect on the Carbon Sink opportunities by the loss of open land and the effects of a housing development Only the bare minimum consultation has been undertaken by EBC with the local residence of Draycott. The six week consultation period is not sufficient when considering the share size of the development and impact on the village, and is not sufficient time for the local parish and residence to develop a set of objections. When two weeks of the consultation period was across easter. This action by the EBC was irresponsible and not acting in the interests of the local communities this plan impacts. To improve local accessibility to healthcare, education, employment, retail facilities and recreational resources including open spaces to enhance wellbeing and promote healthy and sustainable lifestyles. This application will have a negative effect on both wellbeing and health including mental and emotional wellbeing. To create safe and attractive places which contribute towards quality of life and community cohesion. This project will significantly detrimentally impact on the quality of life and fragment the community who use this area as a community facility. Including educational opportunities for local schools. EBC Consultation Objections Only the bare minimum consultation has been undertaken by EBC with the local residence of Draycott. The six week consultation period is not sufficient when considering the share size of the development and impact on the village, and is not sufficient time for the local parish and residence to develop a set of objections. When two weeks of the consultation period was across easter half term and the consultation window included 4 Bank Holidays. This when much of the information required was not available and FOI re

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Martin Kilcoyne	Response-01460	<p>quests were submitted and took 20 working days for a response to be received, when the government agencies contacted themselves did not work the said Bank Holidays. This has meant important information has not been received by residents when developing objections. This action by the EBC was irresponsible, some may say planned, and not acting in the interests of the local communities this plan impacts. I strongly object to the consultation process which as best can be described as limited and not fully transparent when engaging with the local community. EBC has only given local residents mere 6 weeks to submit objections to what is an incredibly important change to the original Local Plan and Core Strategy. This is simply not enough time for residents to review and analysis the share magnitude of information and formulate objections, this when significant information is also missing which includes the master plan for the land south west of Draycott. The manner in which EBC has undertaken the 6 week consultation is not inclusive and does not allow non internet users to be aware of the consultation and changes to the Core Strategy. The average age within Draycott and Church Wile Parish is 58 and there is a large proportion of the community that was not aware of this important change. We fully object to the whole process and in particular the 6 week consultation period. I strongly object to the significant changes EBC plan to make to its Core Strategy and the reclassification of the land south west of Draycott to Grey Belt. It is widely accepted that the Grey Belt policy has been implemented in a rushed and incoherent manner, which is reflected in the EBCs hastily revised Core Strategic Review and a clear lack of transparency and community consultation. The policy is likely to have little to no impact on achieving the government's target of 1.5 million new homes by the end of the current Parliament but threatens to destroy currently protected green spaces. I strongly do not believe these plans are in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, and the Erewash Borough Councils (EBC) Local Plan 2022. I also do not believe that adequate consultation has been undertaken by EBC with the Draycott Local Parish Council or residents on these plans, and the impact they will have on the local community, wider village and amenity. Furthermore, the development plans plus the proposed National Grids pylon corridor which has been identified as only being circa 600 meters away from this development, will mean the south west of Draycott will be unrealistically overburdened with development impacting Green Belt land. As residents living next to the site of the proposed change in Green Belt status and future housing development, we are of the view that these proposals will have a serious negative impact on the village, visual openness, spatial openness, the local community and our standard of living. I strongly object to the Sustainability Assessment which was undertaken by the EBC when assessing the land south west of Draycott. The EBC assessment scored this land as +3 with a ranking of joint 3rd place, when our independent review using professionals and informed local residents resulted in a score of -6 placing this land ran 20th. When reviewed, clear and obvious errors have been made where the EBC has underplayed and positively scored key questions incorrectly to achieve a desired outcome. For example, 9.1: Will it make efficient use of b</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Martin Kilcoyne	Response-01460	<p>rownfield land? the EBC states that it will not as the site is entirely Greenfield and we know there over 109 Brownfield sites in EBC. Yet the EBC only gives this question a -1 when it should surely receive an at least a Minor Negative -2 score. Question 16.5: Will it protect the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land? the EBC itself states the land south west of Draycott 'Agricultural Land Classification Grade 2 so is of reasonable quality' and this scheme will not therefore protect the BMV. Yet the EBC has scored it only -1. This in our view should be a Minor Negative -2 as there is limited Grade 2 land within the area with most being Grade 3 &amp; 4. Furthermore, question 16.6: Will it prevent the loss of greenfield land to development? the EBC itself states that 'No, the site is Greenfield in its classification so development would not prevent the loss of greenfield land. The limited scale of site limits this negative impact', yet the site is over 8H of Greenfield Grade 2 quality land and only awards a -1. This is our view should received a -2 or even a -3 as this development will have a significant impact on the Greenfield land and its surrounding areas. Questions 2.2 and 2.1 relate to employment and EBC advises that this scheme will not boost employment in the local area due to its limited scale yet award neutral 0' to both questions. Surely these questions should receive -1 as they fail to deliver on the question. Furthermore, questions such as 14.4, 15.2, 15.3, 15.4, 16.1 and 16.2 are all speculative in their answer as they relate to the developer delivering on certain sustainable aspects which can not possibly be scored at this time. Overall, we strongly object to the EBC Sustainability Assessment and would call for this to be independently reviewed. The current housing target which drives the need to develop on the Green Belt is flawed and needs to be changed. It is based on over inflated housing targets that are not realistic, which puts pressure on local authorities to disregard the impact such developments have on local communities and villages to purely meet statistical objectives. This can be seen with the c.17% increase in the population of Draycott if the development of 190 houses goes ahead. This would also be further compounded when the safeguarded land is developed adding an additional c70 houses. This increase and expansion is unrealistic and reckless. There are around 2000 vacant social housing in Derbyshire County. Why are these houses not being prioritised ahead of this land being used for development.</p>



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Mary Walsh	Response-01197	<p>Loss of open space and green spaces ? this is vital for our community?s wellbeing The footpaths that cross the land have amazing views and are used regularly by residents and visitors. The recent pandemic years have shown us that we need space to exercise and be at peace with ourselves and nature, for our own mental wellbeing. This development will have the effect, that anyone using the path would not benefit from the current sprawling Greenbelt views as it will be gone forever. It will have a detrimental effect on the wellbeing of people who enjoy the countryside, not to mention wildlife habitats, which are already under extreme pressure. 1 Only the bare minimum consultation has been undertaken by EBC with the local residence of Draycott. The six week consultation period is not sufficient when considering the share size of the development and impact on the village, and is not sufficient time for the local parish and residence to develop a set of objections. When two weeks of the consultation period was across easter half term and the consultation window included 4 Bank Holidays. This when much of the information required was not available and FOI requests were submitted and took 20 working days for a response to be received, when the government agencies contacted themselves did not work the said Bank Holidays. This has meant important information has not been received by residents when developing objections. This action by the EBC was irresponsible, some may say planned, and not acting in the interests of the local communities this plan impacts. I strongly do not believe these plans are in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, and the Erewash Borough Councils (EBC) Local Plan 2022. I also do not believe that adequate consultation has been undertaken by EBC with the Draycott Local Parish Council or residents on these plans, and the impact they will have on the local community, wider village and amenity. Furthermore, the development plans plus the proposed National Grids pylon corridor which has been identified as only being circa 600 meters away from this development, will mean the south west of Draycott will be unrealistically overburdened with development impacting Green Belt land. As residents living next to the site of the proposed change in Green Belt status and future housing development, we are of the view that these proposals will have a serious negative impact on the village, visual openness, spatial openness, the local community and our standard of living. Access and egress to the proposed housing development on Derby Road raises several issues relating to highway and pedestrian safety, ease of access and disruption from increased traffic.</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Matthew Walker	Response-01313	<p>Firstly, I would like to set out my views clearly before I submit my objection to the proposed plans for the land South West of Draycott. I understand that new housing is required and new houses must be built. However, these developments MUST be built in the correct areas and Brownfield, 'true' Grey Belt, derelict land/sites and existing empty social housing MUST be utilised and prioritised first ahead of building on Green Belt and Green Field land. The Land South West of Draycott is Green Field and Grade 2 quality land and should not be develop on until the EBC can clearly demonstrate the aforementioned options have been fully/and properly been appraised and exhausted first. Surely, the EBC must also demonstrate why the existing stock of 109 Brownfield sites within EBC are not used ahead of the Greenfield land south west of Draycott. Whilst the Government and Trevor Phillips publicly stated that 'newts cannot be more protected than people needs' when referring to the changes to the NPPF when allowing Green Belt to be developed, surely this methodology must work in the opposite direction where the prioritisation of Brownfield and the viability of these sites cannot be overlooked in favour of Green Belt or Green Field because the short term financial benefit is a cheaper than using Brownfield sites. This will lead to reduced Green Belt whilst carrying a growing Brownfield stock which is reckless, irresponsible and surely cannot be right. Therefore, I strongly object to the consultation process which at best can be described as limited and not fully transparent when engaging with the local community. EBC has only given local residents a mere 6 weeks to submit objections to what is an incredibly important change to the original Local Plan and Core Strategy. This is simply not enough time for residents to review and analyse the share magnitude of information and formulate objections, this when significant information is also missing which includes the master plan for the land south west of Draycott. This means only the bare minimum consultation has been undertaken by EBC with the local residence of Draycott. The six week consultation period is not sufficient when considering the share size of the development and impact on the village, and is not sufficient time for the local parish and residence to develop a set of objections. When two weeks of the consultation period was across easter half term and the consultation window included 4 Bank Holidays. This when much of the information required was not available and FOI requests were submitted and took 20 working days for a response to be received, when the government agencies contacted themselves did not work the said Bank Holidays. This has meant important information has not been received by residents when developing objections. This action by the EBC was irresponsible, some may say planned, and not acting in the interests of the local communities this plan impacts. The EBC also did not consultant with the Draycott and Church Wilne Parish or local residents ahead of the EBCs Extraordinary Meeting held on the 27th March 2025 where the EBC passed a motion to take the amended Core Strategy forward to public consultation. To further demonstrate this, only one public questions was asked as the EBC released information on the 19th March and closed the public questions submission window on the 24th March giving no time for residents and local Parish's time to review information and to formulate que</p>

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Matthew Walker	Response-01313	<p>tions. This against a backdrop of over 100 residents attending the EBCs Extraordinary Meeting yet only one public question was asked. This clearly demonstrates how EBC purposely did not share important information, or consult properly with local residents with many if not all residents finding out about these proposal via social media and Facebook. This issue was raised at the EBCs Extraordinary meeting by Councillor Wayne Major and the EBC Mayor agreed this was not adequate and it would be investigated. However, not further action has seemingly been taken. There is a significant number of residents that feel that their views have been disregarded by EBC and EBC are not acting in the best interests of the community and have treated them with disdain. Furthermore, it is widely accepted that the Grey Belt policy has been implemented in a rushed and incoherent manner, which is reflected in the EBCs hastily revised Core Strategic Review and a clear lack of transparency and community consultation. The policy is likely to have little to no impact on achieving the government's target of 1.5 million new homes by the end of the current Parliament but threatens to destroy currently protected green spaces. Furthermore, the development plans plus the proposed National Grids pylon corridor which has been identified as only being circa 600 meters away from this development, will mean the south west of Draycott will be unrealistically overburdened with development impacting Green Belt land. EBC Sustainability Assessment: I strongly object to the Sustainability Assessment (CSR00040) which was undertaken by the EBC when assessing land in the borough and when identifying the land south west of Draycott as one of the proposed development sites. The EBC assessment scored this land as +3, giving this land a ranking of joint 3rd place from 44 sites. However, when an independent review using professionals and informed local residents was undertaken this resulted in a score of -6, placing this land in 10th position. When reviewed, clear and obvious errors have been made where the EBC when assessing the land south west of Draycott, with a significant number of the question scores being underplayed and positively scored incorrectly to achieve a desired outcome. I have placed below a set of examples with supporting commentary and would strongly suggest this assessment is undertaken again using independent and informed professionals. This review of the assessment has also been undertaken when comparing it and the scores given to two rejected sites (CSR0008a and CSR0008b) which are sites assessed by EBC as not fit for development, this whilst CSR0008a being only partially cropped Greenfield with a large area of Brownfield whereas CSR0008b is agricultural but is currently unworked scrub, when the land south west of Draycott is Grade 2 very good quality Greenfield that is fully used and cropped. Example of incorrect scoring is below: O1 - The land south west of Draycott (CSR00040) is deemed by EBC to deliver minor positive housing needs, but less than the two rejected sites (CSR0008a and CSR0008b). The call for 40% affordable housing is very unlikely to be achieved due to the location of the site. No upgrading of infrastructure is thought to be expected or even required. O2 - Delivers minor negative employment as opposed to major positive for CSR0008a and neutral for CSR0008b. The scale of the development is too small to have any impact on employment or jobs. O3 - N</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Matthew Walker	Response-01313	<p>o economic structure and innovation benefit to any of the sites due to rural nature of area. O4 - Claims a positive retail effect for all sites but less so for CSR00040 (+1). Describing the development as being reliant on the local retail facilities is optimistic particularly in the variety and size of the retail services offered. The ease of access to other much larger facilities in surrounding villages and Derby retail parks will increase private traffic and delivery services into and out of the village. The vitality or the viability of the services offered would be unlikely to change. The two other rejected sites are somehow rated as even more positive (+2) which does not make sense and should be reviewed. O5 - Claims that the development would have major benefits in the health and wellbeing of new residents (+2), although the two rejected sites do not. The claim that the possible (but not guaranteed) retention of the PROW?s and the inclusion of POS?s in the development as well as the easy 600m (realistically 900m) walk to the village centre would promote healthy travel. No additional health care facilities are considered to be needed as they are available in nearby towns, despite a possible population increase of 10%. O6 - An increase in crime is to be expected in all three sites. A major negative (-2). O7 - The increase in population is seen as an improvement on social inclusion allowing interaction with local culture, although no provision of additional facilities is deemed to be required due to the small scale of the development. O8 - The assessment assumes that there would be few problems integrating the existing transport infrastructure and that access to the village centre would mitigate any need for major improvements. There is an assumption that the use of private cars will be reduced because of the distance to the village centre. The proposed site therefore gets only a minor negative score (-1), but the brownfield site closer to the centre of the village (CSR0008a) is assessed as a major negative for transport (-3). This is clearly incorrect and requires review. O9 - The site is currently entirely classified as Greenfield, and is good grade 2 agricultural land used for small scale crop production and grazing. This is scored as a minor negative (-1) although CSR0008a and CSR00 8b both score as major negative (-2). CSR0008a is only partially cropped Greenfield with a large area of Brownfield whereas CSR0008b is agricultural but is currently unworked scrub. How can CSR00040 therefore score higher than CSR00080a and CSR00080b. O10 - All three sites are somehow seen as positive contributors (+1) to energy and climate change criteria. It is worth noting that there would be no compulsory provision for rooftop solar generation and that the developer would ensure the highest standards of energy efficiency. O11 - All three sites are assessed as having a minor negative effects on pollution (-1). However, it has been noted that the existing sewage and storm water systems are already stressed and any additional development would only increase the risk of emergency outfall into the Derwent. O12 - Flood risk is seen as neutral. Local knowledge and evidence would suggest that this is optimistic at best. Photographic evidence shows that the fields do flood on a regular basis without particularly high river levels, typically around 2.2m at the Wilne measuring station. The highest level recorded, as recently as October 2023, was 2.53m. The wa</p>

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Matthew Walker	Response-01313	ter table is just below the surface during the winter and can be seen as surface water during extended wet spells. Although the site has been reclassified as FZ1, if the risk of flooding is completely eliminated from the development (by mechanical means) the risk of knock on hydrostatic effects in the surrounding properties will increase. The properties near to the proposed development are already at high risk and are not insured for flood. This important sections needs further review and scrutiny to ensure the site, from a flood perspective, is adequate as there are serious and valid concerns that the EBC is just brushing aside the real flooding issues in the area. It is widely reported that due to climate change flooding is increasing and not decreasing yet the flood zoning in the area has only very recently 27th March 2025 been reclassified. from FZ2 to FZ1. O13 - The proposed site somehow scores as a major positive (+2) on the local environment. This appears to be based on the premise that as there are no major biodiversity interests near the site, even though it has yet to be assessed - how can this element therefore be scored. The other mitigating factor appears to be that the developer will provide POS?s, some hedgerows and tree planting within the area yet when we have contacted the EBC via an FOI there is apparently no master plan available and plans for the scheme are not available for review, therefore this score is being made purely on assumptions and not facts. How can incredibly important scoring and review of this site be undertaken in this manner. O14 - The new landscape provided by the development is seen as a major positive (+3) because any new development would blend in with the existing village outlook. As a comparison both the other sites are scored as major negatives (-4). CSR0008a in particular is part Brownfield and is hidden from most aspects and CSR0008b is scrubland and would blend in with the existing newer developments along the mainline railway. The aspect of the CSR0008b would be almost identical to CSR0040 when entering the village from the West. Therefore, why has CSR00040 scored higher than the two declined sites, this does not make logical sense. O15 - No heritage assets would be lost or disturbed as a result of the development and is therefore seen as a minor positive (+1). However, both the alternative sites are claimed to have major negatives (-2, although no information is provided for this assumption). It may be argued that CSR0008a could be close to the heritage assets of the village and could be scored as a negative, but the difference between CSR0008b and CSR0040, separated by the A6005 is minimal at best. Logic would dictate that the proximity of CSR0040 to the older parts of the village would count as a negative score compared to CSR0008b. O16 - The site registers as a major negative (-3) for natural resources and waste management. However, the two other sites have disproportionate negative impacts (-7). As mentioned previously, the entire village is already stressed in terms of sewage and storm water runoff, so, as per O15 if CSR0008b is seen as major negative (-7) then so should CSR0040. These scores imply do not make sense and are not balanced. Anyone that has visited the sites can clearly see this and it would point towards a desktop exercising having been undertaken. In conclusion, based on the above analysis serious and valid questions have been raised about the accuracy of the EBCs Sus
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Matthew Walker	Response-01313	tainability Assessment which is the key metric used in identifying the land south west of Draycott for development. This assessment is being used to demonstrate that the land does not act as well performing Green Belt and Green field but makes assumptions and gives scoring that is clearly not correct, particularly when assessed against other similar sites that have not been identified as development land. It should be noted that some of the rejected sites scores seem skewed in favour of rejection, but without the data available for the reasons of the scores it is difficult to verify as to why, which also enhances the claim of poor transparency and consultation by EBC throughout this process. If the scores are adjusted to more fair and fact based conclusions CSR0040 would be in joint 10th place with a score of -6. I strongly do not believe these plans are in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, and the Erewash Borough Councils (EBC) Local Plan 2022. I also do not believe that adequate consultation has been undertaken by EBC with the Draycott Local Parish Council or residents on these plans, and the impact they will have on the local community, wider village and amenity. Furthermore, the development plans plus the proposed National Grids pylon corridor which has been identified as only being circa 600 meters away from this development, will mean the south west of Draycott will be unrealistically overburdened with development impacting Green Belt land. Surely some sort of logic and common sense must be applied to this area when considering the planned development and National Grids plans. If both go ahead as planned this would result in the area being unrealistically developed and ruined.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Melanie Wilson	Response-00974	The consultation is poorly advertised and rushed through.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Michael Thirtwall	Response-01196	Noise from the construction (including vehicle movements) and operational phases of the proposed development have not been adequately addressed. An environment noise assessment needs to be carried out, particularly for the residents directly opposite the site entrance; but also the whole route that the construction traffic will take. This passes through Draycott, Borrow ash and Beaston villages. Passing busy junctions, Doctor?s surgeries, public car parks, Primary schools, local cricket clubs as well as numerous resident?s homes.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Michelle Marks	Response-00924	Conflict with Labour's Election Policy on Green Belt Development Labour's current housing policy emphasizes a 'brownfield-first' approach and opposes building on high-quality Green Belt land. Instead, the party has introduced the concept of developing on 'grey belt' land/areas within the Green Belt that are of poor quality, such as disused car parks and wastelands. This approach seeks to tackle the housing crisis while preserving natural spaces and protecting vital ecosystems. The proposed development in Draycott does not align with this policy, as it involves building on high-quality Green Belt land that serves as a crucial natural habitat and contributes to the village's rural character. Labour's stance prioritizes sustainable development, ensuring that genuine green spaces remain protected while focusing on lower-quality, underutilized land for housing. Approving this development would contradict Labour's stated commitment to preserving Green Belt land, further undermining national policy efforts to prevent unnecessary urban sprawl. Conclusion This proposal represents an unjustified loss of Green Belt land, an unsustainable burden on local services, and a threat to Draycott's rural character. There are more appropriate locations for housing that do not require the destruction of protected countryside. For these reasons, I urge the council to reject this planning application and uphold its commitment to protecting the Green Belt and ensuring sustainable development.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Miss Ella Meredith	Response-01850	We strongly object to the consultation process, which has been limited and not fully transparent. Erewash Borough Council (EBC) has only given local residents the minimum six-week period to submit objections to this significant change to the Local Plan and Core Strategy. This timeframe is insufficient for residents to review and understand the magnitude of the change and formulate objections, especially given the missing details such as the master plan for the land south west of Draycott. These plans do not align with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024 and EBC Local Plan 2022. Furthermore, adequate consultation has not been undertaken with the Draycott Local Parish Council or residents regarding the impact of these plans on the local community, village, and amenity. Noise from construction and operational phases of the development has not been adequately addressed. An environmental noise assessment needs to be carried out, particularly for residents living adjacent and opposite the site entrance.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Miss Natalie Walsh	Response-01846	We strongly object to the consultation process, which has been limited and not fully transparent. Erewash Borough Council (EBC) has only given local residents the minimum six-week period to submit objections to this significant change to the Local Plan and Core Strategy. This timeframe is insufficient for residents to review and understand the magnitude of the change and formulate objections, especially given the missing details such as the master plan for the land south west of Draycott. These plans do not align with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024 and EBC Local Plan 2022. Furthermore, adequate consultation has not been undertaken with the Draycott Local Parish Council or residents regarding the impact of these plans on the local community, village, and amenity. Noise from construction and operational phases of the development has not been adequately addressed. An environmental noise assessment needs to be carried out, particularly for residents living adjacent and opposite the site entrance.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Miss Paige Murray	Response-01842	We strongly object to the consultation process, which has been limited and not fully transparent. Erewash Borough Council (EBC) has only given local residents the minimum six-week period to submit objections to this significant change to the Local Plan and Core Strategy. This timeframe is insufficient for residents to review and understand the magnitude of the change and formulate objections, especially given the missing details such as the master plan for the land south west of Draycott. These plans do not align with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024 and EBC Local Plan 2022. Furthermore, adequate consultation has not been undertaken with the Draycott Local Parish Council or residents regarding the impact of these plans on the local community, village, and amenity. Noise from construction and operational phases of the development has not been adequately addressed. An environmental noise assessment needs to be carried out, particularly for residents living adjacent and opposite the site entrance.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Mr Graham Bingham and Mrs Kristine Bingham	Response-01302	We strongly object to the consultation process, which has been limited and not fully transparent. EBC has only given local residents the minimum six week period to submit objections to this significant change to the local plan and core strategy. This timeframe is insufficient for residents to review and understand the magnitude of the proposed change and formulate objections, especially given the missing details such as the master plan for the land South West of Draycott. These plans do not align with the National Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024 and EBC's Local Plan 2022. Furthermore, adequate consultation has not been undertaken with the Draycott Parish Council or residents regarding the impact of these plans on the local community, Village, and amenity.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Mr R Sykes	Response-00412	Overall, a site not well suited for development.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Mr Scott Walsh	Response-01844	We strongly object to the consultation process, which has been limited and not fully transparent. Erewash Borough Council (EBC) has only given local residents the minimum six-week period to submit objections to this significant change to the Local Plan and Core Strategy. This timeframe is insufficient for residents to review and understand the magnitude of the change and formulate objections, especially given the missing details such as the master plan for the land south west of Draycott. These plans do not align with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024 and EBC Local Plan 2022. Furthermore, adequate consultation has not been undertaken with the Draycott Local Parish Council or residents regarding the impact of these plans on the local community, village, and amenity. Noise from construction and operational phases of the development has not been adequately addressed. An environmental noise assessment needs to be carried out, particularly for residents living adjacent and opposite the site entrance.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Mrs Mary Walsh	Response-01845	We strongly object to the consultation process, which has been limited and not fully transparent. Erewash Borough Council (EBC) has only given local residents the minimum six-week period to submit objections to this significant change to the Local Plan and Core Strategy. This timeframe is insufficient for residents to review and understand the magnitude of the change and formulate objections, especially given the missing details such as the master plan for the land south west of Draycott. These plans do not align with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024 and EBC Local Plan 2022. Furthermore, adequate consultation has not been undertaken with the Draycott Local Parish Council or residents regarding the impact of these plans on the local community, village, and amenity. Noise from construction and operational phases of the development has not been adequately addressed. An environmental noise assessment needs to be carried out, particularly for residents living adjacent and opposite the site entrance.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Mr Tony Walsh	Response-01849	We strongly object to the consultation process, which has been limited and not fully transparent. Erewash Borough Council (EBC) has only given local residents the minimum six-week period to submit objections to this significant change to the Local Plan and Core Strategy. This timeframe is insufficient for residents to review and understand the magnitude of the change and formulate objections, especially given the missing details such as the master plan for the land south west of Draycott. These plans do not align with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024 and EBC Local Plan 2022. Furthermore, adequate consultation has not been undertaken with the Draycott Local Parish Council or residents regarding the impact of these plans on the local community, village, and amenity. Noise from construction and operational phases of the development has not been adequately addressed. An environmental noise assessment needs to be carried out, particularly for residents living adjacent and opposite the site entrance.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Nigel morton	Response-01351	The proposed site is not the right one ,flood plain ,very busy road already ,accident black spot ,outstanding piece of high grade land .Just because Steven barker wants to sell doesn't make it the roghrmt site Just because its easier because of this doesn't make it the right site either .I'm hoping you will see its the wrong site and protect it as it should be under the greenbelt
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Nikki Riches	Response-00950	? I strongly object to the consultation process, if I hadn't seen Facebook I would have not had the opportunity to respond to this consultation and stand up to our local village from the risk of flooding, increased traffic and risk to safety, stretching further local services, the green belt, biodiversity and wildlife that surrounds it. It feels like the lack of communication and short time scales to respond to the consultation was a conscious decision by Erewash to push this through without local community consultation and is irresponsible by the Council. ? EBC has only given local residents only the bare minimum consultation of a mere 6 weeks to submit objections to what is an incredibly important change to the original Local Plan and Core Strategy. This is simply not enough time for residents to review and analysis the share magnitude of information and formulate objections, this when significant information is also missing which includes the master plan for the land south west of Draycott. This when much of the information required was not available and FOI requests were submitted and took 20 working days for a response to be received, when the government agencies contacted themselves did not work the said Bank Holidays. This has meant important information has not been received by residents when developing objections. This action by the EBC was irresponsible, some may say planned, and not acting in the interests of the local communities this plan impacts. ? The manner in which EBC has undertaken the 6 week consultation is not inclusive and does not allow non internet users to be aware of the consultation and changes to the Core Strategy. The average age within Draycott and Church Wile Parish is 58 and there is a large proportion of the community that was not aware of this important change. I fully object to the whole process and in particular the 6 week consultation period. ? I strongly object to the significant changes EBC plan to make to its Core Strategy and the reclassification of the land south west of Draycott to Grey Belt. It is widely accepted that the Grey Belt policy has been implemented in a rushed and incoherent manner, which is reflected in the EBCs hastily revised Core Strategic Review and a clear lack of transparency and community consultation. The policy is likely to have little to no impact on achieving the government's target of 1.5 million new homes by the end of the current Parliament but threatens to destroy currently protected green spaces. ? I strongly do not believe these plans are in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, and the Erewash Borough Councils (EBC) Local Plan 2022. I also do not believe that adequate consultation has been undertaken by EBC with the Draycott Local Parish Council or residents on these plans, and the impact they will have on the local community, wider village and amenity. Furthermore, the development plans plus the proposed National Grids pylon corridor which has been identified as only being circa 600 meters away from this development, will mean the south west of Draycott will be unrealistically overburdened with development impacting Green Belt land. ? As residents living next to the site of the proposed change in Green Belt status and future housing development, I am of the view that these proposals will have a serious negative impact on the village, visual openness, spatial openness, the local community and our standard of living. ? I strongly object to t

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Nikki Riches	Response-00950	<p>he Sustainability Assessment which was undertaken by the EBC when assessing the land south west of Draycott. The EBC assessment scored this land as +3 with a ranking of joint 3rd place, when our independent review using professionals and informed local residents resulted in a score of -6 placing this land ran 20th. When reviewed, clear and obvious errors have been made where the EBC has underplayed and positively scored key questions incorrectly to achieve a desired outcome. For example, 9.1: Will it make efficient use of brownfield land? the EBC states that it will not as the site is entirely Greenfield and we know there over 109 Brownfield sites in EBC. Yet the EBC only gives this question a -1 when it should surely receive an at least a Minor Negative -2 score. Question 16.5: Will it protect the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land? the EBC itself states the land south west of Draycott 'Agricultural Land Classification Grade 2 so is of reasonable quality' and this scheme will not therefore protect the BMV. Yet the EBC has scored it only -1. This in our view should be a Minor Negative -2 as there is limited Grade 2 land within the area with most being Grade 3 &amp; 4. Furthermore, question 16.6: Will it prevent the loss of greenfield land to development? the EBC itself states that 'No, the site is Greenfield in its classification so development would not prevent the loss of greenfield land. The limited scale of site limits this negative impact', yet the site is over 8H of Greenfield Grade 2 quality land and only awards a -1. This is our view should received a -2 or even a -3 as this development will have a significant impact on the Greenfield land and its surrounding areas. Questions 2.2 and 2.1 relate to employment and EBC advises that this scheme will not boost employment in the local area due to its limited scale yet award neutral 0' to both questions. Surely these questions should receive -1 as they fail to deliver on the question. Furthermore, questions such as 14.4, 15.2, 15.3, 15.4, 16.1 and 16.2 are all speculative in their answer as they relate to the developer delivering on certain sustainable aspects which can not possibly be scored at this time. Overall, we strongly object to the EBC Sustainability Assessment and would call for this to be independently reviewed. ? The current housing target which drives the need to develop on the Green Belt is flawed and needs to be changed. It is based on over inflated housing targets that are not realistic, which puts pressure on local authorities to disregard the impact such developments have on local communities and villages to purely meet statistical objectives. This can be seen with the c.17% increase in the population of Draycott if the development of 190 houses goes ahead. This would also be further compounded when the safeguarded land is developed adding an additional c70 houses. This increase and expansion is unrealistic and reckless. ? There are around 2000 vacant social housing in Derbyshire County. Why are these houses not being prioritised ahead of this land being used for development. ? The footpaths that cross the land have amazing views and are used regularly by residents and visitors. The recent pandemic years have shown us that we need space to exercise and be at peace with ourselves and nature, for our own mental wellbeing. This development will have the effect, that anyone using the path would not benefit from the current sprawling Greenbelt views as it will be</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Nikki Riches	Response-00950	<p>gone forever. ? It will have a detrimental effect on the wellbeing of people who enjoy the countryside, not to mention wildlife habitats, which are already under extreme pressure. ? The recent pandemic has highlighted the valuable and regular use of these footpaths, promoting and fostering good mental health. ? This land is rural in character, providing a tranquil transitional landscape between the rural areas of Draycott Parish, and the small villages surrounding it of Borrowash and Breaston. ? It is the wrong model in the wrong place to deliver the EBCs housing needs being of a scale that is ultimately detrimental to the local landscape and will harm the countryside, wildlife and impact irreversibly upon the area and its residents. ? Footpaths, the Amenity and enjoyment of the use of these pathways which cross through and around this site which provide an important means by which residents of the local villages can get access to the countryside with substantial benefits for their physical and mental health as well as providing means of sustainable transport. For the people of Draycott and other areas, this will have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, replacing green space with 190 houses. ? The sheer scale of the proposed site will have such an irreversible effect on the landscape. The land/footpaths will be surrounded by housing which will render the land unusable by residents whom rely on it as an area to escape and relax. These footpaths are well-used by many people for physical and mental health. This may seem insignificant to others however, residents rely on this land to enable freedom and a work life balance, which will be lost as result of development on this green belt. ? Footpaths although still evident on the plan will no longer be enjoyed by families maintaining their ongoing mental health, health and well-being as they will not have the same enjoyment having to walk through a housing estate. ? NPPF 8. Promoting healthy and safe communities:- 104. Planning policies and decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and access, including taking opportunities to provide better facilities for users, this area has significant lengths of footpaths that will be affected by the development of 190 houses on land south west of Draycott. ? Promoting healthy and safe communities the effect on our healthy lifestyles, especially our local health and well-being needs ? taking away our green space and facility would be detrimental to our community and our day to day needs would fall short by the loss of our valued facilities ? Open space and recreation. NPPF102. Access to a network of high quality open spaces would be reduced by this application and our opportunities for physical activity and health and wellbeing would be adversely affected ? There would be a detrimental effect on the Carbon Sink opportunities by the loss of open land and the effects of a housing development ? Only the bare minimum consultation has been undertaken by EBC with the local residence of Draycott. The six week consultation period is not sufficient when considering the share size of the development and impact on the village, and is not sufficient time for the local parish and residence to develop a set of objections. When two weeks of the consultation period was across easter. This action by the EBC was irresponsible and not acting in the interests of the local communities this plan impacts. ? To improve local accessibility to healthcare</p>

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Nikki Riches	Response-00950	, education, employment, retail facilities and recreational resources including open spaces to enhance wellbeing and promote healthy and sustainable lifestyles. This application will have a negative effect on both wellbeing and health including mental and emotional wellbeing. ? To create safe and attractive places which contribute towards quality of life and community cohesion. This project will significantly detrimentally impact on the quality of life and fragment the community who use this area as a community facility. Including educational opportunities for local schools. ? Noise from the construction (including vehicle movements) and operational phases of the proposed development have not been adequately addressed ? An environment noise assessment needs to be carried out, particularly for the residents directly opposite the site entrance; but also the whole route that the construction traffic will take. This passes through Draycott, Borrow ash and Beaston villages. Passing busy junctions, Doctor?s surgeries, public car parks, Primary schools, local cricket clubs as well as numerous resident?s homes. ? Require the submission of an environmental noise assessment, prior to development works commencing, to rate and assess operational sound from all fixed installations comprising mechanical and electrical plant and equipment, with a scheme of mitigation measures where necessary; that all site preparation and construction to comply with specified working hours and limits to noise and dust emissions, waste disposal and lighting; and the submission of proposals, including the design and operating times, of any permanent external lighting on site. ? Access and egress to the proposed housing development on Derby Road raises several issues relating to highway and pedestrian safety, ease of access and disruption from increased traffic. ? The use of long/heavy goods vehicles should be prohibited due to the significant amount of Grade I and II listed buildings in the vicinity of the proposed development on land south west of Draycott. This will include Nooning Lane Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1417622 and Hopwell Road Bridge, Grade 2 listed building, list entry number 1087963. ? Noise and Vibration consultation to be undertaken to consider impacts during construction on nearby noise sensitive properties and ongoing management of a solar farm and the impact of noise and disturbance
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Oliver Kirk	Response-00569	Increasing the village population by circa 17% is an abhorrent oversight in the proposal, this will drastically alter the community in the area and along with developments in Borrowash will cause many local businesses to be inundated with new residents that will make it all but impossible to enjoy anything in the local area without queuing for three hours or booking a year in advance. In addition, there are many brownfield sites in Erewash that should receive prioritisation for development over the use of this land. I object in the highest possible manner.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Paul Allen	Response-01082	I would like to register my objection to the proposed development on the following grounds: Flooding: The site borders on and slightly encroaches on a Flood Zone 2 (GOV.UK-Flood Map) and there is no flood defence barrier around this area of Draycott. The fields to the south-west of the site regularly flood in the winter period and it is likely to become worse with global warming. Future flooding is likely to make any proposed sustainable urban drainage scheme (SUDS) ineffective and raise the risk of pollution in the nearby River Derwent. Green Belt: The area and its distant views towards Risley in the North and Kings mills in the South will be negatively impacted by this substantial, overbearing, development. There are sufficient Brownfield and Grey Belt site located with Erewash Borough Council's control, which should be considered for development before Green Belt sites. Wildlife/ Biodiversity: The green space provides an important corridor for wildlife, which will be impacted by light pollution and urban noise. There does not seem to be an Ecological survey carried by EBC prior to this proposal, which seems to be at odds with the Biodiversity Supplementary Planning Document. Infrastructure: There is insufficient school spaces, school parking, village parking and medical services at present and the development can only make matters worse.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	paul butcher	Response-01154	Only the bare minimum consultation has been undertaken by EBC with the local residence of Draycott. The six week consultation period is not sufficient when considering the share size of the development and impact on the village, and is not sufficient time for the local parish and residence to develop a set of objections. When two weeks of the consultation period was across easter half term and the consultation window included 4 Bank Holidays. This when much of the information required was not available and FOI requests were submitted and took 20 working days for a response to be received, when the government agencies contacted themselves did not work the said Bank Holidays. This has meant important information has not been received by residents when developing objections. This action by the EBC was irresponsible, some may say planned, and not acting in the interests of the local communities this plan impacts. I strongly object to the consultation process which as best can be described as limited and not fully transparent when engaging with the local community. EBC has only given local residents mere 6 weeks to submit objections to what is an incredibly important change to the original Local Plan and Core Strategy. This is simply not enough time for residents to review and analysis the share magnitude of information and formulate objections, this when significant information is also missing which includes the master plan for the land south west of Draycott. I strongly object to the significant changes EBC plan to make to its Core Strategy and the reclassification of the land south west of Draycott to Grey Belt. It is widely accepted that the Grey Belt policy has been implemented in a rushed and incoherent manner, which is reflected in the EBCs hastily revised Core Strategic Review and a clear lack of transparency and community consultation. The policy is likely to have little to no impact on achieving the government's target of 1.5 million new homes by the end of the current Parliament but threatens to destroy currently protected green spaces. I strongly do not believe these plans are in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, and the Erewash Borough Councils (EBC) Local Plan 2022. I also do not believe that adequate consultation has been undertaken by EBC with the Draycott Local Parish Council or residents on these plans, and the impact they will have on the local community, wider village and amenity. Furthermore, the development plans plus the proposed National Grids pylon corridor which has been identified as only being circa 600 meters away from this development, will mean the south west of Draycott will be unrealistically overburdened with development impacting Green Belt land. As residents living next to the site of the proposed change in Green Belt status and future housing development, we are of the view that these proposals will have a serious negative impact on the village, visual openness, spatial openness, the local community and our standard of living. I strongly object to the Sustainability Assessment which was undertaken by the EBC when assessing the land south west of Draycott. The EBC assessment scored this land as +3 with a ranking of joint 3rd place, when our independent review using professionals and informed local residents resulted in a score of -6 placing this land ran 20th. When reviewed, clear and obvious errors have been made where the EBC has underplayed and positively scored key questions
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	paul butcher	Response-01154	incorrectly to achieve a desired outcome. For example, 9.1: Will it make efficient use of brownfield land? the EBC states that it will not as the site is entirely Greenfield and we know there over 109 Brownfield sites in EBC. Yet the EBC only gives this question a -1 when it should surely receive an at least a Minor Negative -2 score. Question 16.5: Will it protect the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land? the EBC itself states the land south west of Draycott 'Agricultural Land Classification Grade 2 so is of reasonable quality' and this scheme will not therefore protect the BMV. Yet the EBC has scored it only -1. This in our view should be a Minor Negative -2 as there is limited Grade 2 land within the area with most being Grade 3 & 4. Furthermore, question 16.6: Will it prevent the loss of greenfield land to development? the EBC itself states that 'No, the site is Greenfield in its classification so development would not prevent the loss of greenfield land. The limited scale of site limits this negative impact', yet the site is over 8H of Greenfield Grade 2 quality land and only awards a -1. This is our view should received a -2 or even a -3 as this development will have a significant impact on the Greenfield land and its surrounding areas. Questions 2.2 and 2.1 relate to employment and EBC advises that this scheme will not boost employment in the local area due to its limited scale yet award neutral 0' to both questions. Surely these questions should receive -1 as they fail to deliver on the question. Furthermore, questions such as 14.4, 15.2, 15.3, 15.4, 16.1 and 16.2 are all speculative in their answer as they relate to the developer delivering on certain sustainable aspects which can not possibly be scored at this time. Overall, we strongly object to the EBC Sustainability Assessment and would call for this to be independently reviewed.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Pauline Marks	Response-00927	This development also conflicts with established planning policies: There is no evidence that alternative, non-Green Belt or brownfield sites have been fully considered, as required before Green Belt land can be released. The Climate Change Act 2008 commits the UK to cutting carbon emissions. This car-dependent development contradicts that goal, increasing emissions and environmental impact. Contradiction of Labour's Green Belt Housing Policy Labour's national housing policy explicitly supports a 'brownfield-first' approach and opposes building on high-quality Green Belt land. Instead, the focus is on developing 'grey belt' areas?poor-quality or previously developed land within the Green Belt.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Peter Sutton	Response-00409	There is massive local objection to this with over 70 residents attending the Parish Council meeting. An online petition has almost 1300 signatures.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Richard Keith Hanbury	Response-01087	You have been elected to represent all the people in your area. But you are not representing me and my views. Don't I matter? Village life in England should be kept . Soon we wont have villages they will just merge into one suburb.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Richard Syson	Response-01317	This proposal has not been widely communicated to the general public, and there has been no apparent engagement with the residents of Draycott. I have seen a paper poster at on the notice board next to Breaston Cemetery, and nothing in Draycott. I receive the monthly EBC newsletter and this has no mention of the proposal. This appears to be a very underhand attempt by Erewash Borough Council to push through this proposed destruction of Draycott (and other local areas) Green Belt land in order to satisfy arbitrary house building targets imposed by the UK Government. I was only made aware of this proposal when I received manual leaflets from the Draycott Parish Residents Working Group. I believe it is not unreasonable for Erewash Borough Council to have communicated this in detail to every resident. To remain almost silent and issue the bare legal minimum of information to the local residents is totally unacceptable I strongly object to the superficial consultation process which as best can be described as limited and not fully transparent when engaging with the local community. EBC has only given local residents mere 6 weeks to submit objections to what is an incredibly important change to the original Local Plan and Core Strategy. This is simply not enough time for residents to review and analysis the share magnitude of information and formulate objections, this when significant information is also missing which includes the master plan for the land south west of Draycott. There does not appear to be any emphasis on using already available brownfield sites first. Instead, Erewash Borough Council appears to be trying to quietly push through an outrageous destruction / development of prime rural Green Belt land as quietly as possible. Only the bare minimum consultation has been undertaken by EBC with little / no attempt to inform the local residents of Draycott. The six week consultation period is not sufficient when considering the share size of the development and impact on the village, and is not sufficient time for the local parish and residence to develop a set of objections. This action by the EBC was irresponsible and not acting in the interests of the local communities this plan impacts.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Rick Howden	Response-01421	The footpaths that cross the land have amazing views and are used regularly by residents and visitors. The recent pandemic years have shown us that we need space to exercise and be at peace with ourselves and nature, for our own mental wellbeing. This development will have the effect, that anyone using the path would not benefit from the current sprawling Greenbelt views as it will be gone forever. Primary School affected with noise and traffic Footpaths, the Amenity and enjoyment of the use of these pathways which cross through and around this site which provide an important means by which residents of the local villages can get access to the countryside with substantial benefits for their physical and mental health as well as providing means of sustainable transport. For the people of Draycott and other areas, this will have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, replacing green space with 190 houses.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Ricky fisher	Response-00048	Draycott needs to stay a village not a town not more houses to be added this will just start a chain reaction and they will not stop i am a bricklayer by trade and i dont want more houses on my doorstep is sooner turn away the work then have it drown our little village its perfect the way it is with out overflowing it with new builds thats not needed just to benefit some one elses pockets please dont let this happen just because it can make a stand
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Roger Brown	Response-00999	EBC have not conducted themselves well with regard to this proposal. The public have not been given sufficient time to adequately inform themselves of the plans, the availability of information has been limited or non-existent and the manner in which the process started by denying the public both the chance to put questions to the council by closing the submissions before the publishing of the agenda and then denying the public the opportunity to speak at the meeting removed their democratic right to be heard. This disregard for fairness and transparency is nothing short of scandalous.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Ruth Hawkins	Response-01277	I strongly object to the consultation process which at best can be described as limited and not fully transparent when engaging with the local community. EBC has only given local residents a mere 6 weeks to submit objections to what is an incredibly important change to the original Local Plan and Core Strategy. This is simply not enough time for residents to review and analyse all the information and formulate objections and this is compounded by the fact that significant information is also missing including the master plan for the land south west of Draycott.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Sarah Hargreaves	Response-01314	<p>Consultation Process 1. Insufficient Consultation Period: The six-week consultation period is wholly inadequate given the scale of the proposed development and its impact on the village. This period included Easter half-term and four Bank Holidays, during which essential information was not available, and FOI requests took 20 working days for responses. This limited period has hindered residents' ability to develop informed objections. The council's decision to include multiple public holidays within the consultation period appears to be a deliberate attempt to minimize public engagement and reduce the number of objections. Requests via the parish council to extend this period were dismissed, despite their own processes acknowledging that FOI requests would be unavailable for inclusion in objections. 2. Lack of Inclusivity: The consultation process has not been inclusive, particularly for non-internet users. The average age in Draycott and Church Wilne Parish is 58, and many residents were unaware of these significant changes. The council's reliance on online methods for consultation has excluded a sizable portion of the community, which is unacceptable for the development of this magnitude. Residents should at least have been provided with written details of these proposals. 3. Transparency Issues: The consultation process has been limited and not fully transparent. Significant information, including the master plan for the land Southwest of Draycott, is missing. The council has failed to provide adequate time and resources for residents to review and understand the full implications of the proposed development. Steve Birkinshaw, Head of Planning, indicated that it was not necessary for residents to review such information, which contradicts the purpose of a consultation. My conclusion, therefore, is that the council has sought to undertake the classification without challenge in an undemocratic and immoral manner. Full Copy of my OBJECTION Subject: EBC Core Strategy Objection - Land Southwest of Draycott Dear Sir/Madam, I am writing to formally object to the Erewash Borough Council's Core Strategy proposal to reclassify the land Southwest of Draycott to Grey Belt and to build 190 houses, with a further 70 houses on the adjacent identified land. My objections are based on several critical issues that I believe have not been adequately addressed by the EBC. Consultation Process 1. Insufficient Consultation Period: The six-week consultation period is wholly inadequate given the scale of the proposed development and its impact on the village. This period included Easter half-term and four Bank Holidays, during which essential information was not available, and FOI requests took 20 working days for responses. This limited period has hindered residents' ability to develop informed objections. The council's decision to include multiple public holidays within the consultation period appears to be a deliberate attempt to minimize public engagement and reduce the number of objections. Requests via the parish council to extend this period were dismissed, despite their own processes acknowledging that FOI requests would be unavailable for inclusion in objections. 2. Lack of Inclusivity: The consultation process has not been inclusive, particularly for non-internet users. The average age in Draycott and Church Wilne Parish is 58, and many residents were unaware of these significant changes. The council's reliance on online methods for consultation</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Sarah Hargreaves	Response-01314	<p>has excluded a sizable portion of the community, which is unacceptable for the development of this magnitude. Residents should at least have been provided with written details of these proposals. 3. Transparency Issues: The consultation process has been limited and not fully transparent. Significant information, including the master plan for the land Southwest of Draycott, is missing. The council has failed to provide adequate time and resources for residents to review and understand the full implications of the proposed development. Steve Birkinshaw, Head of Planning, indicated that it was not necessary for residents to review such information, which contradicts the purpose of a consultation. My conclusion, therefore, is that the council has sought to undertake the classification without challenge in an undemocratic and immoral manner. Green Belt Reclassification 1. Contradiction to NPPF: The reclassification of Green Belt land to Grey Belt contradicts the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024 and the EBC Local Plan 2022. The Grey Belt policy has been implemented hastily and lacks transparency. 2. Impact on Green Spaces: The proposed development threatens to destroy protected green spaces, which are essential for preventing urban sprawl, safeguarding the countryside, and preserving the character of a historic village such as Draycott. 3. Housing Targets: The current housing targets driving this development are flawed and unrealistic, leading to overburdening local communities and disregarding the impact on the village. Environmental and Landscape Impact 1. Loss of Open Land: The development will result in the loss of open land frequently used by residents for recreation, negatively impacting mental health and wellbeing. 2. Impact on Wildlife: The land is home to significant wildlife, including red-listed species such as birds, foxes, hedgehogs, and squirrels. The development will destroy habitats and nesting sites, which is unacceptable when existing Brownfield sites can be used. The area also includes historical badger sets, Muntjac Deer, and potentially water voles, which are all protected species. The excavation and construction activities will likely force these animals to relocate, causing irreversible damage to the local ecosystem. 3. Protected Bats and Deer: The land Southwest of Draycott is known to be a habitat for protected bat species and deer. Bats are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. The development will disrupt their roosting sites and foraging areas, leading to a decline in their population. Similarly, the presence of deer in the area contributes to the biodiversity and ecological balance. The construction activities and subsequent human encroachment will severely impact their natural habitat. 4. Visual and Spatial Openness: The development will have a significant impact on the visual and spatial openness of the area, obstructing the landscape and diminishing the visual experience of the countryside. 5. Tree Preservation: Many the trees within the area are subject to TPO classification. These should remain protected. National Grid Proposal 1. Chesterfield to Willington: The route for the Pylon's is not yet confirmed. Any changes to the Greenbelt should be considered alongside the already detrimental impact of these proposals. Residents in this area of the village face been overwhelmed with development. The impact on wellbeing and</p>

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Sarah Hargreaves	Response-01314	<p>mental health of many should not be underestimated. I will be clear; this is already impacting people. Infrastructure and Road Safety 1. Traffic Congestion: The A6005 (Derby Road) already experiences significant traffic, with over 3,861 cars per day. The addition of 190 houses will exacerbate congestion and increase the risk of accidents. Recent work by Cadent Gas has caused gridlock within the village due. 2. Accident Hot Spot: The area planned for access to the development has been the site of several serious accidents, unfortunately including a fatality in March 2020 and May 2025. The proposed entrance to the site is unsuitable and has not been given consideration. 3. Road Network Inadequacy: The current road network, including Gypsy Lane and Hopwell Road, cannot handle the increased traffic volume. Significant investment and remodelling are required, which has not been planned. 4. Environmental Impact: Increased traffic will negatively impact the local environment, including Green Belt land, the Erewash River, and local habitats. Air quality deteriorates when traffic builds up due to congestion. Flooding and Drainage 1. Flood Risk: The land Southwest of Draycott experiences significant flooding, impacting residents on Lime Grove. The development will compound these issues, and more investigation is needed. The houses on Lime Grove have experienced severe flooding, affecting gardens and foul sewerage networks. This development will exacerbate these problems, leading to increased flood risk for existing and new residents. 2. Inadequate Assessment: Minimal liaison has been undertaken with Severn Trent regarding drainage and water management. Only four generic questions were asked by EBC in January 2025, indicating a lack of sincere consideration of flood issues. A comprehensive Flood Risk Assessment is required to understand the full impact of the development on local drainage and water management systems. 3. Environmental Agency Flood Risk Survey: Although the relevant area now falls outside of a Flood Risk Zone, the topology of the site indicates that runoff from the development will add to the present flood risk areas within the Environment Agency flood risk zone. Building on a flood plain that has trees, grass, and plants that naturally help absorb water via root systems will have a significant impact when removed. Furthermore, it is not clear why the land was reclassified two days before the consultation was agreed. Who agreed to reclassify this land? And on what basis? Given that recent years have seen unprecedented flooding this is inaccurate. 4. Sequential Test: NPPF 174 states that the aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding. The strategic flood risk assessment will provide the basis for applying for this test. Yet the land Southwest of Draycott was recently within a Flood Risk Zone, and again, the reclassification appears to be a coincidence timed with the consultation period. 5. Climate Change Considerations: NPPF 162 states that the planning system should support the transition to net zero by 2050 and take full account of all climate impacts, including storm and flood risks. The development of 190 houses on land Southwest of Draycott contradicts this statement, as the area experiences</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Sarah Hargreaves	Response-01314	<p>significant flooding throughout the year. This development will further compound these issues, increasing vulnerability to climate change impacts. Housing Type and Scale 1. Mismatch with Existing Housing: The proposed 40% affordable housing is not in keeping with the surrounding 4-5 bedroom detached houses. This allocation is overbearing and does not harmonize with the village character. The homes on Derby Road are established older homes, all unique in their design and do not fit with an 'Estate' or 'New Build' design aesthetic. 2. Scale of Development: The scale of the development is unrealistic and will significantly change the heritage and landscape of Draycott. There are better-suited Brownfield sites that should be prioritized. 3. National Housing Policies: The government's long-term housing strategy emphasizes the importance of prioritizing brownfield development and adhering to mandatory local housing targets. The strategy also includes plans to regenerate towns and cities, focusing on sustainable and beautiful neighborhoods. The proposed development contradicts these policies by prioritizing Green Belt land over available brownfield sites. 4. Affordable Housing Requirements: The government's policy mandates that any Green Belt development should include targets of 50% affordable housing with a focus on social rent. The proposed development's allocation of 40% affordable housing does not meet this requirement, and the type of housing proposed is not in keeping with the surrounding area. Local Facilities 1. NHS Services: There are no provisions within Draycott for GP or Dentistry. Existing local services are already over subscribed and struggling to cope with demand. In conclusion, I strongly urge the EBC to reconsider the proposed development on the Southwest of Draycott. The objections outlined above highlight the significant negative impacts on the environment, community, and local infrastructure. I request that the EBC prioritize existing Brownfield sites and engage in a more inclusive and transparent consultation process. Thank you for considering my objections. Yours sincerely, Sarah Hargreaves</p>

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Scott Gardner	Response-01554	The public consultation process has been inadequate and has left residents feeling unheard. The "frustration" and "anger" expressed at public meetings highlight the community's dissatisfaction with the lack of information and transparency. The timing of agenda releases for crucial council meetings has also been questionable. I remain unconvinced that all reasonable alternative sites have been thoroughly explored. The Council's reliance on the financial viability of the Draycott West site as a primary justification completely disregards the significant environmental and community costs associated with this Green Belt development. The public consultation process surrounding the Erewash Core Strategy Review Amendment has been nothing short of a cynical exercise in ticking boxes. The widespread "frustration" and "anger" expressed at public meetings are a direct result of residents feeling deliberately excluded and uninformed about these life-altering proposals. The questionable timing of the agenda publication for the Erewash Borough Council meeting, after the deadline for submitting questions, reeks of an attempt to stifle public scrutiny and dissent. The legally mandated minimum consultation period of six weeks was woefully inadequate for such a significant and controversial issue, a point rightly raised by Councillor Major who called for a more reasonable 12-week period. Due diligence and consideration should be given for development that will impact our village negatively forever. For all the reasons outlined above, I strongly object to the proposed housing development west of Draycott. This development is unsustainable, will have severe negative consequences for our community, and flies in the face of established planning policies. I urge the Erewash Borough Council and the Planning Inspectorate to reject this ill-conceived proposal.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Sean Peace	Response-01347	Loss of open space and green spaces ? this is vital for our community's wellbeing 5 2 Primary School affected with noise and traffic 6 3 The footpaths that cross the land have amazing views and are used regularly by residents and visitors. The recent pandemic years have shown us that we need space to exercise and be at peace with ourselves and nature, for our own mental wellbeing. This development will have the effect, that anyone using the path would not benefit from the current sprawling Greenbelt views as it will be gone forever. 7 4 It will have a detrimental effect on the wellbeing of people who enjoy the countryside, not to mention wildlife habitats, which are already under extreme pressure. 8 6 The recent pandemic has highlighted the valuable and regular use of these footpaths, promoting and fostering good mental health. 9 7 This land is rural in character, providing a tranquil transitional landscape between the rural areas of Draycott Parish, and the small villages surrounding it of Borrowash and Breaston. 10 8 It is the wrong model in the wrong place to deliver the EBCs housing needs being of a scale that is ultimately detrimental to the local landscape and will harm the countryside, wildlife and impact irreversibly upon the area and its residents. 11 9 Footpaths, the Amenity and enjoyment of the use of these pathways which cross through and around this site which provide an important means by which residents of the local villages can get access to the countryside with substantial benefits for their physical and mental health as well as providing means of sustainable transport. For the people of Draycott and other areas, this will have a devastating effect on the enjoyment of walks, replacing green space with 190 houses. 12 10 The sheer scale of the proposed site will have such an irreversible effect on the landscape. The land/footpaths will be surrounded by housing which will render the land unusable by residents whom rely on it as an area to escape and relax. These footpaths are well-used by many people for physical and mental health. This may seem insignificant to others however, residents rely on this land to enable freedom and a work life balance, which will be lost as result of development on this green belt. 13 11 Footpaths although still evident on the plan will no longer be enjoyed by families maintaining their ongoing mental health, health and well-being as they will not have the same enjoyment having to walk through a housing estate. 14 12 NPPF 8. Promoting healthy and safe communities:- 104. Planning policies and decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and access, including taking opportunities to provide better facilities for users, this area has significant lengths of footpaths that will be affected by the development of 190 houses on land south west of Draycott. 15 13 Promoting healthy and safe communities the effect on our healthy lifestyles, especially our local health and well-being needs ? taking away our green space and facility would be detrimental to our community and our day to day needs would fall short by the loss of our valued facilities 16 14 Open space and recreation. NPPF102. Access to a network of high quality open spaces would be reduced by this application and our opportunities for physical activity and health and wellbeing would be adversely affected 17 15 There would be a detrimental effect on the Carbon Sink opportunities by the loss of open land and the effects of a housing
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Sam Jackson	Response-01287	development 18 16 Only the bare minimum consultation has been undertaken by EBC with the local residence of Draycott. The six week consultation period is not sufficient when considering the share size of the development and impact on the village, and is not sufficient time for the local parish and residence to develop a set of objections. When two weeks of the consultation period was across easter. This action by the EBC was irresponsible and not acting in the interests of the local communities this plan impacts. 19 17 To improve local accessibility to healthcare, education, employment, retail facilities and recreational resources including open spaces to enhance wellbeing and promote healthy and sustainable lifestyles. This application will have a negative effect on both wellbeing and health including mental and emotional wellbeing. 20 18 To create safe and attractive places which contribute towards quality of life and community cohesion. This project will significantly detrimentally impact on the quality of life and fragment the community who use this area as a community facility. Including educational opportunities for local schools.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Simon Jenkins	Response-01287	Look forward to a Labour person visiting our house and explaining things to us !!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	S M Beresford	Response-01851	We strongly object to the consultation process, which has been limited and not fully transparent. Erewash Borough Council (EBC) has only given local residents the minimum six-week period to submit objections to this significant change to the Local Plan and Core Strategy. This timeframe is insufficient for residents to review and understand the magnitude of the change and formulate objections, especially given the missing details such as the master plan for the land south west of Draycott. These plans do not align with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024 and EBC Local Plan 2022. Furthermore, adequate consultation has not been undertaken with the Draycott Local Parish Council or residents regarding the impact of these plans on the local community, village, and amenity. Noise from construction and operational phases of the development has not been adequately addressed. An environmental noise assessment needs to be carried out, particularly for residents living adjacent and opposite the site entrance.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Susan Baker	Response-01316	I moved to Draycott from Grimsby- i craved the village life, open space and nature. I feel devastated this will be taken away from us- especially when there are alternatives
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Susan Foster	Response-00824	All the infrastructure and facilities that would be needed to accommodate the huge number of people, cars etc. could be built with less upheaval to those already residing here. It's not a case of nimby, try to spread the 190 homes around the village where they will be more likely to fit in and be better received by the current population.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Teresa Shaw	Response-01309	1. Will additional 10 ? 15% funds be allocated & re-distributed for Erewash Policing & Fire Services to cope with increased expansion of communities. 2. Diminution in Value: If the development is passed in Drayco all properties with green belt views will be reduce in property value, The council should have to pay the difference between the value of the property before and after the development. This is the only fair compensation for this rushed development plan. Then owners can sell without loss and move out of the village. Has this been considered and put in plac?
			Tim Hawkins	Response-00661	Possibly the worst site to build in the area. EBC's insistence on rushing this through is misguided.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Tracey Morton	Response-00968	The loss of this green space will have a significant.effect on residents mental health and wellbeing 2 primary school with being effected by noise and traffic 3 the footpath though the site was heavily used during covid and still is, fabulous views over the fields and the river and beyond 4 destroyed the wildlife particularly the protected bats and protected badgers 5 This development is simply being proposed in the wrong place, just because the farmer wants to sell doesn't make it the right place / fit 6 Other sites around Draycott would be better areas where traffic could be absorbed more and brown field which some already have tanning permissions on 7 The area significantly contributes to people quality of life 8 on a personal note I overlook this area and walked that area, just standing absorbing it, has helped me during tough times in my life
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Tracie ready	Response-01383	Re: Objection to Proposed 190-Home Development in Draycott I am writing to formally object to the proposed construction of 190 new homes in Draycott, near the River Derwent. This development raises significant environmental, infrastructural, and community concerns. Firstly, the site is located on greenbelt land, which currently supports a rich and diverse range of wildlife and biodiversity. This natural habitat not only offers a haven for flora and fauna but also contributes to the rural character that defines Draycott. Destroying this landscape in favour of large-scale housing would result in irreversible ecological damage. The proximity of the proposed development to the River Derwent is deeply troubling. The land acts as a natural floodplain, serving as a vital barrier that mitigates the risk of flooding in the village. Building on this area could increase the likelihood of flooding events, especially in light of the growing impact of climate change. Beyond environmental concerns, the village already experiences considerable strain on its infrastructure. Local schools and GP surgeries are at capacity, and the existing road network is not equipped to handle a significant increase in population. Draycott is often used as a cut-through route, and this development would exacerbate existing traffic issues, the village roads are already congested. Furthermore, the scale of this development is wholly inappropriate for a village of Draycott's size. Such a substantial influx of new residents would fundamentally alter the character of the village, eroding its distinct rural identity and transforming it into something closer to a town. This loss of community feel and heritage would be a tragic and permanent shift. For the reasons outlined above?flood risk, environmental destruction, infrastructure strain, increased traffic, and loss of village identity?! strongly urge you to reject this proposal.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	T Shields	Response-00570	There will be some impacts: increase in traffic, a small loss of Green Belt land. But the benefits are substantial in terms of providing increased houses, a high proportion of which would be affordable, particularly in the face of a local and regional shortage. The increase in residents would also help to boost the local economy - the local businesses/shops/pubs etc struggle so increased spending locally will support their economic viability. The developers would also have to provide the usual section 106 financial contributions towards health, education and other infrastructure. These would be significant from 190+ houses. The benefits far outweigh the relatively minor negative impacts and will support the future for the upcoming generation in Draycott. There are too many NIMBYS in Draycott who don't think about the next generation. As a resident of Draycott I am saddened that the Parish Council have leafleted the village urging people to oppose the allocation.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Viv Wright	Response-00035	Certainly in our area of Derbyshire we are losing our local green spaces . We are creating an access difficulty for many people.. During COVID our local spaces kept us sane. The ability to walk to and through a natural green space is something we should all cherish and protect.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Wilfred Boone	Response-01424	Only the bare minimum consultation has been undertaken by EBC with the local residence of Draycott. The six week consultation period is not sufficient when considering the share size of the development and impact on the village, and is not sufficient time for the local parish and residence to develop a set of objections. When two weeks of the consultation period was across easter half term and the consultation window included 4 Bank Holidays. This when much of the information required was not available and FOI requests were submitted and took 20 working days for a response to be received, when the government agencies contacted themselves did not work the said Bank Holidays. This has meant important information has not been received by residents when developing objections. This action by the EBC was irresponsible, some may say planned, and not acting in the interests of the local communities this plan impacts. I strongly object to the Sustainability Assessment which was undertaken by the EBC when assessing the land south west of Draycott. The EBC assessment scored this land as +3 with a ranking of joint 3rd place, when our independent review using professionals and informed local residents resulted in a score of -6 placing this land ran 20th. When reviewed, clear and obvious errors have been made where the EBC has underplayed and positively scored key questions incorrectly to achieve a desired outcome. For example, 9.1: Will it make efficient use of brownfield land? the EBC states that it will not as the site is entirely Greenfield and we know there over 109 Brownfield sites in EBC. Yet the EBC only gives this question a -1 when it should surely receive an at least a Minor Negative -2 score. Question 16.5: Will it protect the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land? the EBC itself states the land south west of Draycott 'Agricultural Land Classification Grade 2 so is of reasonable quality' and this scheme will not therefore protect the BMV. Yet the EBC has scored it only -1. This in our view should be a Minor Negative -2 as there is limited Grade 2 land within the area with most being Grade 3 & 4. Furthermore, question 16.6: Will it prevent the loss of greenfield land to development? the EBC itself states that 'No, the site is Greenfield in its classification so development would not prevent the loss of greenfield land. The limited scale of site limits this negative impact', yet the site is over 8H of Greenfield Grade 2 quality land and only awards a -1. This is our view should received a -2 or even a -3 as this development will have a significant impact on the Greenfield land and its surrounding areas. Questions 2.2 and 2.1 relate to employment and EBC advises that this scheme will not boost employment in the local area due to its limited scale yet award neutral 0' to both questions. Surely these questions should receive -1 as they fail to deliver on the question. Furthermore, questions such as 14.4, 15.2, 15.3, 15.4, 16.1 and 16.2 are all speculative in their answer as they relate to the developer delivering on
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	Wilfred Boone	Response-01424	certain sustainable aspects which can not possibly be scored at this time. Overall, we strongly object to the EBC Sustainability Assessment and would call for this to be independently reviewed.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	zak butcher	Response-01156	Only the bare minimum consultation has been undertaken by EBC with the local residence of Draycott. The six week consultation period is not sufficient when considering the share size of the development and impact on the village, and is not sufficient time for the local parish and residence to develop a set of objections. When two weeks of the consultation period was across easter half term and the consultation window included 4 Bank Holidays. This when much of the information required was not available and FOI requests were submitted and took 20 working days for a response to be received, when the government agencies contacted themselves did not work the said Bank Holidays. This has meant important information has not been received by residents when developing objections. This action by the EBC was irresponsible, some may say planned, and not acting in the interests of the local communities this plan impacts. I strongly object to the consultation process which as best can be described as limited and not fully transparent when engaging with the local community. EBC has only given local residents mere 6 weeks to submit objections to what is an incredibly important change to the original Local Plan and Core Strategy. This is simply not enough time for residents to review and analysis the share magnitude of information and formulate objections, this when significant information is also missing which includes the master plan for the land south west of Draycott. I strongly object to the significant changes EBC plan to make to its Core Strategy and the reclassification of the land south west of Draycott to Grey Belt. It is widely accepted that the Grey Belt policy has been implemented in a rushed and incoherent manner, which is reflected in the EBCs hastily revised Core Strategic Review and a clear lack of transparency and community consultation. The policy is likely to have little to no impact on achieving the government's target of 1.5 million new homes by the end of the current Parliament but threatens to destroy currently protected green spaces. I strongly do not believe these plans are in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, and the Erewash Borough Councils (EBC) Local Plan 2022. I also do not believe that adequate consultation has been undertaken by EBC with the Draycott Local Parish Council or residents on these plans, and the impact they will have on the local community, wider village and amenity. Furthermore, the development plans plus the proposed National Grids pylon corridor which has been identified as only being circa 600 meters away from this development, will mean the south west of Draycott will be unrealistically overburdened with development impacting Green Belt land. As residents living next to the site of the proposed change in Green Belt status and future housing development, we are of the view that these proposals will have a serious negative impact on the village, visual openness, spatial openness, the local community and our standard of living. I strongly object to the Sustainability Assessment which was undertaken by the EBC when assessing the land south west of Draycott. The EBC assessment scored this land as +3 with a ranking of joint 3rd place, when our independent review using professionals and informed local residents resulted in a score of -6 placing this land ran 20th. When reviewed, clear and obvious errors have been made where the EBC has underplayed and positively scored key questions

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Other	ix butcher	Response-01155	Incorrectly to achieve a desired outcome. For example, 9.1: Will it make efficient use of brownfield land? the EBC states that it will not as the site is entirely Greenfield and we know there over 109 Brownfield sites in EBC. Yet the EBC only gives this question a -1 when it should surely receive an at least a Minor Negative -2 score. Question 16.5: Will it protect the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land? the EBC itself states the land south west of Draycott 'Agricultural Land Classification Grade 2 so is of reasonable quality' and this scheme will not therefore protect the BMV. Yet the EBC has scored it only -1. This in our view should be a Minor Negative -2 as there is limited Grade 2 land within the area with most being Grade 3 & 4. Furthermore, question 16.6: Will it prevent the loss of greenfield land to development? the EBC itself states that 'No, the site is Greenfield in its classification so development would not prevent the loss of greenfield land. The limited scale of site limits this negative impact', yet the site is over 8H of Greenfield Grade 2 quality land and only awards a -1. This is our view should received a -2 or even a -3 as this development will have a significant impact on the Greenfield land and its surrounding areas. Questions 2.2 and 2.1 relate to employment and EBC advises that this scheme will not boost employment in the local area due to its limited scale yet award neutral 0' to both questions. Surely these questions should receive -1 as they fail to deliver on the question. Furthermore, questions such as 14.4, 15.2, 15.3, 15.4, 16.1 and 16.2 are all speculative in their answer as they relate to the developer delivering on certain sustainable aspects which can not possibly be scored at this time. Overall, we strongly object to the EBC Sustainability Assessment and would call for this to be independently reviewed.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	adrian leeming	Response-01249	The A6005 (Derby Road) is an already significantly busy main road which experience an average number of 3,861 cars per day with a peak of 4,779 recorded in 2023. If 190 houses are built on the land south west of Draycott this will mean an at least additional c.380 cars in Draycott alone. This volume of traffic will significantly impact road safety and increase the risk of road traffic accidents. A recent road traffic survey which was undertaken on the A6005 (Derby Road) and close to the proposed entrance to the housing development, found that within the 40 mph speed limit in this area cars exceeded 70 mph an average of 174 times a day. The addition of over c.380 additional cars will further compound this danger and increase likely road traffic accidents. "NPPF 109. States that transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, using a vision-led approach to identify transport solutions that deliver well-designed, sustainable and popular places. This should involve identifying, assessing and taking into account the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure ? including appropriate opportunities for avoiding and mitigating any adverse effects, and for net environmental gains. Yet no traffic survey has been undertaken. If it had it would have highlighted that along A6005 (Derby Road) and exactly adjacent the proposed development. The peak traffic hours on Fridays are between 4 PM and 6 PM, with the highest average vehicle count observed from 4 PM to 5 PM. The average number of cars per day in the traffic data is approximately 3,861 vehicles. The highest recorded traffic day in the data is June 11, 2023, with a total of 4,779 vehicles. The maximum speed recorded in the traffic data is 106 mph and the number of times 70 mph is exceeded in the traffic data is 174." The increased road and traffic to the area will have a detrimental impact to the local environment when considering the close proximity of Green Belt land, the Erewash River and the Derby Road to Draycott canal and footpath. These areas contain a magnitude of nature and local habitat that will be negatively impacted by increased population density, carbon footprint and does not align to the NPPFs sustainable location assessment. NPPF 20. States that strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and design quality of places and make sufficient provision for infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, security, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat). The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic. NPPF 89. States that planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads. The road network in and around the identified development wou
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	adrian leeming	Response-01249	Id require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Alastair Dundas	Response-01200	The location of the proposed development I believe would be dangerous due to the speed of traffic entering the village.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Alison Bowley	Response-01174	Derby road is known to have had accidents, including fatalities. Many vehicles speed into the village over the railway line. A road junction at that point will undoubtedly increase the accident rate. Sadly, as I type this I've just read that there has been a fatal road traffic accident in Draycott last evening, which involved the air ambulance having to land, i.e needing a green space. EBC should listen to the electorate and not destroy our beloved villages forever.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Alison Thirlwall	Response-01390	The A6005 (Derby Road) is an already significantly busy main road which experience an average number of 3,861 cars per day with a peak of 4,779 recorded in 2023. If 190 houses are built on the land south west of Draycott this will mean an at least additional c.380 cars in Draycott alone. This volume of traffic will significantly impact road safety and increase the risk of road traffic accidents. The increased road and traffic to the area will have a detrimental impact for pedestrians using the Draycott canal and footpath recreations areas. These areas contain a magnitude of nature and local habitat that will be negatively impacted by increased population density, carbon footprint and does not align to the NPPFs sustainable location assessment.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Andrew and Jane Gilmour	Response-01329	The A6005 (Derby Road) is an already significantly busy main road which experience an average number of 3,861 cars per day with a peak of 4,779 recorded in 2023. If 190 houses are built on the land south west of Draycott this will mean at least an additional c.380 vehicles in Draycott alone. This volume of traffic will significantly impact road safety and increase the risk of road traffic accidents considering the proposed siting of a pedestrian crossing near the development access road at the start of the 30mph zone on Derby Road A6005. A recent road traffic survey which was undertaken on the A6005 (Derby Road) and close to the proposed entrance to the housing development, found that within the 40 mph speed limit in this area cars exceeded 70 mph an average of 174 times a day. The addition of over c.380 additional vehicles will further compound this danger and increase likely road traffic accidents. "NPPF 109. States that transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, using a vision-led approach to identify transport solutions that deliver well-designed, sustainable and popular places. This should involve identifying, assessing and taking into account the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure ? including appropriate opportunities for avoiding and mitigating any adverse effects, and for net environmental gains. Yet no traffic survey has been undertaken. If it had it would have highlighted that along A6005 (Derby Road) and exactly adjacent the proposed development safety issues would arise. The peak traffic hours on Fridays are between 4 PM and 6 PM, with the highest average vehicle count observed from 4 PM to 5 PM. The average number of vehicles per day in the traffic data is approximately 3,861. The highest recorded traffic day in the data is June 11, 2023, with a total of 4,779 vehicles. The maximum speed recorded in the traffic data is 106 mph and the number of times 70 mph is exceeded in the traffic data is 174. The increased road and traffic to the area will have a detrimental impact to the local environment when considering the close proximity of Green Belt land, the River Derwent and the partially restored canal and footpath. These areas contain a magnitude of nature and local habitat that will be negatively impacted by increased population density, carbon footprint and does not align to the NPPFs sustainable location assessment. NPPF 20. States that strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and design quality of places and make sufficient provision for infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, security, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat). The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of vehicles. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic. NPPF 89. States that planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Andrew and Jane Gilmour	Response-01329	that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads. The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic. It has been proposed that a pedestrian crossing should be put in place linking this proposed development to the bus route going into Nottingham. Such a pedestrian crossing would be an accident waiting to happen, visibility as you come into Draycott from Borrowash is limited by two road bridges crossing the canal and railway lines and has been pointed out elsewhere in the document the speed limit is routinely ignored by many.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	A Northeast	Response-01848	The A6005 (Derby Road) is already significantly busy, and the addition of 190 houses will increase traffic volume, impacting road safety and increasing the risk of accidents. A transport assessment needs to be undertaken, particularly for the residents opposite and adjoining the proposed site entrance. Moreover, the increased traffic will pose a significant risk to pedestrians and cyclists. The A6005 is a key route for local residents, including children walking to school and elderly residents. Higher traffic volumes increase the likelihood of accidents involving these vulnerable road users. Implementing traffic calming measures such as speed bumps, pedestrian crossings, and improved signage could mitigate some risks, but these measures need to be carefully planned and executed. A comprehensive transport assessment is essential to understand the full impact of the proposed development on road safety. This assessment should consider current traffic levels, projected increases, and the capacity of existing road infrastructure. It should also evaluate the potential need for new traffic control measures and improvements to pedestrian and cyclist safety.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Anthony Lawton-Reeve	Response-00971	The increased road and traffic to the area will have a detrimental impact to the local environment when considering the close proximity of Green Belt land, the Erewash River and the Derby Road to Draycott canal and footpath. These areas contain a magnitude of nature and local habitat that will be negatively impacted by increased population density, carbon footprint and does not align to the NPPFs sustainable location assessment.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Anthony Walsh	Response-00992	The A6005 (Derby Road) is an already significantly busy main road which experience an average number of 3,861 cars per day with a peak of 4,779 recorded in 2023. If 190 houses are built on the land south west of Draycott this will mean an at least additional c.380 cars in Draycott alone. This volume of traffic will significantly impact road safety and increase the risk of road traffic accidents. A recent road traffic survey which was undertaken on the A6005 (Derby Road) and close to the proposed entrance to the housing development, found that within the 40 mph speed limit in this area cars exceeded 70 mph an average of 174 times a day. The addition of over c.380 additional cars will further compound this danger and increase likely road traffic accidents.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Avice Boyle	Response-01427	NPPF 89. States that planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads. The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic. "NPPF 109. States that transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, using a vision-led approach to identify transport solutions that deliver well-designed, sustainable and popular places. This should involve identifying, assessing and taking into account the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure ? including appropriate opportunities for avoiding and mitigating any adverse effects, and for net environmental gains. Yet no traffic survey has been undertaken. If it had it would have highlighted that along A6005 (Derby Road) and exactly adjacent the proposed development. The peak traffic hours on Fridays are between 4 PM and 6 PM, with the highest average vehicle count observed from 4 PM to 5 PM. The average number of cars per day in the traffic data is approximately 3,861 vehicles. The highest recorded traffic day in the data is June 11, 2023, with a total of 4,779 vehicles. The maximum speed recorded in the traffic data is 106 mph and the number of times 70 mph is exceeded in the traffic data is 174." The A6005 (Derby Road) is an already significantly busy main road which experience an average number of 3,861 cars per day with a peak of 4,779 recorded in 2023. If 190 houses are built on the land south west of Draycott this will mean an at least additional c.380 cars in Draycott alone. This volume of traffic will significantly impact road safety and increase the risk of road traffic accidents.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Ben Marshall	Response-01212	The A6005 (Derby Road) is an already significantly busy main road which experience an average number of 3,861 cars per day with a peak of 4,779 recorded in 2023. If 190 houses are built on the land south west of Draycott this will mean an at least additional c.380 cars in Draycott alone. This volume of traffic will significantly impact road safety and increase the risk of road traffic accidents. A recent road traffic survey which was undertaken on the A6005 (Derby Road) and close to the proposed entrance to the housing development, found that within the 40 mph speed limit in this area cars exceeded 70 mph an average of 174 times a day. The addition of over c.380 additional cars will further compound this danger and increase likely road traffic accidents. Just this week a very serious accident occurred on the road, the area is in desperate need of a speed camera with further building only putting people further at risk.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Bernadette Rothwell	Response-00998	There was a death of a motorcyclist in this area from a car existing a property onto Derby Road. How will this be managed and mitigated?
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Bradley Peace	Response-01348	The A6005 (Derby Road) is an already significantly busy main road which experience an average number of 3,861 cars per day with a peak of 4,779 recorded in 2023. If 190 houses are built on the land south west of Draycott this will mean an at least additional c.380 cars in Draycott alone. This volume of traffic will significantly impact road safety and increase the risk of road traffic accidents. 5 2 A recent road traffic survey which was undertaken on the A6005 (Derby Road) and close to the proposed entrance to the housing development, found that within the 40 mph speed limit in this area cars exceeded 70 mph an average of 174 times a day. The addition of over c.380 additional cars will further compound this danger and increase likely road traffic accidents. 6 3 NPPF 109. States that transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, using a vision-led approach to identify transport solutions that deliver well-designed, sustainable and popular places. This should involve identifying, assessing and taking into account the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure ? including appropriate opportunities for avoiding and mitigating any adverse effects, and for net environmental gains. Yet no traffic survey has been undertaken. If it had it would have highlighted that along A6005 (Derby Road) and exactly adjacent the proposed development. The peak traffic hours on Fridays are between 4 PM and 6 PM, with the highest average vehicle count observed from 4 PM to 5 PM. The average number of cars per day in the traffic data is approximately 3,861 vehicles. The highest recorded traffic day in the data is June 11, 2023, with a total of 4,779 vehicles. The maximum speed recorded in the traffic data is 106 mph and the number of times 70 mph is exceeded in the traffic data is 174. 7 4 The increased road and traffic to the area will have a detrimental impact to the local environment when considering the close proximity of Green Belt land, the Erewash River and the Derby Road to Draycott canal and footpath. These areas contain a magnitude of nature and local habitat that will be negatively impacted by increased population density, carbon footprint and does not align to the NPPFs sustainable location assessment. 8 5 NPPF 20. States that strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and design quality of places and make sufficient provision for infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, security, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat). The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic. 9 6 NPPF 89. States that planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads. The road network in and around the identifi
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Bradley Peace	Response-01348	ed development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Charlotte Brennan	Response-00931	A recent road traffic survey which was undertaken on the A6005 (Derby Road) and close to the proposed entrance to the housing development, found that within the 40 mph speed limit in this area cars exceeded 70 mph an average of 174 times a day. The addition of over c.380 additional cars will further compound this danger and increase likely road traffic accidents.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Colin & Cynthia Green	Response-00922	Again, crossing this busy road problematic already so additional 190 homes will increase traffic say 2 vehicles per new build will pose problems to Derby or Nottingham. Not safe to cross now at peak times as no crossing available & speeds in excess of 30 mph now.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	David and Mary Murden	Response-01898	Other concerns that we have are Road Safety and the Amenities in the village. The stretch of Derby Road from Shacklecross to the village of Draycott is a notorious danger spot. It is still called by many 'The Draycott Straight', as it used to have a 60 mph speed limit. Now, of course, that is down to 40 mph, then 30 mph, but we all know that there are very many motorists and motocyclists who ignore these limits and still use it as a fast run, and this has been the cause of many accidents. Having a new road opening onto this area, which we believe would be near to the railway bridge, would add to this peril and put many more lives in danger.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	David and Nicala O'Leary	Response-00822	Speed Indicator Devices in the village routinely show vehicles exceeding safe limits, often surpassing speeds seen on major highways. Adding 190 homes could introduce over 380 additional vehicles to local roads, significantly increasing the risk of accidents
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	David Atchison	Response-01247	A recent road traffic survey which was undertaken on the A6005 (Derby Road) and close to the proposed entrance to the housing development, found that within the 40 mph speed limit in this area cars exceeded 70 mph an average of 174 times a day. The addition of over c.380 additional cars will further compound this danger and increase likely road traffic accidents. The increased road and traffic to the area will have a detrimental impact to the local environment when considering the close proximity of Green Belt land, the Erewash River and the Derby Road to Draycott canal and footpath. These areas contain a magnitude of nature and local habitat that will be negatively impacted by increased population density, carbon footprint and does not align to the NPPFs sustainable location assessment.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	David Boyle	Response-01426	An environment noise assessment needs to be carried out, particularly for the residents directly opposite the site entrance; but also the whole route that the construction traffic will take. This passes through Draycott, Borrow ash and Beaston villages. Passing busy junctions, Doctor?s surgeries, public car parks, Primary schools, local cricket clubs as well as numerous resident?s homes.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	David G York	Response-01843	The A6005 (Derby Road) is already significantly busy, and the addition of 190 houses will increase traffic volume, impacting road safety and increasing the risk of accidents. A transport assessment needs to be undertaken, particularly for the residents opposite and adjoining the proposed site entrance. Moreover, the increased traffic will pose a significant risk to pedestrians and cyclists. The A6005 is a key route for local residents, including children walking to school and elderly residents. Higher traffic volumes increase the likelihood of accidents involving these vulnerable road users. Implementing traffic calming measures such as speed bumps, pedestrian crossings, and improved signage could mitigate some risks, but these measures need to be carefully planned and executed. A comprehensive transport assessment is essential to understand the full impact of the proposed development on road safety. This assessment should consider current traffic levels, projected increases, and the capacity of existing road infrastructure. It should also evaluate the potential need for new traffic control measures and improvements to pedestrian and cyclist safety.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	David Thompson	Response-00654	The development of further housing will bring added flow of traffic to Derby Road. This will only add to the existing issues with vehicles speeding through the village at all times of the day and night and will further add to the current situation of "an accident waiting to happen".
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	David Webster	Response-01113	The A6005 (Derby Road) is an already significantly busy main road which experience an average number of 3,861 cars per day with a peak of 4,779 recorded in 2023. If 190 houses are built on the land south west of Draycott this will mean an at least additional c.380 cars in Draycott alone. This volume of traffic will significantly impact road safety and increase the risk of road traffic accidents.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Dexter Codrington	Response-00986	The road is regularly backed up due to accidents on the A50, M1 and adjoining A52. It is a short cut to avoid many of the busy junctions at peak times. The volume of traffic and the subsequent number of accidents is already far too many for such a small village. It is no longer safe to ride a horse or bike at busy times along this road., or indeed attempt to cross the road to walk a dogWe have had a fatality outside of our house and a serious collision into a parked car due to speed and parked cars.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Diane Webster	Response-01177	The A6005 (Derby Road) is an already significantly busy main road which experience an average number of 3,861 cars per day with a peak of 4,779 recorded in 2023. If 190 houses are built on the land south west of Draycott this will mean an at least additional c.380 cars in Draycott alone. This volume of traffic will significantly impact road safety and increase the risk of road traffic accidents. A recent road traffic survey which was undertaken on the A6005 (Derby Road) and close to the proposed entrance to the housing development, found that within the 40 mph speed limit in this area cars exceeded 70 mph an average of 174 times a day. The addition of over c.380 additional cars will further compound this danger and increase likely road traffic accidents. "NPPF 109. States that transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, using a vision-led approach to identify transport solutions that deliver well-designed, sustainable and popular places. This should involve identifying, assessing and taking into account the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure ? including appropriate opportunities for avoiding and mitigating any adverse effects, and for net environmental gains. Yet no traffic survey has been undertaken. If it had it would have highlighted that along A6005 (Derby Road) and exactly adjacent the proposed development. The peak traffic hours on Fridays are between 4 PM and 6 PM, with the highest average vehicle count observed from 4 PM to 5 PM. The average number of cars per day in the traffic data is approximately 3,861 vehicles. The highest recorded traffic day in the data is June 11, 2023, with a total of 4,779 vehicles. The maximum speed recorded in the traffic data is 106 mph and the number of times 70 mph is exceeded in the traffic data is 174."

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Donna Butcher	Response-01155	The A6005 (Derby Road) is an already significantly busy main road which experience an average number of 3,861 cars per day with a peak of 4,779 recorded in 2023. If 190 houses are built on the land south west of Draycott this will mean an at least additional c.380 cars in Draycott alone. This volume of traffic will significantly impact road safety and increase the risk of road traffic accidents. A recent road traffic survey which was undertaken on the A6005 (Derby Road) and close to the proposed entrance to the housing development, found that within the 40 mph speed limit in this area cars exceeded 70 mph an average of 174 times a day. The addition of over c.380 additional cars will further compound this danger and increase likely road traffic accidents. NPPF 109. States that transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, using a vision-led approach to identify transport solutions that deliver well-designed, sustainable and popular places. This should involve identifying, assessing and taking into account the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure ? including appropriate opportunities for avoiding and mitigating any adverse effects, and for net environmental gains. Yet no traffic survey has been undertaken. If it had it would have highlighted that along A6005 (Derby Road) and exactly adjacent the proposed development. NPPF 20. States that strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and design quality of places and make sufficient provision for infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, security, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat). The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic. NPPF 89. States that planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads. The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Donna Peace	Response-01344	oad SafetyTraffic CongestionWildlife - BiodiversityOther - Noise & DisturbanceOther - Health & Wellbeing A B C 1 2 Road Safety 3 Objection Data 4 1 The A6005 (Derby Road) is an already significantly busy main road which experience an average number of 3,861 cars per day with a peak of 4,779 recorded in 2023. If 190 houses are built on the land south west of Draycott this will mean an at least additional c.380 cars in Draycott alone. This volume of traffic will significantly impact road safety and increase the risk of road traffic accidents. 5 2 A recent road traffic survey which was undertaken on the A6005 (Derby Road) and close to the proposed entrance to the housing development, found that within the 40 mph speed limit in this area cars exceeded 70 mph an average of 174 times a day. The addition of over c.380 additional cars will further compound this danger and increase likely road traffic accidents. 6 3 NPPF 109. States that transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, using a vision-led approach to identify transport solutions that deliver well-designed, sustainable and popular places. This should involve identifying, assessing and taking into account the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure ? including appropriate opportunities for avoiding and mitigating any adverse effects, and for net environmental gains. Yet no traffic survey has been undertaken. If it had it would have highlighted that along A6005 (Derby Road) and exactly adjacent the proposed development. The peak traffic hours on Fridays are between 4 PM and 6 PM, with the highest average vehicle count observed from 4 PM to 5 PM. The average number of cars per day in the traffic data is approximately 3,861 vehicles. The highest recorded traffic day in the data is June 11, 2023, with a total of 4,779 vehicles. The maximum speed recorded in the traffic data is 106 mph and the number of times 70 mph is exceeded in the traffic data is 174. 7 4 The increased road and traffic to the area will have a detrimental impact to the local environment when considering the close proximity of Green Belt land, the Erewash River and the Derby Road to Draycott canal and footpath. These areas contain a magnitude of nature and local habitat that will be negatively impacted by increased population density, carbon footprint and does not align to the NPPFs sustainable location assessment. 8 5 NPPF 20. States that strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and design quality of places and make sufficient provision for infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, security, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat). The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic. 9 6 NPPF 89. States that planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Donna Peace	Response-01344	that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads. The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Douglas Walker	Response-00994	A recent road traffic survey which was undertaken on the A6005 (Derby Road) and close to the proposed entrance to the housing development, found that within the 40 mph speed limit in this area cars exceeded 70 mph an average of 174 times a day. The addition of over c.380 additional cars will further compound this danger and increase likely road traffic accidents. NPPF 109. States that transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, using a vision-led approach to identify transport solutions that deliver well-designed, sustainable and popular places. This should involve identifying, assessing and taking into account the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure ? including appropriate opportunities for avoiding and mitigating any adverse effects, and for net environmental gains. Yet no traffic survey has been undertaken. If it had it would have highlighted that along A6005 (Derby Road) and exactly adjacent the proposed development. The peak traffic hours on Fridays are between 4 PM and 6 PM, with the highest average vehicle count observed from 4 PM to 5 PM. The average number of cars per day in the traffic data is approximately 3,861 vehicles. The highest recorded traffic day in the data is June 11, 2023, with a total of 4,779 vehicles. The maximum speed recorded in the traffic data is 106 mph and the number of times 70 mph is exceeded in the traffic data is 174. The increased road and traffic to the area will have a detrimental impact to the local environment when considering the close proximity of Green Belt land, the Erewash River and the Derby Road to Draycott canal and footpath. These areas contain a magnitude of nature and local habitat that will be negatively impacted by increased population density, carbon footprint and does not align to the NPPFs sustainable location assessment. NPPF 89. States that planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads. The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Dr Shelagh Brown	Response-01158	The A6005 between Draycott and Borrowash is increasingly busy, with many drivers exceeding the speed limit. Additional housing with the associated additional cars is likely to increase the accident rate. Fatalities have resulted from accidents on this road.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Dudley Medhurst	Response-01180	It is a very dangerous part of our village road and there have indeed been many accidents in the area. Further traffic will only make it worse when coming over the bridge into the village.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Francis Ian Scott	Response-01535	The A6005 (Derby Road) is an already significantly busy main road which experience an average number of 3,861 cars per day with a peak of 4,779 recorded in 2023. If 190 houses are built on the land south west of Draycott this will mean an at least additional c.380 cars in Draycott alone. This volume of traffic will significantly impact road safety and increase the risk of road traffic accidents. A recent road traffic survey which was undertaken on the A6005 (Derby Road) and close to the proposed entrance to the housing development, found that within the 40 mph speed limit in this area cars exceeded 70 mph an average of 174 times a day. The addition of over c.380 additional cars will further compound this danger and increase likely road traffic accidents. "NPPF 109. States that transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, using a vision-led approach to identify transport solutions that deliver well-designed, sustainable and popular places. This should involve identifying, assessing and taking into account the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure ? including appropriate opportunities for avoiding and mitigating any adverse effects, and for net environmental gains. Yet why has no traffic survey been undertaken? If it had it would have highlighted that along A6005 (Derby Road) and exactly adjacent the proposed development ... the peak traffic hours on Fridays are between 4 PM and 6 PM, with the highest average vehicle count observed from 4 PM to 5 PM. The average number of cars per day in the traffic data is approximately 3,861 vehicles. The highest recorded traffic day in the data is June 11, 2023, with a total of 4,779 vehicles. The maximum speed recorded in the traffic data is 106 mph and the number of times 70 mph is exceeded in the traffic data is 174." The increased road and traffic to the area will have a detrimental impact to the local environment when considering the close proximity of Green Belt land, the Erewash River and the Derby Road to Draycott canal and footpath. These areas contain a magnitude of nature and local habitat that will be negatively impacted by increased population density, carbon footprint and does not align to the NPPFs sustainable location assessment. NPPF 20. States that strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and design quality of places and make sufficient provision for infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, security, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat). The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic. NPPF 89. States that planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads. The road network in and around the identified developm
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Francis Ian Scott	Response-01535	ent would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Gail Holdsworth	Response-00937	Further to previous comments. Speeding through Draycott , especially at night. It is a straight road from Borrowash to Long Eaton.
			Garry Hickton	Response-01473	Potential pedestrian/ vehicle collision accidents at the bottom of the railway bridge

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Gary Siddall	Response-01237	There is potentially going to be a lot more traffic in the close area of the "proposed new houses" .... There have been RTA/RTI's in that area in the past (including one fatal, that I can recall) Has a full and comprehensive road safety/traffic planning assessment done (which I understand should be done very early on in any planning and development proposals)...?
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Gemma Woolnough	Response-01394	As previously mentioned there has been multiple fatalities on the main road through Draycott, the latest on Tuesday 13th May, in which a motor cyclist was killed. Speeding is commonplace on the main road going through the village, which would likely only be made worse by an increase in houses and consequently more traffic . Many of the fatalities have involved traffics joining the main road from side streets which will only increase with the new housing development as more vehicles will be joining a busy & fast road.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	George Foster	Response-01199	The A6005 (Derby Road) is an already significantly busy main road which experience an average number of 3,861 cars per day with a peak of 4,779 recorded in 2023. If 190 houses are built on the land south west of Draycott this will mean an at least additional c.380 cars in Draycott alone. This volume of traffic will significantly impact road safety and increase the risk of road traffic accidents. A recent road traffic survey which was undertaken on the A6005 (Derby Road) and close to the proposed entrance to the housing development, found that within the 40 mph speed limit in this area cars exceeded 70 mph an average of 174 times a day. The addition of over c.380 additional cars will further compound this danger and increase likely road traffic accidents. NPPF 109. States that transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, using a vision-led approach to identify transport solutions that deliver well-designed, sustainable and popular places. This should involve identifying, assessing and taking into account the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure ? including appropriate opportunities for avoiding and mitigating any adverse effects, and for net environmental gains. Yet no traffic survey has been undertaken. If it had it would have highlighted that along A6005 (Derby Road) and exactly adjacent the proposed development. The peak traffic hours on Fridays are between 4 PM and 6 PM, with the highest average vehicle count observed from 4 PM to 5 PM. The average number of cars per day in the traffic data is approximately 3,861 vehicles. The highest recorded traffic day in the data is June 11, 2023, with a total of 4,779 vehicles. The maximum speed recorded in the traffic data is 106 mph and the number of times 70 mph is exceeded in the traffic data is 174. The increased road and traffic to the area will have a detrimental impact to the local environment when considering the close proximity of Green Belt land, the Erewash River and the Derby Road to Draycott canal and footpath. These areas contain a magnitude of nature and local habitat that will be negatively impacted by increased population density, carbon footprint and does not align to the NPPFs sustainable location assessment. NPPF 20. States that strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and design quality of places and make sufficient provision for infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, security, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat). The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowwash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic. NPPF 89. States that planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads. The road network in and around the identified development would
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Gerri Hickton	Response-01472	require significant investment and remodeling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowwash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Gerri Hickton	Response-01472	Traffic exiting the site will be turning into / against traffic coming over the bridge which makes them blind until last minute. This causes a significant risk to pedestrians, cyclists, horse riders, motorcyclists and other drivers Exacerbating this problem is speeding traffic which whilst it happens, cannot be prevented - it is already a danger, adding further traffic would be to increase this risk
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Gill Trickitt	Response-01157	The one point in the village which all cars and vehicles must pass to get from one side of Draycott to the other - was sadly the scene of a fatal accident last night. There are not enough roads or routes through the village to accommodate the traffic that currently passes, road safety is already an issue and adding additional homes, cars and people to this village will only make the situation more grave.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Gordon Dahill	Response-00690	Access to Derby A6005 just beyond the bridge after the 40 to 30mph is barley 100 yards ,plus the fact that view of the road ahead is compromised by the road dropping down towards the entrance after the bridge,where there will queuing for the entrance causing a hazard . this junction has already had several accidents , one FATAL. It will become an accident black spot.I believe that a resident living opposite the entrance recalls that an application for a small garden centre on the proposed site was rejected in the past due to highway safety concerns. Putting a pedestrian crossing will only make the road more dangerous ant the bus stop east to Nottingham is only a narrow pavement 'no shelter. Anything of any width on the pavement will mean people will need to step into the road to get by, with possible consequences. Also other proposed changes ,signes dragons teeth will not remove the basic dangers associated with this junction.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Graham Wakeling	Response-01238	Further to road congestion, Road safety will suffer, many accidents have occurred in and around Draycott (even one just this week). Also as a pet owner who's cat has suffered RTA recently, The proposed new housing developments will increase the problem.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Hannah McMaster	Response-01381	There have been several fatalities in the village due to speeding along the main route of Derby Road. An increase of vehicles and a new junction will increase the likelihood of more fatalities, potentially involving children as the homes are earmarked for social housing.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Hannah Pritchard	Response-01399	The roads surrounding the proposed development site are narrow and not designed to accommodate high traffic volumes. Increased vehicle numbers will raise the risk of accidents, particularly for pedestrians, cyclists, and school children using already pressured routes such as Hopwell Road. The lack of safe pedestrian crossings and cycleways will create a hazardous environment and increase the potential for road traffic incidents, especially near Draycott Primary School and village amenities.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	James Hargreaves	Response-01315	Road Safety 1. High-Risk Area: The proposed access point for the development is located in an area with a history of serious accidents, including fatalities in March 2020 and May 2025. The entrance design is inappropriate and lacks proper evaluation. 2. Inadequate Infrastructure: Roads such as Gypsy Lane and Hopwell Road are not equipped to handle increased traffic. Major upgrades are necessary but have not been planned.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	James Whyman	Response-01551	1 The A6005 (Derby Road) is an already significantly busy main road which experience an average number of 3,861 cars per day with a peak of 4,779 recorded in 2023. If 190 houses are built on the land south west of Draycott this will mean an at least additional c.380 cars in Draycott alone. This volume of traffic will significantly impact road safety and increase the risk of road traffic accidents. 2 A recent road traffic survey which was undertaken on the A6005 (Derby Road) and close to the proposed entrance to the housing development, found that within the 40 mph speed limit in this area cars exceeded 70 mph an average of 174 times a day. The addition of over c.380 additional cars will further compound this danger and increase likely road traffic accidents. 3 NPPF 109. States that transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, using a vision-led approach to identify transport solutions that deliver well-designed, sustainable and popular places. This should involve identifying, assessing and taking into account the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure ? including appropriate opportunities for avoiding and mitigating any adverse effects, and for net environmental gains. Yet no traffic survey has been undertaken. If it had it would have highlighted that along A6005 (Derby Road) and exactly adjacent the proposed development. The peak traffic hours on Fridays are between 4 PM and 6 PM, with the highest average vehicle count observed from 4 PM to 5 PM. The average number of cars per day in the traffic data is approximately 3,861 vehicles. The highest recorded traffic day in the data is June 11, 2023, with a total of 4,779 vehicles. The maximum speed recorded in the traffic data is 106 mph and the number of times 70 mph is exceeded in the traffic data is 174. 4 The increased road and traffic to the area will have a detrimental impact to the local environment when considering the close proximity of Green Belt land, the Erewash River and the Derby Road to Draycott canal and footpath. These areas contain a magnitude of nature and local habitat that will be negatively impacted by increased population density, carbon footprint and does not align to the NPPFs sustainable location assessment. 5 NPPF 20. States that strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and design quality of places and make sufficient provision for infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, security, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat). The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowwash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic. 6 NPPF 89. States that planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads. The road network in and around the identified devel
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	James Whyman	Response-01551	opment would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowwash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Jane Barker	Response-01178	The part of the A6005 road that will be the main access to this prosed developement is already a hazard due to it being the entrance to the village going from 40mph to 30mph and the bridges etc. and I cannot see that adding a further 400 (approx) vehicles is going to help and will only increase the risk of accidents turning into and out of this development.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	J Morgan	Response-01847	The A6005 (Derby Road) is already significantly busy, and the addition of 190 houses will increase traffic volume, impacting road safety and increasing the risk of accidents. A transport assessment needs to be undertaken, particularly for the residents opposite and adjoining the proposed site entrance. Moreover, the increased traffic will pose a significant risk to pedestrians and cyclists. The A6005 is a key route for local residents, including children walking to school and elderly residents. Higher traffic volumes increase the likelihood of accidents involving these vulnerable road users. Implementing traffic calming measures such as speed bumps, pedestrian crossings, and improved signage could mitigate some risks, but these measures need to be carefully planned and executed. A comprehensive transport assessment is essential to understand the full impact of the proposed development on road safety. This assessment should consider current traffic levels, projected increases, and the capacity of existing road infrastructure. It should also evaluate the potential need for new traffic control measures and improvements to pedestrian and cyclist safety.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Jonathan Childs	Response-01117	The A6005 (Derby Road) is an already significantly busy main road which experience an average number of 3,861 cars per day with a peak of 4,779 recorded in 2023. If 190 houses are built on the land south west of Draycott this will mean an at least additional c.380 cars in Draycott alone. This volume of traffic will significantly impact road safety and increase the risk of road traffic accidents. A recent road traffic survey which was undertaken on the A6005 (Derby Road) and close to the proposed entrance to the housing development, found that within the 40 mph speed limit in this area cars exceeded 70 mph an average of 174 times a day. The addition of over c.380 additional cars will further compound this danger and increase likely road traffic accidents. NPPF 109. States that transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, using a vision-led approach to identify transport solutions that deliver well-designed, sustainable and popular places. This should involve identifying, assessing and taking into account the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure ? including appropriate opportunities for avoiding and mitigating any adverse effects, and for net environmental gains. Yet no traffic survey has been undertaken. If it had it would have highlighted that along A6005 (Derby Road) and exactly adjacent the proposed development. The peak traffic hours on Fridays are between 4 PM and 6 PM, with the highest average vehicle count observed from 4 PM to 5 PM. The average number of cars per day in the traffic data is approximately 3,861 vehicles. The highest recorded traffic day in the data is June 11, 2023, with a total of 4,779 vehicles. The maximum speed recorded in the traffic data is 106 mph and the number of times 70 mph is exceeded in the traffic data is 174. The increased road and traffic to the area will have a detrimental impact to the local environment when considering the close proximity of Green Belt land, the Erewash River and the Derby Road to Draycott canal and footpath. These areas contain a magnitude of nature and local habitat that will be negatively impacted by increased population density, carbon footprint and does not align to the NPPFs sustainable location assessment. NPPF 20. States that strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and design quality of places and make sufficient provision for infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, security, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat). The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic. NPPF 89. States that planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads. The road network in and around the identified development would
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Jonathan Childs	Response-01117	require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic. In addition to the above, issues already exist at the junction of Lime Grove and Derby Road where bus stops are positioned adjacent to and directly opposite Lime Grove and issues with vehicles parking too close to the junction are common. There have been numerous instances of near head-on collision where traffic travelling west-east on Derby Road has chosen not to wait behind the stopped eastbound bus and thus has created a 'near miss' situation with vehicles turning left out of Lime Grove. Similarly, with vehicles parked sometimes partly on the pavement (and illegally) too close to the junction with Lime Grove prevent a clear view of the Derby Road traffic and thus make it a difficult and dangerous task for anyone attempting to emerge from Lime Grove. Nothing has been done to address or police this in my 22 year residence and it is reasonable to expect that given the proposed topology of the proposed new site access road that similar situations will develop there too. It should also be considered that the stretch of Derby Road west of Draycott (known locally as 'Draycott Straight' is a mile long, effectively uninterrupted section of straight road. Typically, traffic found to be exceeding the speed limit is travelling west to east. There is a 30mph transition upon entering Draycott village but this (and the proposed new site access road) is very effectively masked from the view of any approaching vehicle until said vehicle 'crests' the railway bridge - as discussed elsewhere, often at illegal and dangerously high speeds. This topology gives drivers very little time (and obviously less at high speeds) to react and prepare for either the speed transition or the presence of any vehicle entering or emerging from the new site. It is therefore quite reasonable to expect that if the proposed development proceeds, there is very likely to be a significant rise in road traffic collisions in the vicinity.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Judith Boyle	Response-01418	"NPPF 109. States that transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, using a vision-led approach to identify transport solutions that deliver well-designed, sustainable and popular places. This should involve identifying, assessing and taking into account the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure ? including appropriate opportunities for avoiding and mitigating any adverse effects, and for net environmental gains. Yet no traffic survey has been undertaken. If it had it would have highlighted that along A6005 (Derby Road) and exactly adjacent the proposed development. The peak traffic hours on Fridays are between 4 PM and 6 PM, with the highest average vehicle count observed from 4 PM to 5 PM. The average number of cars per day in the traffic data is approximately 3,861 vehicles. The highest recorded traffic day in the data is June 11, 2023, with a total of 4,779 vehicles. The maximum speed recorded in the traffic data is 106 mph and the number of times 70 mph is exceeded in the traffic data is 174." A recent road traffic survey which was undertaken on the A6005 (Derby Road) and close to the proposed entrance to the housing development, found that within the 40 mph speed limit in this area cars exceeded 70 mph an average of 174 times a day. The addition of over c.380 additional cars will further compound this danger and increase likely road traffic accidents.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Juliet Macve	Response-01572	A recent road traffic survey which was undertaken on the A6005 (Derby Road) and close to the proposed entrance to the housing development, found that within the 40 mph speed limit in this area cars exceeded 70 mph an average of 174 times a day. I have personally seen that there is very often a dangerous level of traffic and congestion around the entrance to the primary school on Hopwell road at the start and end of the school day. Cars are often parked very close to junctions throughout the day. The roads and footpaths are used a great deal by vulnerable road users - ie motorcyclists, cyclists, runners and walkers (including families with children). The inevitable large increase in traffic from the proposed development will obviously increase dangers to all, and especially to vulnerable road users. The high speed of traffic close to the entrance to the proposed development makes accidents involving vehicles turning onto and off Derby Road a near-certainty.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Karla Williams	Response-00077	The site is sustainable and the railway bridge is the natural boundary to the village. The crossing is a welcome addition as crossing the road to use the canal path has always been difficult at peak times.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Katie May	Response-01518	The A6005 (Derby Road) is an already significantly busy main road which experience an average number of 3,861 cars per day with a peak of 4,779 recorded in 2023. If 190 houses are built on the land south west of Draycott this will mean an at least additional c.380 cars in Draycott alone. This volume of traffic will significantly impact road safety and increase the risk of road traffic accidents. A recent road traffic survey which was undertaken on the A6005 (Derby Road) and close to the proposed entrance to the housing development, found that within the 40 mph speed limit in this area cars exceeded 70 mph an average of 174 times a day. The addition of over c.380 additional cars will further compound this danger and increase likely road traffic accidents. "NPPF 109. States that transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, using a vision-led approach to identify transport solutions that deliver well-designed, sustainable and popular places. This should involve identifying, assessing and taking into account the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure ? including appropriate opportunities for avoiding and mitigating any adverse effects, and for net environmental gains. Yet no traffic survey has been undertaken. If it had it would have highlighted that along A6005 (Derby Road) and exactly adjacent the proposed development. The peak traffic hours on Fridays are between 4 PM and 6 PM, with the highest average vehicle count observed from 4 PM to 5 PM. The average number of cars per day in the traffic data is approximately 3,861 vehicles. The highest recorded traffic day in the data is June 11, 2023, with a total of 4,779 vehicles. The maximum speed recorded in the traffic data is 106 mph and the number of times 70 mph is exceeded in the traffic data is 174." The increased road and traffic to the area will have a detrimental impact to the local environment when considering the close proximity of Green Belt land, the Erewash River and the Derby Road to Draycott canal and footpath. These areas contain a magnitude of nature and local habitat that will be negatively impacted by increased population density, carbon footprint and does not align to the NPPFs sustainable location assessment. NPPF 20. States that strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and design quality of places and make sufficient provision for infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, security, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat). The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic. NPPF 89. States that planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads. The road network in and around the identified development wou
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Katie May	Response-01518	ld require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Kayleigh Bonallie	Response-01375	There are no crossings, no pavements and a lack of speed control in the area of the proposed entrance to this building site. There are children in most houses along this road and they already have nowhere safe to cross as the council refused to install a speed camera or reduce the limit. Adding extra traffic to this is asking for further issues



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Kelly Walker	Response-00911	The A6005 (Derby Road) is an already significantly busy main road which experience an average number of 3,861 cars per day with a peak of 4,779 recorded in 2023. If 190 houses are built on the land south west of Draycott this will mean an at least additional c.380 cars in Draycott alone. This volume of traffic will significantly impact road safety and increase the risk of road traffic accidents. NPPF 109. States that transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, using a vision-led approach to identify transport solutions that deliver well-designed, sustainable and popular places. This should involve identifying, assessing and taking into account the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure ? including appropriate opportunities for avoiding and mitigating any adverse effects, and for net environmental gains. Yet no traffic survey has been undertaken. If it had it would have highlighted that along A6005 (Derby Road) and exactly adjacent the proposed development. The peak traffic hours on Fridays are between 4 PM and 6 PM, with the highest average vehicle count observed from 4 PM to 5 PM. The average number of cars per day in the traffic data is approximately 3,861 vehicles. The highest recorded traffic day in the data is June 11, 2023, with a total of 4,779 vehicles. The maximum speed recorded in the traffic data is 106 mph and the number of times 70 mph is exceeded in the traffic data is 174. The increased road and traffic to the area will have a detrimental impact to the local environment when considering the close proximity of Green Belt land, the Erewash River and the Derby Road to Draycott canal and footpath. These areas contain a magnitude of nature and local habitat that will be negatively impacted by increased population density, carbon footprint and does not align to the NPPFs sustainable location assessment. NPPF 89. States that planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads. The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowwash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Laura Charier	Response-01218	The A6005 (Derby Road) is an already significantly busy main road which experience an average number of 3,861 cars per day with a peak of 4,779 recorded in 2023. If 190 houses are built on the land south west of Draycott this will mean an at least additional c.380 cars in Draycott alone. This volume of traffic will significantly impact road safety and increase the risk of road traffic accidents. The increased road and traffic to the area will have a detrimental impact to the local environment when considering the close proximity of Green Belt land, the Erewash River and the Derby Road to Draycott canal and footpath. These areas contain a magnitude of nature and local habitat that will be negatively impacted by increased population density, carbon footprint and does not align to the NPPFs sustainable location assessment.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Laura Roffey	Response-01479	access to the new houses would be just over the bow a hill from Borrowwash - not a great place for a new junction.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Lee	Response-00742	1. Planning permission was rejected a small business at this local site because of access & egress issues in that area. Why can this genuine safety issue now be ignored when it suites? Who will be liable if the rush to build causes actual loss of life? This is double standards. 2. Bridges coming into the village create a blind spot - this is fact. A new access & egress sight will cause major issues. A pedestrian crossing may help a little, but the current speed limit of 40MPH into the village is regularly abused. Have you considered what a car doing 60MPH will do? It takes 73 meters to stop! Cars will overshoot the proposed site entrance by some way. This will likely become a black spot and lives we be lost. What other plans are in place to slow these cars down to allow safe access? E.g. Islands, Speed bumps, cameras. 3. A popular dedicated cyclist?s route passes through Draycott and this busy junction with increase?s traffic will put cyclist and a much greater risk. I ride to work but wont in the future as the danger isn?t worth the risk. What is being done or considered to ensure the safety of cyclist? And encourage this greener mode of transport without risking lives. 4. Motor bikes race through the village a serious accident happened July 2019 & a fatality in March 2020. Your regularly get motorcycles going over a 100MPH up to and through the village. How will you prevent these motor cyclists killing themselves and now the new residents in this dangerous location.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Linda Jane Jenkins	Response-01007	my objection is the same as traffic congestion
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Louise and Shane Foster	Response-01219	The plan to install a pedestrian crossing on Derby Road is inadequate. Access to the site by large plant and delivery trucks will cause potential accidents. Again, has there been a risk assessment with regard to this?
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Louise Burnell	Response-00262	Increased traffic flow will lead to a decline in road safety.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Luke Harper	Response-00898	Cars often speed as they enter/exit the village at this point and with new families in the proposed site this will be dangerous
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Luke Hatch	Response-00160	The A6005 is a busy, fast road. More vehicles entering and exiting a new development near this junction will increase the risk to drivers, pedestrians, and cyclists. A single pedestrian crossing and minor junction improvements don?t feel like enough.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Lynne Dundas	Response-01198	I feel the location is not safe for a road to be created at the foot of the hill coming into Draycott from Borrowwash

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Maggie Murphy	Response-00833	The A6005 (Derby Road) is an already significantly busy main road which experiences an average of 3,861 cars per day with a peak of 4,779 recorded in 2023. If 190 houses are built on the land south west of Draycott this will mean at least an additional c.380 cars in Draycott alone. This volume of traffic will significantly impact road safety and increase the risk of road traffic accidents. We also need to be cognisant of the cumulative impact of the proposed sites in Borrowash and Breaston. Derby Road is the main road between all 3 villages. A recent road traffic survey which was undertaken on the A6005 (Derby Road) and close to the proposed entrance to the housing development, found that within the 40 mph speed limit in this area cars exceeded 70 mph an average of 174 times a day. The addition of over c.380 additional cars will further compound this danger and increase road traffic accidents. NPPF 89. States that planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads. The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Martin Fawcett	Response-01077	It's already busy so adding over another 200 vehicles is only going to increase the risk of safety through the village
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Martin Kilcoyne	Response-01460	The A6005 (Derby Road) is an already significantly busy main road which experience an average number of 3,861 cars per day with a peak of 4,779 recorded in 2023. If 190 houses are built on the land south west of Draycott this will mean an at least additional c.380 cars in Draycott alone. This volume of traffic will significantly impact road safety and increase the risk of road traffic accidents. A recent road traffic survey which was undertaken on the A6005 (Derby Road) and close to the proposed entrance to the housing development, found that within the 40 mph speed limit in this area cars exceeded 70 mph an average of 174 times a day. The addition of over c.380 additional cars will further compound this danger and increase likely road traffic accidents. "NPPF 109. States that transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, using a vision-led approach to identify transport solutions that deliver well-designed, sustainable and popular places. This should involve identifying, assessing and taking into account the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure ? including appropriate opportunities for avoiding and mitigating any adverse effects, and for net environmental gains. Yet no traffic survey has been undertaken. If it had it would have highlighted that along A6005 (Derby Road) and exactly adjacent the proposed development. The peak traffic hours on Fridays are between 4 PM and 6 PM, with the highest average vehicle count observed from 4 PM to 5 PM. The average number of cars per day in the traffic data is approximately 3,861 vehicles. The highest recorded traffic day in the data is June 11, 2023, with a total of 4,779 vehicles. The maximum speed recorded in the traffic data is 106 mph and the number of times 70 mph is exceeded in the traffic data is 174." The increased road and traffic to the area will have a detrimental impact to the local environment when considering the close proximity of Green Belt land, the Erewash River and the Derby Road to Draycott canal and footpath. These areas contain a magnitude of nature and local habitat that will be negatively impacted by increased population density, carbon footprint and does not align to the NPPFs sustainable location assessment. NPPF 20. States that strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and design quality of places and make sufficient provision for infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, security, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat). The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic. NPPF 89. States that planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads. The road network in and around the identified development wou
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Martin Kilcoyne	Response-01460	Id require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Mary Walsh	Response-01197	The A6005 (Derby Road) is an already significantly busy main road which experience an average number of 3,861 cars per day with a peak of 4,779 recorded in 2023. If 190 houses are built on the land south west of Draycott this will mean an at least additional c.380 cars in Draycott alone. This volume of traffic will significantly impact road safety and increase the risk of road traffic accidents.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Matthew Walker	Response-01313	The A6005 (Derby Road) is an already significantly busy main road which experience an average number of 3,861 cars per day with a peak of 4,779 recorded in 2023. If 190 houses are built on the land south west of Draycott this will mean an at least additional c.380 cars in Draycott alone. This volume of traffic will significantly impact road safety and increase the risk of road traffic accidents. A recent road traffic survey which was undertaken on the A6005 (Derby Road) and close to the proposed entrance to the housing development, found that within the 40 mph speed limit in this area cars exceeded 70 mph an average of 174 times a day. The addition of over c.380 additional cars will further compound this danger and increase likely road traffic accidents. NPPF 109. States that transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, using a vision-led approach to identify transport solutions that deliver well-designed, sustainable and popular places. This should involve identifying, assessing and taking into account the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure ? including appropriate opportunities for avoiding and mitigating any adverse effects, and for net environmental gains. Yet no traffic survey has been undertaken. If it had it would have highlighted that along A6005 (Derby Road) and exactly adjacent the proposed development. The peak traffic hours on Fridays are between 4 PM and 6 PM, with the highest average vehicle count observed from 4 PM to 5 PM. The average number of cars per day in the traffic data is approximately 3,861 vehicles. The highest recorded traffic day in the data is June 11, 2023, with a total of 4,779 vehicles. The maximum speed recorded in the traffic data is 106 mph and the number of times 70 mph is exceeded in the traffic data is 174. To date, the EBC have not applied a vision-led approach and the surveys and appraisals undertaken to date have been brief at best, which includes the Road Traffic Assessment which was undertaken by Systra (13.03.25) did not include Draycott or assess the road network in or around the land south west of Draycott. This is a huge error and oversight by EBC, and further compounds the hasty and reckless approach taken by EBC when developing the housing plan with Draycott. A road traffic survey would have highlighted the significant volume of traffic experienced on the A6005 (Derby Road), which can see over 4,000 cars per day, and the already locally congested network of Gypsy Lane and Hopewell Road which cannot take the current volume of traffic. A transport assessment needs to undertaken, particularly for the residents directly opposite the proposed site entrance; but also the whole route that the construction traffic will take. This passes through Draycott and Borrowwash. Passing busy junctions, Doctor?s surgeries, public car parks, Primary schools, local cricket club as well as numerous resident?s homes. The roads in and around the proposed housing development South West of Draycott are not adequate for the volume of traffic that would use these routes if the development goes ahead. These include the A6005 (Derby Road) which itself experiences 3,861 car per day, Gypsy Lane and Hopewell Road which are small country lanes. These roads currently struggle to cope with the current traffic demand and would not cope with at least a further 190 cars if this development goes ahead. The A6005 (Derby Road) is an already busy
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Matthew Walker	Response-01313	road at peak times during the week and weekend which currently experiences over 3,861 cars a day. Adding 190 additional houses will cause significant congestion issues throughout the village and increase accidents within this overburdened area. The current road network between Borrowwash and Draycott, which includes Derby Road, Hopewell Road and Gypsy Lane, already struggles to handle current traffic demand let alone the potential for at least 190 more cars. The increased road and traffic to the area will have a detrimental impact to the local environment when considering the close proximity of Green Belt land, the Erewash River and the Derby Road to Draycott canal and footpath. These areas contain a magnitude of nature and local habitat that will be negatively impacted by increased population density, carbon footprint and does not align to the NPPF sustainable location assessment. NPPF 20. States that strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and design quality of places and make sufficient provision for infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, security, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat). The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowwash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic. NPPF 89. States that planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads. The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowwash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Maureen Pinchbeck	Response-00041	Pedestrian crossing fairly near to bridge.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Melanie Wilson	Response-00974	The numerous trips generated by the additional housing will increase accidents and reduce the safety of vehicles entering Derby Road from the existing side streets and properties, the speeds though the village are already in excess of 30mph in particular where the vehicles enter the village at the location of the proposed Junction.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Michael Thirlwall	Response-01196	Access and egress to the proposed housing development on Derby Road raises several issues relating to highway and pedestrian safety, ease of access and disruption from increased traffic.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Miss Ella Meredith	Response-01850	The A6005 (Derby Road) is already significantly busy, and the addition of 190 houses will increase traffic volume, impacting road safety and increasing the risk of accidents. A transport assessment needs to be undertaken, particularly for the residents opposite and adjoining the proposed site entrance. Moreover, the increased traffic will pose a significant risk to pedestrians and cyclists. The A6005 is a key route for local residents, including children walking to school and elderly residents. Higher traffic volumes increase the likelihood of accidents involving these vulnerable road users. Implementing traffic calming measures such as speed bumps, pedestrian crossings, and improved signage could mitigate some risks, but these measures need to be carefully planned and executed. A comprehensive transport assessment is essential to understand the full impact of the proposed development on road safety. This assessment should consider current traffic levels, projected increases, and the capacity of existing road infrastructure. It should also evaluate the potential need for new traffic control measures and improvements to pedestrian and cyclist safety.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Miss Natalie Walsh	Response-01846	The A6005 (Derby Road) is already significantly busy, and the addition of 190 houses will increase traffic volume, impacting road safety and increasing the risk of accidents. A transport assessment needs to be undertaken, particularly for the residents opposite and adjoining the proposed site entrance. Moreover, the increased traffic will pose a significant risk to pedestrians and cyclists. The A6005 is a key route for local residents, including children walking to school and elderly residents. Higher traffic volumes increase the likelihood of accidents involving these vulnerable road users. Implementing traffic calming measures such as speed bumps, pedestrian crossings, and improved signage could mitigate some risks, but these measures need to be carefully planned and executed. A comprehensive transport assessment is essential to understand the full impact of the proposed development on road safety. This assessment should consider current traffic levels, projected increases, and the capacity of existing road infrastructure. It should also evaluate the potential need for new traffic control measures and improvements to pedestrian and cyclist safety.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Miss Paige Murray	Response-01842	The A6005 (Derby Road) is already significantly busy, and the addition of 190 houses will increase traffic volume, impacting road safety and increasing the risk of accidents. A transport assessment needs to be undertaken, particularly for the residents opposite and adjoining the proposed site entrance. Moreover, the increased traffic will pose a significant risk to pedestrians and cyclists. The A6005 is a key route for local residents, including children walking to school and elderly residents. Higher traffic volumes increase the likelihood of accidents involving these vulnerable road users. Implementing traffic calming measures such as speed bumps, pedestrian crossings, and improved signage could mitigate some risks, but these measures need to be carefully planned and executed. A comprehensive transport assessment is essential to understand the full impact of the proposed development on road safety. This assessment should consider current traffic levels, projected increases, and the capacity of existing road infrastructure. It should also evaluate the potential need for new traffic control measures and improvements to pedestrian and cyclist safety.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Mr Graham Bingham and Mrs Kristine Bingham	Response-01302	The A6005 is already significantly busy, and the addition of 190 houses and probably 400 cars as a consequence will significantly increase traffic volume, impacting on road safety and increase the risk of accidents. A transport assessment needs to be undertaken, particularly for the residents opposite and adjoining the proposed site entrance.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Mr G Wyatt	Response-01269	The other objection I have is regarding the roads. If you build 190 houses there is likely to be upwards of over 300 new cars in the village. Turning right from the road leading from banks farm is likely to cause havoc. Also the double bridge restrict the sight line. As speeding traffic is not unusual (there was a death a few years ago at this spot) through Draycott there is likely to be more injuries or worse.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Mr R Sykes	Response-00412	As access.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Mr Scott Walsh	Response-01844	The A6005 (Derby Road) is already significantly busy, and the addition of 190 houses will increase traffic volume, impacting road safety and increasing the risk of accidents. A transport assessment needs to be undertaken, particularly for the residents opposite and adjoining the proposed site entrance. Moreover, the increased traffic will pose a significant risk to pedestrians and cyclists. The A6005 is a key route for local residents, including children walking to school and elderly residents. Higher traffic volumes increase the likelihood of accidents involving these vulnerable road users. Implementing traffic calming measures such as speed bumps, pedestrian crossings, and improved signage could mitigate some risks, but these measures need to be carefully planned and executed. A comprehensive transport assessment is essential to understand the full impact of the proposed development on road safety. This assessment should consider current traffic levels, projected increases, and the capacity of existing road infrastructure. It should also evaluate the potential need for new traffic control measures and improvements to pedestrian and cyclist safety.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Mrs Elizabeth White	Response-00060	Due to the bridge to the lefthand side of the entrance of the site along with extra traffic there could be a safety issue.
			Mrs Maria E Hardy	Response-00614	Lots of children and families in the village. Making unsafe especially near the primary school which has no lollipop person.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Mrs Mary Walsh	Response-01845	The A6005 (Derby Road) is already significantly busy, and the addition of 190 houses will increase traffic volume, impacting road safety and increasing the risk of accidents. A transport assessment needs to be undertaken, particularly for the residents opposite and adjoining the proposed site entrance. Moreover, the increased traffic will pose a significant risk to pedestrians and cyclists. The A6005 is a key route for local residents, including children walking to school and elderly residents. Higher traffic volumes increase the likelihood of accidents involving these vulnerable road users. Implementing traffic calming measures such as speed bumps, pedestrian crossings, and improved signage could mitigate some risks, but these measures need to be carefully planned and executed. A comprehensive transport assessment is essential to understand the full impact of the proposed development on road safety. This assessment should consider current traffic levels, projected increases, and the capacity of existing road infrastructure. It should also evaluate the potential need for new traffic control measures and improvements to pedestrian and cyclist safety.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Mr Tony Walsh	Response-01849	The A6005 (Derby Road) is already significantly busy, and the addition of 190 houses will increase traffic volume, impacting road safety and increasing the risk of accidents. A transport assessment needs to be undertaken, particularly for the residents opposite and adjoining the proposed site entrance. Moreover, the increased traffic will pose a significant risk to pedestrians and cyclists. The A6005 is a key route for local residents, including children walking to school and elderly residents. Higher traffic volumes increase the likelihood of accidents involving these vulnerable road users. Implementing traffic calming measures such as speed bumps, pedestrian crossings, and improved signage could mitigate some risks, but these measures need to be carefully planned and executed. A comprehensive transport assessment is essential to understand the full impact of the proposed development on road safety. This assessment should consider current traffic levels, projected increases, and the capacity of existing road infrastructure. It should also evaluate the potential need for new traffic control measures and improvements to pedestrian and cyclist safety.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Nat	Response-00158	The main road through draycott is already heavily used- more traffic will make it worse and the road isn't big enough to accommodate this
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Neil Johnstone	Response-00725	Increase in traffic and road users potentially speeding through the village. Especially from leaving the 40mph zone into the 30mph zone. This is already bad enough.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Nigel morton	Response-01351	The road is has heavy traffic all day ,we have had several vehicles hit and written off legally while parked outside our house,as have our neighbours .The junction for backfield Farm has alot of traffic in and out ,the caravans are a problem We have had 2 fatal accidents on this road in the last 5 years ,one on the bridge with working traffic lights .Most recent (may 13th 2025 ( a fatal motorbike accident on Gertrude Road and derby Road entry point ,well in the 30 mph zone.We also have alot of cyclists along this proposed site ,who since the rains were put in on the bridge now ride down the pavement instead ,which is not a cycle path ,Derbyshire County Council and police are aware ,I have contacted them many times
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Nikki Riches	Response-00950	? As a resident in Draycott the amount of traffic that uses Derby Road has increased in time. Trying to cross it is a already a nightmare and risk, numerous vehicles exceeding the current speed limit, this will only be compounded by a significant increase to the village of 190 cars (min) if the development does go ahead. ? The A6005 (Derby Road) is an already significantly busy main road which experience an average number of 3,861 cars per day with a peak of 4,779 recorded in 2023. If 190 houses are built on the land south west of Draycott this will mean an at least additional c.380 cars in Draycott alone. This volume of traffic will significantly impact road safety and increase the risk of road traffic accidents. ? A recent road traffic survey which was undertaken on the A6005 (Derby Road) and close to the proposed entrance to the housing development, found that within the 40 mph speed limit in this area cars exceeded 70 mph an average of 174 times a day. The addition of over c.380 additional cars will further compound this danger and increase likely road traffic accidents. ? NPPF 109. States that transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, using a vision-led approach to identify transport solutions that deliver well-designed, sustainable and popular places. This should involve identifying, assessing and taking into account the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure ? including appropriate opportunities for avoiding and mitigating any adverse effects, and for net environmental gains. Yet no traffic survey has been undertaken. If it had it would have highlighted that along A6005 (Derby Road) and exactly adjacent the proposed development. The peak traffic hours on Fridays are between 4 PM and 6 PM, with the highest average vehicle count observed from 4 PM to 5 PM. The average number of cars per day in the traffic data is approximately 3,861 vehicles. The highest recorded traffic day in the data is June 11, 2023, with a total of 4,779 vehicles. The maximum speed recorded in the traffic data is 106 mph and the number of times 70 mph is exceeded in the traffic data is 174. ? The increased road and traffic to the area will have a detrimental impact to the local environment when considering the close proximity of Green Belt land, the Erewash River and the Derby Road to Draycott canal and footpath. These areas contain a magnitude of nature and local habitat that will be negatively impacted by increased population density, carbon footprint and does not align to the NPPFs sustainable location assessment. ? NPPF 20. States that strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and design quality of places and make sufficient provision for infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, security, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat). The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowwash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic. ? NPPF 89. States that planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Nikki Riches	Response-00950	found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads. The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowwash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	paul butcher	Response-01154	The A6005 (Derby Road) is an already significantly busy main road which experience an average number of 3,861 cars per day with a peak of 4,779 recorded in 2023. If 190 houses are built on the land south west of Draycott this will mean an at least additional c.380 cars in Draycott alone. This volume of traffic will significantly impact road safety and increase the risk of road traffic accidents. A recent road traffic survey which was undertaken on the A6005 (Derby Road) and close to the proposed entrance to the housing development, found that within the 40 mph speed limit in this area cars exceeded 70 mph an average of 174 times a day. The addition of over c.380 additional cars will further compound this danger and increase likely road traffic accidents. NPPF 109. States that transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, using a vision-led approach to identify transport solutions that deliver well-designed, sustainable and popular places. This should involve identifying, assessing and taking into account the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure ? including appropriate opportunities for avoiding and mitigating any adverse effects, and for net environmental gains. Yet no traffic survey has been undertaken. If it had it would have highlighted that along A6005 (Derby Road) and exactly adjacent the proposed development. NPPF 20. States that strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and design quality of places and make sufficient provision for infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, security, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat). The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic. NPPF 89. States that planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads. The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Peter Sutton	Response-00409	Cars approach from the west over a blind double bridge. Data from the speed camera shows excessive speed is an issue with vehicles travelling at 80mph and above. These factor combined will make it dangerous for cars leaving the proposed site onto the main road and collisions will be likely.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	R Beresford	Response-01907	The A6005 is a busy road through the village, the entrance to the site is a dangerous spot as the traffic comes over the bridge often above the speed limit and a few accidents have occurred there. Having a pedestrian crossing there will be disastrous.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	R Fazackerley	Response-01415	The sites access an traffic poses a significant safety concern due to the entrance being obscured by the bridge over the canal
			Richard Keith Hanbury	Response-01087	as per our points in the previous comment.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Richard Syson	Response-01317	The A6005 (Derby Road) is an already significantly busy main road which experience an average number of c. 4,000 vehicles per day with a peak of 4,779 recorded in 2023. If 190 houses + a potential further 70 homes were to be built on the land south west of Draycott this will mean an at least additional c.500 cars in Draycott alone. This volume of traffic will significantly impact road safety and pollution NPPF 89. States that planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads. The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic. The increased road and traffic to the area will have a detrimental impact to the local environment when considering the close proximity of Green Belt land, the Erewash River and the Derby Road to Draycott canal and footpath. These areas contain a magnitude of nature and local habitat that will be negatively impacted by increased population density, carbon footprint and does not align to the NPPFs sustainable location assessment.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Rick Howden	Response-01421	The A6005 (Derby Road) is an already significantly busy main road which experience an average number of 3,861 cars per day with a peak of 4,779 recorded in 2023. If 190 houses are built on the land south west of Draycott this will mean an at least additional c.380 cars in Draycott alone. This volume of traffic will significantly impact road safety and increase the risk of road traffic accidents. NPPF 89. States that planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads. The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Ricky fisher	Response-00048	Road safety is only going to get worse with a 190 odd houses with multiple cars more traffic and more accident's waiting to happen
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Robert Alan Duncanson	Response-00855	WITH PLAY AREAS SPEARD ACROSS THE VILLAGE IT WOULD MAKE IT MORE UNSAFE FOR LOCA CHILDREN TO USE THOSE FACILITIES

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Roger Brown	Response-00999	The stretch of Derby Rd where residents of this development will join has had several serious and some fatal accidents within metres of this point in recent years. Speeds in excess of 100mph have been recorded here on several occasions with 70mph being regularly exceeded. To make this more dangerous there is a central reservation which puts cyclists in danger, private drive entrances and a slight dip and bend reducing visibility as you enter the village just as you would meet any new junction with cars, bikes and pedestrians. There is a limit to what type of junction could be installed here given that it is on the edge of a rail bridge.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Ross Roberts	Response-01377	Someone has already died this week on the road, we do not need more unsafe roads , also the are is right next to the bridge for the train and will be a terrible blind spot for the drivers if a junction is added
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Ruth Hawkins	Response-01277	The A6005 (Derby Road) is an already significantly busy main road which experiences an average number of 3,861 cars per day with a peak of 4,779 recorded in 2023. If 190 houses are built on the land south west of Draycott this could mean at least an additional c.380 cars in Draycott alone. This volume of traffic will significantly impact road safety and increase the risk of road traffic accidents.
			Sarah	Response-01541	Far too many already passing through well over the speed limit.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Sarah Hargreaves	Response-01314	1. Accident Hot Spot: The area planned for access to the development has been the site of several serious accidents, unfortunately including a fatality in March 2020 and May 2025. The proposed entrance to the site is unsuitable and has not been given consideration. 2. Road Network Inadequacy: The current road network, including Gypsy Lane and Hopwell Road, cannot handle the increased traffic volume. Significant investment and remodelling are required, which has not been planned.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Scott Gardner	Response-01554	There are serious concerns about the excessive speed limit and existing congestion near the proposed site access. This development also threatens to disrupt the reliability of essential bus services operating on the A6005. Paragraph 109 of the NPPF clearly states that development should be refused if it leads to unacceptable impacts on highway safety or severe residual cumulative impacts on the road network , and this proposal undoubtedly meets that threshold. I urge the council to consider the recent tragic accident as evidence that the A6005 is dangerous and more traffic will risk lives.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Sean Peace	Response-01347	The A6005 (Derby Road) is an already significantly busy main road which experience an average number of 3,861 cars per day with a peak of 4,779 recorded in 2023. If 190 houses are built on the land south west of Draycott this will mean an at least additional c.380 cars in Draycott alone. This volume of traffic will significantly impact road safety and increase the risk of road traffic accidents. 5 2 A recent road traffic survey which was undertaken on the A6005 (Derby Road) and close to the proposed entrance to the housing development, found that within the 40 mph speed limit in this area cars exceeded 70 mph an average of 174 times a day. The addition of over c.380 additional cars will further compound this danger and increase likely road traffic accidents. 6 3 NPPF 109. States that transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, using a vision-led approach to identify transport solutions that deliver well-designed, sustainable and popular places. This should involve identifying, assessing and taking into account the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure ? including appropriate opportunities for avoiding and mitigating any adverse effects, and for net environmental gains. Yet no traffic survey has been undertaken. If it had it would have highlighted that along A6005 (Derby Road) and exactly adjacent the proposed development. The peak traffic hours on Fridays are between 4 PM and 6 PM, with the highest average vehicle count observed from 4 PM to 5 PM. The average number of cars per day in the traffic data is approximately 3,861 vehicles. The highest recorded traffic day in the data is June 11, 2023, with a total of 4,779 vehicles. The maximum speed recorded in the traffic data is 106 mph and the number of times 70 mph is exceeded in the traffic data is 174. 7 4 The increased road and traffic to the area will have a detrimental impact to the local environment when considering the close proximity of Green Belt land, the Erewash River and the Derby Road to Draycott canal and footpath. These areas contain a magnitude of nature and local habitat that will be negatively impacted by increased population density, carbon footprint and does not align to the NPPFs sustainable location assessment. 8 5 NPPF 20. States that strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and design quality of places and make sufficient provision for infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, security, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat). The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic. 9 6 NPPF 89. States that planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads. The road network in and around the identifi
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Sean Peace	Response-01347	ed development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Simon Jenkins	Response-01287	As per the first box, but adding a minimum of 300 plus extra cars is obviously going to cause congestion. That's a given, its safety that is paramount and quite clearly whoever is behind this proposal is not a Draycott resident !!!!!

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	S M Beresford	Response-01851	The A6005 (Derby Road) is already significantly busy, and the addition of 190 houses will increase traffic volume, impacting road safety and increasing the risk of accidents. A transport assessment needs to be undertaken, particularly for the residents opposite and adjoining the proposed site entrance. Moreover, the increased traffic will pose a significant risk to pedestrians and cyclists. The A6005 is a key route for local residents, including children walking to school and elderly residents. Higher traffic volumes increase the likelihood of accidents involving these vulnerable road users. Implementing traffic calming measures such as speed bumps, pedestrian crossings, and improved signage could mitigate some risks, but these measures need to be carefully planned and executed. A comprehensive transport assessment is essential to understand the full impact of the proposed development on road safety. This assessment should consider current traffic levels, projected increases, and the capacity of existing road infrastructure. It should also evaluate the potential need for new traffic control measures and improvements to pedestrian and cyclist safety.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Stephanie Ashley-Lane	Response-01380	Many cars speed once they come from Borrowwash into Draycott and do not reduce down to 30mph. Many cars have been written off on derby road due to the terrible driving and the main road is dangerous without adding more cars and parking to the area.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Susan Baker	Response-01316	We've already seen tragedy on these roads?fatal accidents in March 2020 and again in May 2025. The proposed access point for this development is not only unsuitable, it's dangerous. Roads like Gypsy Lane and Hopwell Road simply weren't built to handle this kind of volume. Major upgrades would be needed, but none are planned.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Susan Foster	Response-00824	The speed limit means nothing to some drivers at present, even though there is a speed indicator to show them when they are exceeding the 30mph limit. How much worse will it become with all the extra cars the 190 homes will bring, most homes having 2cars at least! The amount of traffic generated is going to cause significant problems for the community, as they speed through the village.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Teresa Batchelor	Response-01240	Having lived on Derby Road for over 20 years, it is my experience that speeding is a very serious problem, especially at this end of Derby Road as it leads out of the village and onto the straight roadway, which is locally known as 'Draycott Straight'. Cars and motorbikes speed up in anticipation of being able to "put their foot down" once they start to approach "the straight". This is just about at the point where the entrance to the new housing proposed would join Derby Road.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Teresa Shaw	Response-01309	1. Planning permission was rejected a small business at this local site because of access & egress issues in that area. Why can this genuine safety issue now be ignored when it suites? Who will be liable if the rush to build causes actual loss of life? This is double standards. 2. Bridges coming into the village create a blind spot - this is fact. A new access & egress sight will cause major issues. A pedestrian crossing may help a little, but the current speed limit of 40MPH into the village is regularly abused. Have you considered what a car doing 60MPH will do? It takes 73 meters to stop! Cars will overshoot the proposed site entrance by some way. This will likely become a black spot and lives we be lost. What other plans are in place to slow these cars down to allow safe access? E.g. Islands, Speed bumps, cameras. 3. A popular dedicated cyclist's route passes through Draycott and this busy junction with increase's traffic will put cyclist and a much greater risk. What is being done or considered to ensure the safety of cyclist? And encourage this greener mode of transport without risking lives. 4. Cycling clubs use derby road for club rides these will be exposed to a very busy junction. What precautions, safety measures are in place to consider cyclist. 5. Many Bridal paths surround the village riding is a popular past time. People ridding horses regularly plod down Derby Road. Purposely making the roads even busier will on increase the risk of fatality and incident. 6. Motor bikes race through the village a serious accident happened July 2019 & a fatality in March 2020. There was another fatality this week on Derby Road outside the one stop in Draycott. Your regularly get motorcycles going over a 100MPH from Borrowwash up to and through the village of Draycott & Breaston. It's a popular route for motorcycles. How will you prevent these motor cyclists killing themselves and now the new residents in this dangerous location blind spot.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Tim Hawkins	Response-00661	Putting pelican crossing so close to a blind bridge is asking for an increase in accidents. However, as I have not been permitted to see EBC's master plan for the development it's difficult to say.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	Tracey Morton	Response-00968	The A6005 is very busy already 3861 cars per day average, highest being 4,779 per day in 2023,this will significantly increase road safety and accidents 2 speeding along this road is a big problem cars rarely do 30mph, more like 50-70, maximum speed recorded is 109 mph 3 There has been a fatal accident on the bridge out to borrowwash with traffic lights present 4 we have had a number of vehicles hit whilst parked on the road as have many residents along here 5 Lighting is not adequate resulting in accidents with parked vehicles 6 Developments need to be sensitive to there surroundings and not cause heavy impact to the road network 7 Limited bus service
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	T Shields	Response-00570	A new crossing is proposed as well as improvements to the main junction. It would be a short walk to the bus stop for trips between Derby and Long Eaton/Nottingham. There is no reason why there would be any adverse impact on road safety subject to the already existing 30mph speed limits.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	William Batchelor	Response-01210	already a speeding blackspot with a fatal accident in recent years near the exisiting junction over the brow of a hill. Speeding from Drayott out and for reckless drivers coming in from Borrowwash (especially motorcycles and boy racers) is a constant problem



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Road Safety	zak butcher	Response-01156	The A6005 (Derby Road) is an already significantly busy main road which experience an average number of 3,861 cars per day with a peak of 4,779 recorded in 2023. If 190 houses are built on the land south west of Draycott this will mean an at least additional c.380 cars in Draycott alone. This volume of traffic will significantly impact road safety and increase the risk of road traffic accidents. A recent road traffic survey which was undertaken on the A6005 (Derby Road) and close to the proposed entrance to the housing development, found that within the 40 mph speed limit in this area cars exceeded 70 mph an average of 174 times a day. The addition of over c.380 additional cars will further compound this danger and increase likely road traffic accidents. NPPF 109. States that transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, using a vision-led approach to identify transport solutions that deliver well-designed, sustainable and popular places. This should involve identifying, assessing and taking into account the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure ? including appropriate opportunities for avoiding and mitigating any adverse effects, and for net environmental gains. Yet no traffic survey has been undertaken. If it had it would have highlighted that along A6005 (Derby Road) and exactly adjacent the proposed development. NPPF 20. States that strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and design quality of places and make sufficient provision for infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, security, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat). The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic. NPPF 89. States that planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads. The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic.
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Anthony Walsh	Response-00992	The local school is currently under performing (OFSTED) and is not suitably equipped for any additional influx of children
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Ben Kassoul	Response-01024	The additional homes will place a massive strain on the number of available places at the local school for existing residents who are yet to have children.
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Bernadette Rothwell	Response-00998	The local primary has plenty of capacity I'd imagine as it's terrible. The local secondary schools are getting flier and fuller, with first choice options becoming increasingly hard to get, taking away the choice to send our kids to a school of good standard.
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Bradley Peace	Response-01348	secondary schools are at or near capacity. An influx of families will put immense pressure on school places, potentially forcing local children to travel further afield for education.
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Colin & Cynthia Green	Response-00922	Local Draycott infants/primary school not able to extend boundaries so where are extra schoolchildren going to go? Believe school capacity currently about right but extra places will definitely be needed so will be overcrowded.
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	David and Nicala O'Leary	Response-00822	Local schools are already oversubscribed and would not be able to accommodate the additional demand without significant, unfunded investment in staff and facilities.
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	David Boyle	Response-01426	The A6005 (Derby Road) is an already significantly busy main road which experience an average number of 3,861 cars per day with a peak of 4,779 recorded in 2023. If 190 houses are built on the land south west of Draycott this will mean an at least additional c.380 cars in Draycott alone. This volume of traffic will significantly impact road safety and increase the risk of road traffic accidents.
			David Webster	Response-01113	Has there been a study if our local school can cope with the extra children that will require education
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Dexter Codrington	Response-00986	A lot of local children across the Borough have to travel to an available secondary school. There are limited places at the local schools as it is
			Diane Webster	Response-01177	Will the Draycott school have the capacity to cater for the addition children I assume a survey has taken
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Donna Peace	Response-01344	The village primary school and surrounding secondary schools are at or near capacity. An influx of families will put immense pressure on school places, potentially forcing local children to travel further afield for education.
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Gail Holdsworth	Response-00937	There is a small school right in the middle of Draycott. Such an increase in numbers will obviously result in more traffic congestion and pollution. Obviously not good for young children.
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Gary Siddall	Response-01237	Yes, Draycott does have a school - I admit I do not know whether it has capacity for new children at the moment, but even if it does, will it be able to cope in the near future with potentially 190+ additional families...?? This needs to be taken in account.
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Gerri Hickton	Response-01472	There is only one small primary school. Local secondary schools are further away which further increases the traffic congestion , air quality and accident risk
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Gill Trickitt	Response-01157	The school is tiny. 1 class per year group. There would not be space for 190 children and with 190 or more homes, this figure is not even a worse case scenario.
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Gordon Dahill	Response-00690	Availability of spaces in the local schools is not certain and secondary schools require buses to reach the schools More congestion.
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Graham Wakeling	Response-01238	School capacities will increase locally, forcing current Draycott residents to seek schooling outside of the village, having a knock on affect to other local small communities.
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Hannah Pritchard	Response-01399	Local primary and secondary schools are already near or at capacity. An influx of potentially hundreds of children from the development would overwhelm existing education provision. There is no confirmed plan or funding commitment for expanding school capacity to accommodate this growth, meaning local children may have to travel out of the area, reducing educational accessibility and increasing traffic burden.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	James Hargreaves	Response-01315	Local schools are underperforming, and parents are opting for already oversubscribed schools elsewhere, increasing car travel.
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Jane Barker	Response-01178	The local village school is running at near full capacity now and I'm pretty sure that a further approx 200 more children would swamp the system. This would also increase pressure on the already heavily used buses to the secondary schools in the area.
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Justine Murrin	Response-01478	This will increase demand on an already overstretched school system in this area.
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Karen Smith	Response-01484	I'm concerned about the lack of infrastructure to support the proposed development. The village school doesn't have capacity to support 200+ houses.
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Karla Williams	Response-00077	The school has capacity.
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Kayleigh Bonallie	Response-01375	The school is a school that requires improvement. The local area have relocated their children to school in other villages as the school does not meet the needs of children
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Kerry Naylor	Response-00993	What secondary school will be used for the pupils? How will the rather small primary school cope. The playground area is too small now. Classrooms are not fit for purpose and the building is very old.
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Laura Charier	Response-01218	This may have a detrimental effect to the local school as number of pupils would drastically increase over a short period. Moreover, the Primary School will affected with noise and additional traffic.
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Lee	Response-00742	1. Claims were made in council meeting @ Long Eaton 2,000 children are on the waiting list for affordable housing. Are School expansions being planned to cope with the accelerated builds? 2. Can schools flex / increase their capacity to cope with an escalated plan for these new builds or will students? educations suffer for a metric?
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Louise and Shane Foster	Response-01219	Causing extra pressure on amenities particularly schooling
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Louise Burnell	Response-00262	Existing schools will not cope with increased demand.
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Luke Harper	Response-00898	The school has space for more children, but is a small school with limited space and not for as many as the potential amount the new houses will bring to the village.
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Luke Hatch	Response-00160	Adding hundreds of new residents could easily overwhelm places and there's no detail on how education will be expanded to meet that need.
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Maggie Murphy	Response-00833	Many children go to school outside of the village which again will increase traffic and pollution
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Martin Kilcoyne	Response-01460	Local schools are already oversubscribed so the addition of 190 new homes, most of which will be likely purchased by families with children of school age will only exacerbate the situation.
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Melanie Wilson	Response-00974	The primary school in the village would not have the capacity for the additional pupils, therefore the children would have to look for places elsewhere which would increase the traffic through the village
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Michelle Marks	Response-00924	The village primary school and surrounding secondary schools are either full or near capacity. Additional housing will force families to seek school places further afield, creating logistical challenges and disrupting children's education.
		School Capacity	Mr R Sykes	Response-00412	Will overload an existing situation.
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Mrs Elizabeth White	Response-00060	The local school would possibly have a problem with number of pupils.
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Mrs Maria E Hardy	Response-00614	Very full primary school can only hold so many places.Furfield in Breaston I believe to be full capacity.
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Mrs Patricia L Tacey	Response-00283	Draycott school is a typical village school and not designed to cope with the influx of children that a further 190 houses will bring.
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Mrs V Atkin	Response-01871	Also the school will be impacted.
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Nat	Response-00158	The schools in the area may not be able to cope with the increased volume of children- staffing are already stretched with the lack of teaching assistants/ dinner ladies etc
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Neil Johnstone	Response-00725	The school is only small and probably at its limit. Adding more children to the mix will only put a strain on an already strained school.
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Nicole Howe	Response-00881	Draycott school is already a small school. Building more houses is going to lead to overcrowding in schools. Affecting children's education due to disruptions in classrooms, not enough teachers etc.
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Nigel morton	Response-01351	Local primary and secondary schools are low on spaces, 700 houses over draycott, breaston and borrowash will put a strain on them all.Draycott primary school does have space but there is reasons for that and until the head changes it will never be well used .
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Oliver Kirk	Response-00569	There is already a shortage of school availability, the addition of 190 houses, will cause a significant increase on the schooling system in the area. Putting unfair pressure on the schools, nursery and colleges along with their staff to increase staff sizes and absorb this influx of people.
		School Capacity	Owen	Response-01547	With extra houses being built, what if any extra resources will be given to ensure that schools are not over crowed?
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Paul Allen	Response-01082	There is insufficient school spaces, school parking, village parking and medical services at present and the development can only make matters worse.
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Pauline Marks	Response-00927	Local schools are operating at or near full capacity. Additional pupils would likely have to travel outside the area, disrupting families and increasing traffic
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Peter Sutton	Response-00409	Draycott only has one small primary school which would not have the capacity to accept the number of children expected on the development. the schools footprint is too small to expand even with Section 106 money.
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	R Fazackerley	Response-01415	There is insufficient local capacity in thr local schools to accommodate this development
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Richard Syson	Response-01317	Assuming 'typical' population demographics, the addition of 190 + potential further 70 homes would have a significant impact upon Draycott Community Primary School. There does not appear to be any mention of any obligation for the developers to fund any necessary expansion of the school's capacity to be able to accomodate the influx of additional pupils
		School Capacity	Robert Alan Duncanson	Response-00855	THERE JUST ISNT THE CAPACITY FOR LOTS MORE CHILDREN IN THE VILLAGE

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Roger Brown	Response-00999	The local primary school possibly has sufficient capacity for any new children resident at this site. However, all secondary aged children require buses to take them to and from school in Lon Eaton, Sandiacre and Spondon.
			Sarah	Response-01541	We've already struggled to get our son into a secondary school of choice and both in the area are full to capacity each year.
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Sarah Hargreaves	Response-01314	School is underperforming- Parent will choose other local schools- already full and requiring travel by car
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Scott Gardner	Response-01554	Draycott School I'm sure has vacancies. Numeric capacity is not my primary concern. Draycott school does not have the capacity to provide quality education and hasn't had within my lifetime. Adding more pupils to this system will make the quality worse for all children involved.
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Sean Peace	Response-01347	secondary schools are at or near capacity. An influx of families will put immense pressure on school places, potentially forcing local children to travel further afield for education.
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Simon Jenkins	Response-01287	I have no knowledge of the local school, but can it handle a minimum 200 and possibly up to 400 extra children ?
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Susan Baker	Response-01316	Our local school is already under strain. Parents are opting for schools further afield, which means more cars on the road and more pressure on families.
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Susan Foster	Response-00824	Draycott school has nowhere to be extended for an influx of children and the secondary schools are in the same position, therefore children would have to be bused elsewhere for their education, totally unsuitable for most parents who would prefer a school on the doorstep.
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Teresa Batchelor	Response-01240	We only have a small infant/junior school, so where is it proposed the children of these new residents will be educated? Surely the housing is being built with families in mind, who will obviously, at some point, produce children! I do not consider enough consideration has been given to this aspect.
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Teresa Shaw	Response-01309	1. Claims were made in council meeting @ Long Eaton 2,000 children are on the waiting list for affordable housing. Are School expansions being planned to cope with the accelerated builds? 2. Can schools flex / increase their capacity to cope with an escalated plan for these new builds or will students' educations suffer for a metric?
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	Tracey Morton	Response-00968	Popular Schools in the area are near the limit 2 Draycott primary is the only one with space but that's because children left on mass 3 people of lost confidence in Draycott school will take alot to turn it round
1.14	South West of Draycott	School Capacity	T Shields	Response-00570	Any infrastructure shortfall/need arising for education can be offset by a proportionate financial requirement from developers through a section 106 obligation.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	adrian leeming	Response-01249	The roads through Draycott are already an accident hotspot. There is daily speeding past the proposed site and at least 2 fatal accidents in recent years. 190+ more road users will certainly add to this. The Road Traffic Assessment which was undertaken by Systra (13.03.25) did not include Draycott or assess the road network in or around the land south west of Draycott. This is a huge error and oversight by EBC, and further compounds the hasty and reckless approach taken by EBC when developing the housing plan with Draycott. A road traffic survey would have highlighted the significant volume of traffic experienced on the A6005 (Derby Road), which can see over 4,000 cars per day, and the already locally congested network of Gypsy Lane and Hopewell Road which cannot take the current volume of traffic. A transport assessment needs to be undertaken, particularly for the residents directly opposite the proposed site entrance; but also the whole route that the construction traffic will take. This passes through Draycott and Borrowwash. Passing busy junctions, Doctor's surgeries, public car parks, Primary schools, local cricket club as well as numerous resident's homes. Noise from the construction (including vehicle movements) and operational phases of the proposed development need to be adequately addressed. The roads in and around the proposed housing development South West of Draycott are not adequate for the volume of traffic that would use these routes if the development goes ahead. These include the A6005 (Derby Road) which itself experiences 3,861 car per day, Gypsy Lane and Hopewell Road which are small country lanes. These roads currently struggle to cope with the current traffic demand and would not cope with at least a further 190 cars if this development goes ahead and will cause significant congestion issues throughout the village and increase accidents within this overburdened area. It will be negatively impacted by increased population density, carbon footprint and does not align to the NPPF sustainable location assessment. "NPPF 20. States that strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and design quality of places and make sufficient provision for infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, security, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat). The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowwash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic." NPPF 89. States that planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads. The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowwash. This is totally unrealistic and t
					he current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Alastair Dundas	Response-01200	The road that would need to be created for this development of 190 houses, would cause traffic buildup as you enter Draycott. Also Draycott has very little parking facilities.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Alison Bowley	Response-01174	The A6005 Derby Rd is the main thoroughfare through the village from Borrowwash to Breaston. It carries a large volume of traffic, and the increased number of cars from a new housing estate will really impact both the safety and bring along environmental issues such as air pollution. ( Will all 190 households be able to afford electric vehicles?).

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Alison Thirlwall	Response-01390	The roads in and around the proposed housing development South-West of Draycott are not adequate for the volume of traffic that would use these routes if the development goes ahead. These include the A6005 (Derby Road) which itself experiences 3,861 car per day, Gypsy Lane and Hopewell Road which are small country lanes. These roads currently struggle to cope with the current traffic demand and would not cope with at least a further 190 cars if this development goes ahead. The A6005 (Derby Road) is an already busy road at peak times during the week and weekend which currently experiences over 3,861 cars a day. Adding 190 additional houses will cause significant congestion issues throughout the village and increase accidents within this overburdened area. The current road network between Borrowwash and Draycott, which includes Derby Road, Hopewell Road and Gypsy Lane, already struggles to handle current traffic demand let alone the potential for at least 190 more cars. The increased road and traffic to the area will have a detrimental impact to the local environment when considering the close proximity of Green Belt land, the Erewash River and the Derby Road to Draycott canal and footpath. These areas contain a magnitude of nature and local habitat that will be negatively impacted by increased population density, carbon footprint and does not align to the NPPF sustainable location assessment.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Andrew and Jane Gilmour	Response-01329	The Road Traffic Assessment which was undertaken by Systra (13.03.25) did not include Draycott or assess the road network in or around the land south west of Draycott. This is a huge error and oversight by EBC, and further compounds the hasty and reckless approach taken by EBC when developing the housing plan with Draycott. A road traffic survey would have highlighted the significant volume of traffic experienced on the A6005 (Derby Road), which can see over 4,000 cars per day, and the already locally congested network of Gypsy Lane and Hopwell Road which cannot take the current volume of traffic. A transport assessment needs to undertaken, particularly for the residents directly opposite the proposed site entrance; but also the whole route that the construction traffic will take. This will have to travel through Draycott and Borrowwash, using busy junctions, passing by busy shopping centres, public car parks, Primary schools, as well as numerous resident's homes. Noise from the construction (including vehicle movements) and operational phases of the proposed development need to be adequately addressed. The roads in and around the proposed housing development South West of Draycott are not adequate for the volume of traffic that would use these routes if the development goes ahead. These include the A6005 (Derby Road) which itself experiences 3,861 car per day, Gypsy Lane and Hopwell Road which are small country lanes. These roads currently struggle to cope with the current traffic demand and would not cope with at least a further 190 vehicles if this development goes ahead. The A6005 (Derby Road) is an already busy road at peak times during the week and weekend which currently experiences over 3,861 cars a day. Adding 190 additional houses will cause significant congestion issues throughout the village and increase accidents within this overburdened area. The current road network between Borrowwash and Draycott, which includes Derby Road, Hopwell Road and Gypsy Lane, already struggles to handle current traffic demand let alone the potential for at least 190 more vehicles. The increased road traffic to the area will have a detrimental impact to the local environment when considering the close proximity of Green Belt land, the River Derwent and the partially restored canal and footpath. These areas contain a magnitude of nature and local habitat that will be negatively impacted by increased population density, carbon footprint and does not align to the NPPF sustainable location assessment. "NPPF 20. States that strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and design quality of places and make sufficient provision for infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, security, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat). The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of vehicles. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowwash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic." NPPF 89. States that planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads. The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowwash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Andrew and Jane Gilmour	Response-01329	ved by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads. The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowwash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	A Northeast	Response-01848	The A6005 (Derby Road) is already significantly busy, and the addition of 190 houses will exacerbate traffic volume, impacting road safety and increasing the risk of accidents. Increased traffic can lead to congestion, longer travel times, and heightened frustration among drivers, which may result in more aggressive driving behaviours. The road infrastructure may not be equipped to handle the additional load, leading to potential bottlenecks and increased wear and tear on the road surface.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Anthony Lawton-Reeve	Response-00971	The roads in and around the proposed housing development South West of Draycott are not adequate for the volume of traffic that would use these routes if the development goes ahead. These include the A6005 (Derby Road) which itself experiences 3,861 car per day, Gypsy Lane and Hopewell Road which are small country lanes. These roads currently struggle to cope with the current traffic demand and would not cope with at least a further 190 cars if this development goes ahead.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Anthony Walsh	Response-00992	The Road Traffic Assessment which was undertaken by Systra (13.03.25) did not include Draycott or assess the road network in or around the land south west of Draycott. This is a huge error and oversight by EBC, and further compounds the hasty and reckless approach taken by EBC when developing the housing plan with Draycott. A road traffic survey would have highlighted the significant volume of traffic experienced on the A6005 (Derby Road), which can see over 4,000 cars per day, and the already locally congested network of Gypsy Lane and Hopewell Road which cannot take the current volume of traffic. The roads in and around the proposed housing development South West of Draycott are not adequate for the volume of traffic that would use these routes if the development goes ahead. These include the A6005 (Derby Road) which itself experiences 3,861 car per day, Gypsy Lane and Hopewell Road which are small country lanes. These roads currently struggle to cope with the current traffic demand and would not cope with at least a further 190 cars if this development goes ahead. NPPF 89. States that planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads. The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowwash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Ashley Cartlidge	Response-01420	The area is already congested.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Avice Boyle	Response-01427	NPPF 89. States that planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads. The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowwash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic. A transport assessment needs to be undertaken, particularly for the residents directly opposite the proposed site entrance; but also the whole route that the construction traffic will take. This passes through Draycott and Borrowwash. Passing busy junctions, Doctor's surgeries, public car parks, Primary schools, local cricket club as well as numerous residents' homes. The Road Traffic Assessment which was undertaken by Systra (13.03.25) did not include Draycott or assess the road network in or around the land south west of Draycott. This is a huge error and oversight by EBC, and further compounds the hasty and reckless approach taken by EBC when developing the housing plan with Draycott. A road traffic survey would have highlighted the significant volume of traffic experienced on the A6005 (Derby Road), which can see over 4,000 cars per day, and the already locally congested network of Gypsy Lane and Hopewell Road which cannot take the current volume of traffic.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Ben Marshall	Response-01212	The existing road network struggles to deal with the amount of traffic already existing in the area. The roads in and around the proposed housing development South West of Draycott are not adequate for the volume of traffic that would use these routes if the development goes ahead. These include the A6005 (Derby Road) which itself experiences 3,861 car per day, Gypsy Lane and Hopewell Road which are small country lanes. These roads currently struggle to cope with the current traffic demand and would not cope with at least a further 190 cars (minimum) if this development goes ahead. The increased road and traffic to the area will have a detrimental impact to the local environment when considering the close proximity of Green Belt land, the Erewash River and the Derby Road to Draycott canal and footpath. These areas contain a magnitude of nature and local habitat that will be negatively impacted by increased population density, carbon footprint and does not align to the NPPF sustainable location assessment.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Bernadette Rothwell	Response-00998	The broader area is already congested. Traffic particularly towards Nottingham is poor from Long Eaton.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Bradley Peace	Response-01348	The Road Traffic Assessment which was undertaken by Systra (13.03.25) did not include Draycott or assess the road network in or around the land south west of Draycott. This is a huge error and oversight by EBC, and further compounds the hasty and reckless approach taken by EBC when developing the housing plan with Draycott. A road traffic survey would have highlighted the significant volume of traffic experienced on the A6005 (Derby Road), which can see over 4,000 cars per day, and the already locally congested network of Gypsy Lane and Hopewell Road which cannot take the current volume of traffic. 5 2 A transport assessment needs to undertaken, particularly for the residents directly opposite the proposed site entrance; but also the whole route that the construction traffic will take. This passes through Draycott and Borrowwash. Passing busy junctions, Doctor?s surgeries, public car parks, Primary schools, local cricket club as well as numerous resident?s homes. 6 3 Noise from the construction (including vehicle movements) and operational phases of the proposed development need to be adequately addressed. 7 4 The roads in and around the proposed housing development South West of Draycott are not adequate for the volume of traffic that would use these routes if the development goes ahead. These include the A6005 (Derby Road) which itself experiences 3,861 car per day, Gypsy Lane and Hopewell Road which are small country lanes. These roads currently struggle to cope with the current traffic demand and would not cope with at least a further 190 cars if this development goes ahead. 8 5 The A6005 (Derby Road) is an already busy road at peak times during the week and weekend which currently experiences over 3,861 cars a day. Adding 190 additional houses will cause significant congestion issues throughout the village and increase accidents within this overburdened area. 9 6 The current road network between Borrowwash and Draycott, which includes Derby Road, Hopewell Road and Gypsy Lane, already struggles to handle current traffic demand let alone the potential for at least 190 more cars. 10 7 The increased road and traffic to the area will have a detrimental impact to the local environment when considering the close proximity of Green Belt land, the Erewash River and the Derby Road to Draycott canal and footpath. These areas contain a magnitude of nature and local habitat that will be negatively impacted by increased population density, carbon footprint and does not align to the NPPF sustainable location assessment. 11 8 NPPF 20. States that strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and design quality of places and make sufficient provision for infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, security, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat). The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowwash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic. 12 9 NPPF 89. States that planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locatio
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Bradley Peace	Response-01348	ns that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads. The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowwash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Caroline and John Thirwell	Response-01001	increased volume of traffic entering/exiting our village
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Colin & Cynthia Green	Response-00922	Road prone to speeding traffic at anytime even though 30 mph several incidents/traffic accidents recorded plus at least one fatality. Assuming 2 vehicles per new build which is down currently @ 190 homes plus safeguarding area in future, vehicles will be turning out each direction to either Derby or Nottingham so trying to cross this road safely will be dangerous plus children cross this busy road to catch school bus to Friesland etc. Speed watch checks on this stretch should be contacted for their statistics.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	David and Nicala O'Leary	Response-00822	Draycott?s infrastructure is not equipped to accommodate a development of this scale. Local roads are already struggling with speeding and congestion. Adding 190 homes could introduce over 380 additional vehicles to local roads, significantly increasing congestion
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	David Atchison	Response-01247	The Road Traffic Assessment which was undertaken by Systra (13.03.25) did not include Draycott or assess the road network in or around the land south west of Draycott. This is a huge error and oversight by EBC, and further compounds the hasty and reckless approach taken by EBC when developing the housing plan with Draycott. A road traffic survey would have highlighted the significant volume of traffic experienced on the A6005 (Derby Road), which can see over 4,000 cars per day, and the already locally congested network of Gypsy Lane and Hopewell Road which cannot take the current volume of traffic. The roads in and around the proposed housing development South West of Draycott are not adequate for the volume of traffic that would use these routes if the development goes ahead. These include the A6005 (Derby Road) which itself experiences 3,861 car per day, Gypsy Lane and Hopewell Road which are small country lanes. These roads currently struggle to cope with the current traffic demand and would not cope with at least a further 190 cars if this development goes ahead.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	David Boyle	Response-01426	The Road Traffic Assessment which was undertaken by Systra (13.03.25) did not include Draycott or assess the road network in or around the land south west of Draycott. This is a huge error and oversight by EBC, and further compounds the hasty and reckless approach taken by EBC when developing the housing plan with Draycott. A road traffic survey would have highlighted the significant volume of traffic experienced on the A6005 (Derby Road), which can see over 4,000 cars per day, and the already locally congested network of Gypsy Lane and Hopewell Road which cannot take the current volume of traffic. Noise from the construction (including vehicle movements) and operational phases of the proposed development need to be adequately addressed. NPPF 89. States that planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads. The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowwash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic. "NPPF 20. States that strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and design quality of places and make sufficient provision for infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, security, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat). The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowwash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic."
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	David G York	Response-01843	The A6005 (Derby Road) is already significantly busy, and the addition of 190 houses will exacerbate traffic volume, impacting road safety and increasing the risk of accidents. Increased traffic can lead to congestion, longer travel times, and heightened frustration among drivers, which may result in more aggressive driving behaviours. The road infrastructure may not be equipped to handle the additional load, leading to potential bottlenecks and increased wear and tear on the road surface.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	David Thurgood	Response-01195	The roads in and around the proposed housing development South West of Draycott are not adequate for the volume of traffic that would use these routes if the development goes ahead. These include the A6005 (Derby Road) which itself experiences 3,861 car per day, Gypsy Lane and Hopewell Road which are small country lanes. These roads currently struggle to cope with the current traffic demand and would not cope with the increased number of vehicles (>250) if this development goes ahead. It is likely that further new access routes will have to be incorporated for this and any associated future development into areas not designed for increased traffic causing real safety risks.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	David Webster	Response-01113	"NPPF 109. States that transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, using a vision-led approach to identify transport solutions that deliver well-designed, sustainable and popular places. This should involve identifying, assessing and taking into account the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure ? including appropriate opportunities for avoiding and mitigating any adverse effects, and for net environmental gains. Yet no traffic survey has been undertaken. If it had it would have highlighted that along A6005 (Derby Road) and exactly adjacent the proposed development. The peak traffic hours on Fridays are between 4 PM and 6 PM, with the highest average vehicle count observed from 4 PM to 5 PM. The average number of cars per day in the traffic data is approximately 3,861 vehicles. The highest recorded traffic day in the data is June 11, 2023, with a total of 4,779 vehicles. The maximum speed recorded in the traffic data is 106 mph and the number of times 70 mph is exceeded in the traffic data is 174."
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Dexter Codrington	Response-00986	The A6005 (Derby Road) is already significantly busy, and the addition of 190 houses will increase traffic volume, impacting road safety and increasing the risk of accidents. A transport assessment needs to be undertaken, particularly for the residents opposite and adjoining the proposed site entrance. The increased traffic and congestion will increase the pollution in the village. The traffic situation will be a cumulative impact of an additional 700 plus homes using the same main road from Borrowwash to Draycott to Breaston and onwards.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Diane Webster	Response-01177	A transport assessment needs to undertaken, particularly for the residents directly opposite the proposed site entrance; but also the whole route that the construction traffic will take. This passes through Draycott and Borrowwash. Passing busy junctions, Doctor?s surgeries, public car parks, Primary schools, local cricket club as well as numerous resident?s homes. Noise from the construction (including vehicle movements) and operational phases of the proposed development need to be adequately addressed. The roads in and around the proposed housing development South West of Draycott are not adequate for the volume of traffic that would use these routes if the development goes ahead. These include the A6005 (Derby Road) which itself experiences 3,861 car per day, Gypsy Lane and Hopewell Road which are small country lanes. These roads currently struggle to cope with the current traffic demand and would not cope with at least a further 190 cars if this development goes ahead. The A6005 (Derby Road) is an already busy road at peak times during the week and weekend which currently experiences over 3,861 cars a day. Adding 190 additional houses will cause significant congestion issues throughout the village and increase accidents within this overburdened area. The current road network between Borrowwash and Draycott, which includes Derby Road, Hopewell Road and Gypsy Lane, already struggles to handle current traffic demand let alone the potential for at least 190 more cars. The increased road and traffic to the area will have a detrimental impact to the local environment when considering the close proximity of Green Belt land, the Erewash River and the Derby Road to Draycott canal and footpath. These areas contain a magnitude of nature and local habitat that will be negatively impacted by increased population density, carbon footprint and does not align to the NPPF sustainable location assessment. "NPPF 20. States that strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and design quality of places and make sufficient provision for infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, security, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat). The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowwash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic."
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Donna Butcher	Response-01155	he Road Traffic Assessment which was undertaken by Systra (13.03.25) did not include Draycott or assess the road network in or around the land south west of Draycott. This is a huge error and oversight by EBC, and further compounds the hasty and reckless approach taken by EBC when developing the housing plan with Draycott. A road traffic survey would have highlighted the significant volume of traffic experienced on the A6005 (Derby Road), which can see over 4,000 cars per day, and the already locally congested network of Gypsy Lane and Hopewell Road which cannot take the current volume of traffic. A transport assessment needs to undertaken, particularly for the residents directly opposite the proposed site entrance; but also the whole route that the construction traffic will take. This passes through Draycott and Borrowwash. Passing busy junctions, Doctor?s surgeries, public car parks, Primary schools, local cricket club as well as numerous resident?s homes. The increased road and traffic to the area will have a detrimental impact to the local environment when considering the close proximity of Green Belt land, the Erewash River and the Derby Road to Draycott canal and footpath. These areas contain a magnitude of nature and local habitat that will be negatively impacted by increased population density, carbon footprint and does not align to the NPPF sustainable location assessment. NPPF 89. States that planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads. The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowwash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Donna Peace	Response-01344	The road n and around Draycott are not designed to accommodate the extra vehicles this development will bring. Increased congestior and parking issues wil iegatively impact both resident: and commuters



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Douglas Walker	Response-00994	NPPF 89. States that planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads. The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic. The Road Traffic Assessment which was undertaken by Systra (13.03.25) did not include Draycott or assess the road network in or around the land south west of Draycott. This is a huge error and oversight by EBC, and further compounds the hasty and reckless approach taken by EBC when developing the housing plan with Draycott. A road traffic survey would have highlighted the significant volume of traffic experienced on the A6005 (Derby Road), which can see over 4,000 cars per day, and the already locally congested network of Gypsy Lane and Hopewell Road which cannot take the current volume of traffic. The A6005 (Derby Road) is an already busy road at peak times during the week and weekend which currently experiences over 3,861 cars a day. Adding 190 additional houses will cause significant congestion issues throughout the village and increase accidents within this overburdened area. The increased road and traffic to the area will have a detrimental impact to the local environment when considering the close proximity of Green Belt land, the Erewash River and the Derby Road to Draycott canal and footpath. These areas contain a magnitude of nature and local habitat that will be negatively impacted by increased population density, carbon footprint and does not align to the NPPF sustainable location assessment. NPPF 20. States that strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and design quality of places and make sufficient provision for infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, security, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat). The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Dr CJ Marvell	Response-01901	Traffic and safety concerns. Exacerbated by the dormitory nature of the proposed development, traffic through the village will be much increased especially by commuting at busy times. At these times Derby Road is extremely busy and the extra junction and traffic will put great pressure on this infrastructure. There may also be safety concerns due to the increased traffic and the new road junction.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Dr Shelagh Brown	Response-01158	Traffic in and out of the proposed construction site will cause noise pollution in what was previously a quiet area between two villages.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Dudley Medhurst	Response-01180	Our roads already struggle at peak times. If there are incidents on the motorways or A52 and traffic is often diverted our village comes to a standstill.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Francis Ian Scott	Response-01535	The Road Traffic Assessment which was undertaken by Systra (13.03.25) did not include Draycott or assess the road network in or around the land south west of Draycott. This is a huge error and oversight by EBC, and further compounds the hasty and reckless approach taken by EBC when developing the housing plan with Draycott. A road traffic survey would have highlighted the significant volume of traffic experienced on the A6005 (Derby Road), which can see over 4,000 cars per day, and the already locally congested network of Gypsy Lane and Hopewell Road which cannot take the current volume of traffic. A transport assessment needs to be undertaken, particularly for the residents directly opposite the proposed site entrance; but also the whole route that the construction traffic will take. This passes through Draycott and Borrowash., passing busy junctions, Doctor's surgeries, public car parks, Primary schools, local cricket club as well as numerous resident's homes. Noise from the construction (including vehicle movements) and operational phases of the proposed development need to be adequately addressed. The roads in and around the proposed housing development South West of Draycott are not adequate for the volume of traffic that would use these routes if the development goes ahead. These include the A6005 (Derby Road) which itself experiences 3,861 car per day, Gypsy Lane and Hopewell Road which are small country lanes. These roads currently struggle to cope with the current traffic demand and would not cope with at least a further 190 cars if this development goes ahead. The A6005 (Derby Road) is an already busy road at peak times during the week and weekend which currently experiences over 3,861 cars a day. Adding 190 additional houses will cause significant congestion issues throughout the village and increase accidents within this overburdened area. The current road network between Borrowash and Draycott, which includes Derby Road, Hopewell Road and Gypsy Lane, already struggles to handle current traffic demand let alone the potential for at least 190 more cars. The increased road and traffic to the area will have a detrimental impact to the local environment when considering the close proximity of Green Belt land, the Erewash River and the Derby Road to Draycott canal and footpath. These areas contain a magnitude of nature and local habitat that will be negatively impacted by increased population density, carbon footprint and does not align to the NPPF sustainable location assessment. "NPPF 20. States that strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and design quality of places and make sufficient provision for infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, security, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat). The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic." NPPF 89. States that planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by p

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Francis Ian Scott	Response-01535	ublic transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads. The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowwash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Gail Holdsworth	Response-00937	I rely on the only bus from Nottingham. Always full. The main road through Draycott near the Olympic is virtually one way traffic . Often difficult to cross the road. There is a history of speeding through Draycott especially near the proposed site.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Garry Hickton	Response-01473	The site will bring in congestion to the village and the access and egress to the houses is in a dangerous place. With an additional 190 vehicles moving on and off the site there is the potential of major accidents
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Gary Siddall	Response-01237	The A6005 is a busy road already - but as a main "A" road between Nottingham and Derby (and excluding the A52 "bypass"), it's expected to be, that's what it's there for. (Figures for the amount of traffic using the road through Draycott are available, if you wish to ask.) However, it doesn't take much to snarl it all up and bring the whole area to a virtual standstill ! The most recent example has been all the roadworks etc. happening in Draycott and out towards Borrowwash... The almost constant traffic lights for weeks have caused some considerable disruption in the village and surrounding roads. I live on the main A6005 and although I personally live towards the opposite end of the village to where the works and traffic lights were, it was a regular occurrence to see traffic queuing past my house and cause difficulty for me to get on and off my own driveway. But yes, this case was "temporary", I know.... But it gives a good indication of what life could be like with increased traffic and - God forbid - (potentially) additional traffic lights to allow cars to get in and out of a "new housing estate". The increased traffic will not only congest the local roads in Draycott though - I fully expect many of the additional cars will be wanting to use the A52 as well.... Access to that is already just barely adequate (IMO), but add another 190+ cars (plus all of the ones from Borrowwash's "new houses") going up and down Cole Lane...?? Really...?? Traffic flow in the area is almost on a knife-edge, so any significant increase in traffic is likely to cause huge congestion.... And with 190/240 new houses, an additional one car per household on the roads in Draycott is surely a greatly conservative estimate...? I don't know how access/egress to the "proposed new houses" is going to work, there is potentially a lot of traffic trying to get in and out there... There have been RTA/RTI's in that area in the past (including one fatal, that I can recall), But as I said above, the thought of installing traffic lights there will likely disrupt traffic in the whole area, IMO. Increased traffic will also inevitably mean increased wear and tear on the roads too: It is already obvious, that the County Council are incapable of maintaining the roads (potholes !) to an acceptable standard - has this been taken into account at all....? As far as I'm aware, road safety/traffic planning should be addressed at the very early/primary stages of planning and development proposals, but this does not appear to be the case in this instance. The road infrastructure needs to have a LOT more thought than just putting one or two "side streets" into the "proposed new estate" - in fact, the WHOLE road traffic assessment by EBC seems to have been woefully inadequate. And remember - when I keep saying "190+ cars", that is a VERY conservative "absolute best case scenario" that unrealistically assumes that every new household has just one car.... Which we all know will NOT be the case in reality.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Gemma Woolnough	Response-01394	The location of this housing development is directly off the main road through Draycott, a road which is already very busy at peak times and on which there is a high level of traffic speeding. There has also been multiple fatalities on this road involving cars entering the road from various streets & avenues going off it. It is very likely that the entrance to this housing development will require traffic to merge near the bridge which means less time for cars/motorbikes to react to new cars entering the road. The increase in traffic will also result in increased noise and air pollution, negatively impacting the lives of villagers.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	George Foster	Response-01199	The Road Traffic Assessment which was undertaken by Systra (13.03.25) did not include Draycott or assess the road network in or around the land south west of Draycott. This is a huge error and oversight by EBC, and further compounds the hasty and reckless approach taken by EBC when developing the housing plan with Draycott. A road traffic survey would have highlighted the significant volume of traffic experienced on the A6005 (Derby Road), which can see over 4,000 cars per day, and the already locally congested network of Gypsy Lane and Hopewell Road which cannot take the current volume of traffic. A transport assessment needs to be undertaken, particularly for the residents directly opposite the proposed site entrance; but also the whole route that the construction traffic will take. This passes through Draycott and Borrowwash. Passing busy junctions, Doctor's surgeries, public car parks, Primary schools, local cricket club as well as numerous resident's homes. Noise from the construction (including vehicle movements) and operational phases of the proposed development need to be adequately addressed. The roads in and around the proposed housing development South West of Draycott are not adequate for the volume of traffic that would use these routes if the development goes ahead. These include the A6005 (Derby Road) which itself experiences 3,861 cars per day, Gypsy Lane and Hopewell Road which are small country lanes. These roads currently struggle to cope with the current traffic demand and would not cope with at least a further 190 cars if this development goes ahead. The A6005 (Derby Road) is an already busy road at peak times during the week and weekend which currently experiences over 3,861 cars a day. Adding 190 additional houses will cause significant congestion issues throughout the village and increase accidents within this overburdened area. The current road network between Borrowwash and Draycott, which includes Derby Road, Hopewell Road and Gypsy Lane, already struggles to handle current traffic demand let alone the potential for at least 190 more cars. The increased road and traffic to the area will have a detrimental impact to the local environment when considering the close proximity of Green Belt land, the Erewash River and the Derby Road to Draycott canal and footpath. These areas contain a magnitude of nature and local habitat that will be negatively impacted by increased population density, carbon footprint and does not align to the NPPF sustainable location assessment. NPPF 20. States that strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and design quality of places and make sufficient provision for infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, security, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat). The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowwash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic. NPPF 89. States that planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads. The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowwash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Gerri Hickton	Response-01472	The village is busy at key times- this was shown by the recent roadworks which caused carnage! This is going to be worse with additional housing and associated cars. Add construction traffic into the mix and the roads will be horrific at key times
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Gill Trickitt	Response-01157	As soon as there are any temporary lights in the village, the road straight through the centre which is a main road I believe for the emergency services too - comes to a standstill with queueing traffic and basic gridlock. There is one single passing point to get from one side of the village to the other and there are no other routes around without a huge detour and the congestion is terrible.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Gordon Dahill	Response-00690	The extra traffic congestion between Breaston Draycott and Borrowwash with a possible extra 1000 cars is going to cause significant traffic problems
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Graham Wakeling	Response-01238	Draycott's roads are already far too busy, adding more houses will only further the traffic congestion problem(s) and that will be unacceptable.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Hannah McMaster	Response-01381	The main Derby Road route is used as an alternative to the A52 at peak times. An increase in housing will increase the traffic through the village.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Hannah Pritchard	Response-01399	The introduction of 190 new dwellings is projected to increase the local population by up to 950 residents, leading to a significant rise in vehicle use. Draycott's road network, particularly the pinch points along Station Road and Wilne Road, already experiences congestion during peak hours. Adding potentially 300-500 more vehicles from the development would severely exacerbate traffic issues, increase commute times, and reduce quality of life for current residents. No substantial traffic mitigation measures have been proposed.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	James Hargreaves	Response-01315	1. Existing Road Pressure: The A6005 (Derby Road) already handles a high volume of traffic, with over 3,861 vehicles daily. Adding 190 new homes will worsen congestion and heighten the likelihood of accidents. Recent utility works by Cadent Gas have already caused severe traffic disruption in the village. Road Safety

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	James Whyman	Response-01551	<p>1 The Road Traffic Assessment which was undertaken by Systra (13.03.25) did not include Draycott or assess the road network in or around the land south west of Draycott. This is a huge error and oversight by EBC, and further compounds the hasty and reckless approach taken by EBC when developing the housing plan with Draycott. A road traffic survey would have highlighted the significant volume of traffic experienced on the A6005 (Derby Road), which can see over 4,000 cars per day, and the already locally congested network of Gypsy Lane and Hopewell Road which cannot take the current volume of traffic. 2 A transport assessment needs to be undertaken, particularly for the residents directly opposite the proposed site entrance; but also the whole route that the construction traffic will take. This passes through Draycott and Borrowwash. Passing busy junctions, Doctor's surgeries, public car parks, Primary schools, local cricket club as well as numerous resident's homes. 3 Noise from the construction (including vehicle movements) and operational phases of the proposed development need to be adequately addressed. 4 The roads in and around the proposed housing development South West of Draycott are not adequate for the volume of traffic that would use these routes if the development goes ahead. These include the A6005 (Derby Road) which itself experiences 3,861 cars per day, Gypsy Lane and Hopewell Road which are small country lanes. These roads currently struggle to cope with the current traffic demand and would not cope with at least a further 190 cars if this development goes ahead. 5 The A6005 (Derby Road) is an already busy road at peak times during the week and weekend which currently experiences over 3,861 cars a day. Adding 190 additional houses will cause significant congestion issues throughout the village and increase accidents within this overburdened area. 6 The current road network between Borrowwash and Draycott, which includes Derby Road, Hopewell Road and Gypsy Lane, already struggles to handle current traffic demand let alone the potential for at least 190 more cars. 7 The increased road and traffic to the area will have a detrimental impact to the local environment when considering the close proximity of Green Belt land, the Erewash River and the Derby Road to Draycott canal and footpath. These areas contain a magnitude of nature and local habitat that will be negatively impacted by increased population density, carbon footprint and does not align to the NPPF sustainable location assessment. 8 NPPF 20. States that strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and design quality of places and make sufficient provision for infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, security, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat). The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowwash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic. 9 NPPF 89. States that planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not w</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	James Whyman	Response-01551	<p>ell served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads. The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowwash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic.</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	J Morgan	Response-01847	<p>The A6005 (Derby Road) is already significantly busy, and the addition of 190 houses will exacerbate traffic volume, impacting road safety and increasing the risk of accidents. Increased traffic can lead to congestion, longer travel times, and heightened frustration among drivers, which may result in more aggressive driving behaviours. The road infrastructure may not be equipped to handle the additional load, leading to potential bottlenecks and increased wear and tear on the road surface.</p>

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Jonathan Childs	Response-01117	The Road Traffic Assessment which was undertaken by Systra (13.03.25) did not include Draycott or assess the road network in or around the land south west of Draycott. This is a huge error and oversight by EBC, and further compounds the hasty and reckless approach taken by EBC when developing the housing plan with Draycott. A road traffic survey would have highlighted the significant volume of traffic experienced on the A6005 (Derby Road), which can see over 4,000 cars per day, and the already locally congested network of Gypsy Lane and Hopewell Road which cannot take the current volume of traffic. A transport assessment needs to undertaken, particularly for the residents directly opposite the proposed site entrance; but also the whole route that the construction traffic will take. This passes through Draycott and Borrowwash. Passing busy junctions, Doctor?s surgeries, public car parks, Primary schools, local cricket club as well as numerous resident?s homes. Noise from the construction (including vehicle movements) and operational phases of the proposed development need to be adequately addressed. The roads in and around the proposed housing development South West of Draycott are not adequate for the volume of traffic that would use these routes if the development goes ahead. These include the A6005 (Derby Road) which itself experiences 3,861 car per day, Gypsy Lane and Hopewell Road which are small country lanes. These roads currently struggle to cope with the current traffic demand and would not cope with at least a further 190 cars if this development goes ahead. The A6005 (Derby Road) is an already busy road at peak times during the week and weekend which currently experiences over 3,861 cars a day. Adding 190 additional houses will cause significant congestion issues throughout the village and increase accidents within this overburdened area. The current road network between Borrowwash and Draycott, which includes Derby Road, Hopewell Road and Gypsy Lane, already struggles to handle current traffic demand let alone the potential for at least 190 more cars. The increased road and traffic to the area will have a detrimental impact to the local environment when considering the close proximity of Green Belt land, the Erewash River and the Derby Road to Draycott canal and footpath. These areas contain a magnitude of nature and local habitat that will be negatively impacted by increased population density, carbon footprint and does not align to the NPPF sustainable location assessment. NPPF 20. States that strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and design, quality of places and make sufficient provision for infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, security, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat). The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowwash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic. NPPF 89. States that planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by publ
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Jonathan Childs	Response-01117	ic transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads. The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowwash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic. In addition to the above, issues already exist at the junction of Lime Grove and Derby Road where bus stops are positioned adjacent to and directly opposite Lime Grove and issues with vehicles parking too close to the junction are common. There have been numerous instances of near head-on collision where traffic travelling west-east on Derby Road has chosen not to wait behind the stopped eastbound bus and thus has created a 'near miss' situation with vehicles turning left out of Lime Grove. Similarly, with vehicles parked sometimes partly on the pavement (and illegally) too close to the junction with Lime Grove prevent a clear view of the Derby Road traffic and thus make it a difficult and dangerous task for anyone attempting to emerge from Lime Grove. Nothing has been done to address or police this in my 22 year residence and it is reasonable to expect that given the proposed topology of the proposed new site access road that similar situations will develop there too.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Jonathan Fletcher	Response-01463	With an already busy village, the introduction of many more homes will only significantly increase severe congestion.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Judith Boyle	Response-01418	A transport assessment needs to undertaken, particularly for the residents directly opposite the proposed site entrance; but also the whole route that the construction traffic will take. This passes through Draycott and Borrowwash. Passing busy junctions, Doctor?s surgeries, public car parks, Primary schools, local cricket club as well as numerous resident?s homes. The increased road and traffic to the area will have a detrimental impact to the local environment when considering the close proximity of Green Belt land, the Erewash River and the Derby Road to Draycott canal and footpath. These areas contain a magnitude of nature and local habitat that will be negatively impacted by increased population density, carbon footprint and does not align to the NPPF sustainable location assessment.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Julie Pleass	Response-01526	The Road Traffic Assessment which was undertaken by Systra (13.03.25) did not include Draycott or assess the road network in or around the land south west of Draycott. This is a huge error and oversight by EBC, and further compounds the hasty and reckless approach taken by EBC when developing the housing plan with Draycott. A road traffic survey would have highlighted the significant volume of traffic experienced on the A6005 (Derby Road), which can see over 4,000 cars per day, and the already locally congested network of Gypsy Lane and Hopewell Road which cannot take the current volume of traffic The roads in and around the proposed housing development South West of Draycott are not adequate for the volume of traffic that would use these routes if the development goes ahead. These include the A6005 (Derby Road) which itself experiences 3,861 car per day, Gypsy Lane and Hopewell Road which are small country lanes. These roads currently struggle to cope with the current traffic demand and would not cope with at least a further 190 cars if this development goes ahead. The A6005 (Derby Road) is an already busy road at peak times during the week and weekend which currently experiences over 3,861 cars a day. Adding 190 additional houses will cause significant congestion issues throughout the village and increase accidents within this overburdened area.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Juliet Macve	Response-01572	I understand that the Road Traffic Assessment carried out in March 2025 did not include Draycott, or assess the road network in or around the land South-West of Draycott. This appears to be a massive oversight, and had it been carried out it would have shown that the roads are already congested. A transport assessment must be carried out. NPPF (para 20) states that "Strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and design quality of places and make sufficient provision for: ... b) infrastructure for transport ...." NPPF (para 89) states that "Planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads and exploits any opportunities to make a location more sustainable (for example by improving the scope for access on foot, by cycling or by public transport). The use of previously developed land, and sites that are physically well-related to existing settlements, should be encouraged where suitable opportunities exist. The road network in and around the area is not suitable to cope with additional demand from new housing, especially taking into account the high number of new houses proposed for Draycott, Breaston and Borrowwash. The main road through Draycott (A6605) is already busy, particularly at peak times. Additional traffic will cause further congestion, thus increasing noise levels and reducing air quality and potentially causing health issues for residents. In addition, given the proximity to other green belt land and footpaths it will impact biodiversity as well as enjoyment of the countryside.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Justine Murrin	Response-01478	this many houses will significantly and negatively impact on our infrastructure and traffic.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Katie May	Response-01518	The Road Traffic Assessment which was undertaken by Systra (13.03.25) did not include Draycott or assess the road network in or around the land south west of Draycott. This is a huge error and oversight by EBC, and further compounds the hasty and reckless approach taken by EBC when developing the housing plan with Draycott. A road traffic survey would have highlighted the significant volume of traffic experienced on the A6005 (Derby Road), which can see over 4,000 cars per day, and the already locally congested network of Gypsy Lane and Hopewell Road which cannot take the current volume of traffic. A transport assessment needs to be undertaken, particularly for the residents directly opposite the proposed site entrance; but also the whole route that the construction traffic will take. This passes through Draycott and Borrowwash. Passing busy junctions, Doctor's surgeries, public car parks, Primary schools, local cricket club as well as numerous residents' homes. Noise from the construction (including vehicle movements) and operational phases of the proposed development need to be adequately addressed. The roads in and around the proposed housing development South West of Draycott are not adequate for the volume of traffic that would use these routes if the development goes ahead. These include the A6005 (Derby Road) which itself experiences 3,861 cars per day, Gypsy Lane and Hopewell Road which are small country lanes. These roads currently struggle to cope with the current traffic demand and would not cope with at least a further 190 cars if this development goes ahead. The A6005 (Derby Road) is an already busy road at peak times during the week and weekend which currently experiences over 3,861 cars a day. Adding 190 additional houses will cause significant congestion issues throughout the village and increase accidents within this overburdened area. The current road network between Borrowwash and Draycott, which includes Derby Road, Hopewell Road and Gypsy Lane, already struggles to handle current traffic demand let alone the potential for at least 190 more cars. The increased road and traffic to the area will have a detrimental impact to the local environment when considering the close proximity of Green Belt land, the Erewash River and the Derby Road to Draycott canal and footpath. These areas contain a magnitude of nature and local habitat that will be negatively impacted by increased population density, carbon footprint and does not align to the NPPF sustainable location assessment. "NPPF 20. States that strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and design quality of places and make sufficient provision for infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, security, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat). The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowwash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic." NPPF 89. States that planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads. The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowwash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Katie May	Response-01518	public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads. The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowwash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Kayleigh Bonallie	Response-01375	There is a continuous flow of heavy traffic with regular roadworks, construction and temporary lights cause traffic across the entire village

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Kelly Walker	Response-00911	The Road Traffic Assessment which was undertaken by Systra (13.03.25) did not include Draycott or assess the road network in or around the land south west of Draycott. This is a huge error and oversight by EBC, and further compounds the hasty and reckless approach taken by EBC when developing the housing plan with Draycott. A road traffic survey would have highlighted the significant volume of traffic experienced on the A6005 (Derby Road), which can see over 4,000 cars per day, and the already locally congested network of Gypsy Lane and Hopewell Road which cannot take the current volume of traffic. The roads in and around the proposed housing development South West of Draycott are not adequate for the volume of traffic that would use these routes if the development goes ahead. These include the A6005 (Derby Road) which itself experiences 3,861 car per day, Gypsy Lane and Hopewell Road which are small country lanes. These roads currently struggle to cope with the current traffic demand and would not cope with at least a further 190 cars if this development goes ahead. The current road network between Borrowwash and Draycott, which includes Derby Road, Hopewell Road and Gypsy Lane, already struggles to handle current traffic demand let alone the potential for at least 190 more cars. NPPF 89. States that planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads. The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowwash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic. The increased road and traffic to the area will have a detrimental impact to the local environment when considering the close proximity of Green Belt land, the Erewash River and the Derby Road to Draycott canal and footpath. These areas contain a magnitude of nature and local habitat that will be negatively impacted by increased population density, carbon footprint and does not align to the NPPF sustainable location assessment.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Kerry Naylor	Response-00993	up to 200 cars/vehicles pulling onto Derby Road!! Really, that's considered acceptable is it?!
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Laura Charier	Response-01218	A transport assessment needs to be undertaken, particularly for the residents directly opposite the proposed site entrance; but also the whole route that the construction traffic will take. This passes through Draycott and Borrowwash. Passing busy junctions, Doctor's surgeries, public car parks, Primary schools, local cricket club as well as numerous resident's homes. The roads in and around the proposed housing development South West of Draycott are not adequate for the volume of traffic that would use these routes if the development goes ahead. These include the A6005 (Derby Road) which itself experiences 3,861 car per day, Gypsy Lane and Hopewell Road which are small country lanes. These roads currently struggle to cope with the current traffic demand and would not cope with at least a further 190 cars if this development goes ahead.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Laura Roffey	Response-01479	190 homes will add massively to the number of cars using Draycott and the surrounding area which will be a huge negative to Draycott as a village.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Lee	Response-00742	1. With the increased traffic throughput is the road budget for maintenance to be increased locally? 2. Slowing Derby Road down to make it safe enough for the new housing estate and existing residents. Will impact the Ambulances that pass through the village to the hospital. This new pinch point / bottle neck plus additional traffic in general in Erewash will add crucial time to a critical ambulance route. Minutes will cost lives. Has this been seriously considered at all? 3. With the average household owning 1.3 Car this will introduce another 247 cars just in Draycott. When taking into account Borrowwash & Breaston our close neighbours another 572 vehicles will be zooming around. With planned extension to the plan, it will easily tip the 1000 figure. Is introducing this many cars in condensed area safe & particle? 4. Congestion, Road works & speed on the humpback bridge on Derby Road in March 2020 contributed to a fatality.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Lee Bunday	Response-00028	The proposed development plans, as outlined in the strategy, will significantly increase the volume of vehicles on already overburdened road networks. There is one key route in and out of the area and with the additional allocations on the same road at Borrowwash and Breaston, will lead to regular congestion during peak hours. The addition of new housing developments without a corresponding, robust transport infrastructure plan will only exacerbate this issue. There appears to be a lack of detailed traffic impact assessments that take into account cumulative effects of multiple developments over time. The review also does not present any substantial mitigation strategies, such as improved public transport, new road links, or traffic management systems to support the proposed growth. Unchecked traffic congestion leads to: Increased air pollution and public health risks. Reduced economic productivity due to longer commute times. Lower quality of life for residents affected by noise, stress, and safety concerns. Greater wear and tear on local infrastructure, leading to higher maintenance costs. I urge the council to reconsider the scale and scope of the proposed developments until a comprehensive and sustainable transport plan is in place, supported by proper consultation and technical studies.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Linda Jane Jenkins	Response-01007	I object on the grounds that if 190 houses are built in Draycott there are likely to be over 300 cars. Already it is difficult to turn right out of the current lane. Cars come far too fast over the double hump bridges to the west. There is no line of sight on traffic. A fatality occurred a couple of years ago just 30m from this exit. There is likely to be more accidents or worse.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Louise and Shane Foster	Response-01219	Derby Road is a busy road and more houses will increase traffic volume. Again, has there been a risk assessment with regard to this and the disruption to the area whilst the building work takes place? Access to the site by large plant and delivery trucks will cause long delays.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Louise Burnell	Response-00262	Increased traffic flow will lead to congestion.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Luke Hatch	Response-00160	Draycott already sees traffic build-up, particularly on the A6005. Another 190 homes means hundreds more cars using the same narrow road network and there?s no clear plan for how that will be managed. This will only be compounded with the Borrowwash and Breaston developments, which all use the same road to access the A6 or Long Eaton/M1.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Lynne Dundas	Response-01198	The location of the additional houses would mean that a road at the bottom of the hill coming into Draycott from Borrowwash, which would be a very bad traffic hazard.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Maggie Murphy	Response-00833	The proposal for an initial 190 houses, which will increase to c.240 once the safeguarded land has been developed, is far too big and overpowering for the area. It will totally change the look and feel of the village and will distract from the existing buildings and fields that welcome visitors to the village entrance alongside the proposed site. Draycott has some lovely footpaths and bridleways that allow simple and accessible access to the countryside and the surrounding villages. The village has a thriving community of horse riders with many Horse livery stables, keen cyclists and numerous walking and ramblers groups. They all happily coexist and share these paths throughout the locality. Increased urbanisation and the massive increase in traffic will impact this from Day 1. The roads will become unsuitable for horse riders and cyclists and the footpaths will be limited due to the development. The village will lose its rural identity and risk morphing into a combined town with Breaston and Borrowwash.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Martin Fawcett	Response-01077	You don?t need to be a rocket scientist to know what impact this will have
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Martin Kilcoyne	Response-01460	The Road Traffic Assessment which was undertaken by Systra (13.03.25) did not include Draycott or assess the road network in or around the land south west of Draycott. This is a huge error and oversight by EBC, and further compounds the hasty and reckless approach taken by EBC when developing the housing plan with Draycott. A road traffic survey would have highlighted the significant volume of traffic experienced on the A6005 (Derby Road), which can see over 4,000 cars per day, and the already locally congested network of Gypsy Lane and Hopewell Road which cannot take the current volume of traffic. A transport assessment needs to be undertaken, particularly for the residents directly opposite the proposed site entrance; but also the whole route that the construction traffic will take. This passes through Draycott and Borrowwash. Passing busy junctions, Doctor?s surgeries, public car parks, Primary schools, local cricket club as well as numerous resident?s homes. Noise from the construction (including vehicle movements) and operational phases of the proposed development need to be adequately addressed. The roads in and around the proposed housing development South West of Draycott are not adequate for the volume of traffic that would use these routes if the development goes ahead. These include the A6005 (Derby Road) which itself experiences 3,861 cars per day, Gypsy Lane and Hopewell Road which are small country lanes. These roads currently struggle to cope with the current traffic demand and would not cope with at least a further 190 cars if this development goes ahead. The A6005 (Derby Road) is an already busy road at peak times during the week and weekend which currently experiences over 3,861 cars a day. Adding 190 additional houses will cause significant congestion issues throughout the village and increase accidents within this overburdened area. The current road network between Borrowwash and Draycott, which includes Derby Road, Hopewell Road and Gypsy Lane, already struggles to handle current traffic demand let alone the potential for at least 190 more cars. The increased road and traffic to the area will have a detrimental impact to the local environment when considering the close proximity of Green Belt land, the Erewash River and the Derby Road to Draycott canal and footpath. These areas contain a magnitude of nature and local habitat that will be negatively impacted by increased population density, carbon footprint and does not align to the NPPF sustainable location assessment. "NPPF 20. States that strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and design quality of places and make sufficient provision for infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, security, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat). The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowwash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic." NPPF 89. States that planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads. The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowwash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Martin Kilcoyne	Response-01460	public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads. The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowwash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Mary Walsh	Response-01197	The A6005 (Derby Road) is an already busy road at peak times during the week and weekend which currently experiences over 3,861 cars a day. Adding 190 additional houses will cause significant congestion issues throughout the village and increase accidents within this overburdened area. The current road network between Borrowwash and Draycott, which includes Derby Road, Hopewell



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Matthew Walker	Response-01313	The Road Traffic Assessment which was undertaken by Systra (13.03.25) did not include Draycott or assess the road network in or around the land south west of Draycott. This is a huge error and oversight by EBC, and further compounds the hasty and reckless approach taken by EBC when developing the housing plan with Draycott. A road traffic survey would have highlighted the significant volume of traffic experienced on the A6005 (Derby Road), which can see over 4,000 cars per day, and the already locally congested network of Gypsy Lane and Hopewell Road which cannot take the current volume of traffic. A transport assessment needs to be undertaken, particularly for the residents directly opposite the proposed site entrance; but also the whole route that the construction traffic will take. This passes through Draycott and Borrowash. Passing busy junctions, Doctor's surgeries, public car parks, Primary schools, local cricket club as well as numerous residents' homes. The roads in and around the proposed housing development South West of Draycott are not adequate for the volume of traffic that would use these routes if the development goes ahead. These include the A6005 (Derby Road) which itself experiences 3,861 cars per day, Gypsy Lane and Hopewell Road which are small country lanes. These roads currently struggle to cope with the current traffic demand and would not cope with at least a further 190 cars if this development goes ahead. The A6005 (Derby Road) is an already busy road at peak times during the week and weekend which currently experiences over 3,861 cars a day. Adding 190 additional houses will cause significant congestion issues throughout the village and increase accidents within this overburdened area. The current road network between Borrowash and Draycott, which includes Derby Road, Hopewell Road and Gypsy Lane, already struggles to handle current traffic demand let alone the potential for at least 190 more cars. The increased road and traffic to the area will have a detrimental impact to the local environment when considering the close proximity of Green Belt land, the Erewash River and the Derby Road to Draycott canal and footpath. These areas contain a magnitude of nature and local habitat that will be negatively impacted by increased population density, carbon footprint and does not align to the NPPF sustainable location assessment. NPPF 20. States that strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and design quality of places and make sufficient provision for infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, security, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat). The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic. NPPF 89. States that planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unaccept-
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Matthew Walker	Response-01313	able impact on local roads. The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Matt Tovey	Response-00929	The roads are currently horrendously busy - building more houses and having more cars on the road is neither safe or economic. . As a cyclist it is not safe increasing the car volume on the roads.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Melanie Wilson	Response-00974	The Traffic assessment undertaken by Systra did not include Draycott, therefore this should be repeated before any decision is made, Derby Road is already busy at Peak times an additional 190 houses will generate numerous trips
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Michael Atkin	Response-01872	The main road through the village cannot cope with the volume of traffic passing through. It is a danger to other traffic and pedestrians, let alone the fact that there are insufficient parking spaces.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Michael Thirtwall	Response-01196	The roads in and around the proposed housing development South West of Draycott are not adequate for the volume of traffic that would use these routes if the development goes ahead. These include the A6005 (Derby Road) Gypsy Lane and Hopewell Road which are small country lanes. These roads currently struggle to cope with the current traffic demand and would not cope with at least a further 190 cars if this development goes ahead. The A6005 (Derby Road) is an already busy road at peak times during the week and weekend which currently experiences over 3,861 cars a day. Adding 190 additional houses will cause significant congestion issues throughout the village and increase accidents within this overburdened area. The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Michelle Marks	Response-00924	Traffic & Public Transport ? The existing road network in Draycott was not designed to accommodate high volumes of traffic. Increased congestion, parking issues, and road safety concerns will negatively impact both residents and commuters. There is also no evidence of improved public transport provision, making this development wholly unsustainable.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Miss Ella Meredith	Response-01850	The A6005 (Derby Road) is already significantly busy, and the addition of 190 houses will exacerbate traffic volume, impacting road safety and increasing the risk of accidents. Increased traffic can lead to congestion, longer travel times, and heightened frustration among drivers, which may result in more aggressive driving behaviours. The road infrastructure may not be equipped to handle the additional load, leading to potential bottlenecks and increased wear and tear on the road surface.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Miss Natalie Walsh	Response-01846	The A6005 (Derby Road) is already significantly busy, and the addition of 190 houses will exacerbate traffic volume, impacting road safety and increasing the risk of accidents. Increased traffic can lead to congestion, longer travel times, and heightened frustration among drivers, which may result in more aggressive driving behaviours. The road infrastructure may not be equipped to handle the additional load, leading to potential bottlenecks and increased wear and tear on the road surface.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Miss Paige Murray	Response-01842	The A6005 (Derby Road) is already significantly busy, and the addition of 190 houses will exacerbate traffic volume, impacting road safety and increasing the risk of accidents. Increased traffic can lead to congestion, longer travel times, and heightened frustration among drivers, which may result in more aggressive driving behaviours. The road infrastructure may not be equipped to handle the additional load, leading to potential bottlenecks and increased wear and tear on the road surface.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Mr R Sykes	Response-00412	The access is on to heavily used between Borrowwash and Draycott.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Mr Scott Walsh	Response-01844	The A6005 (Derby Road) is already significantly busy, and the addition of 190 houses will exacerbate traffic volume, impacting road safety and increasing the risk of accidents. Increased traffic can lead to congestion, longer travel times, and heightened frustration among drivers, which may result in more aggressive driving behaviours. The road infrastructure may not be equipped to handle the additional load, leading to potential bottlenecks and increased wear and tear on the road surface.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Mrs Elizabeth White	Response-00060	It would bring extra traffic to the area with danger to the stress put on the bridges on that road and the village is already overcrowded with traffic.
			Mrs Maria E Hardy	Response-00614	Too much congestion. Making a peaceful village noisy, polluted, and unsafe.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Mrs Mary Walsh	Response-01845	The A6005 (Derby Road) is already significantly busy, and the addition of 190 houses will exacerbate traffic volume, impacting road safety and increasing the risk of accidents. Increased traffic can lead to congestion, longer travel times, and heightened frustration among drivers, which may result in more aggressive driving behaviours. The road infrastructure may not be equipped to handle the additional load, leading to potential bottlenecks and increased wear and tear on the road surface.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Mrs V Atkin	Response-01871	Not only that but the road through the village is already far to busy, without adding extra traffic.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Mr Tony Walsh	Response-01849	The A6005 (Derby Road) is already significantly busy, and the addition of 190 houses will exacerbate traffic volume, impacting road safety and increasing the risk of accidents. Increased traffic can lead to congestion, longer travel times, and heightened frustration among drivers, which may result in more aggressive driving behaviours. The road infrastructure may not be equipped to handle the additional load, leading to potential bottlenecks and increased wear and tear on the road surface.
			Nat	Response-00158	Increased traffic to the area
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Neil Johnstone	Response-00725	Increased traffic on an already busy main road through the village.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Nicole Howe	Response-00881	Draycott already had a busy main road leading from borrowwash through to breaston. Adding more houses is only going to create more traffic and pollution.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Nigel morton	Response-01351	The traffic is very heavy along proposed site location and surrounding area ie Cole Lane borrowwash for A52 ,Victoria avenue to A52 and routes to A50 and M1 ,the 700 houses proposed over draycott ,breaston and borrowwash will add to that drastically .my property is opposite the proposed site and I have trouble getting off my drive at all times of the day ,road traffic doesn't slow till around 8 at night .The speed monitor on the bridge has recorded a highest speed of 100mph ,most vehicles don't do 30mpn but much higher
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Nikki Riches	Response-00950	As a resident in Draycott the amount of traffic that uses Derby Road has increased in time. Trying to cross it is a already a nightmare and risk, which will only be compounded by a significant increase to the village of 190 cars (min) if the development does go ahead. The Road Traffic Assessment which was undertaken by Systra (13.03.25) did not include Draycott or assess the road network in or around the land south west of Draycott. This is a huge error and oversight by EBC or quite frankly ineptitude, and further compounds the hasty and reckless approach taken by EBC when developing the housing plan with Draycott. A road traffic survey would have highlighted the significant volume of traffic experienced on the A6005 (Derby Road), which can see over 4,000 cars per day, and the already locally congested network of Gypsy Lane and Hopewell Road which cannot take the current volume of traffic - struggling to handle current traffic demand let alone the potential for at least 190 more cars. A transport assessment needs to undertaken, particularly for the residents directly opposite the proposed site entrance; but also the whole route that the construction traffic will take. This passes through Draycott and Borrowwash. Passing busy junctions, Doctor?s surgeries, public car parks, Primary schools, local cricket club as well as numerous resident?s homes. The roads in and around the proposed housing development South West of Draycott are not adequate for the volume of traffic that would use these routes if the development goes ahead. These include the A6005 (Derby Road) which itself experiences 3,861 car per day, Gypsy Lane and Hopewell Road which are small country lanes. These roads currently struggle to cope with the current traffic demand and would not cope with at least a further 190 cars if this development goes ahead. The increased road and traffic to the area will have a detrimental impact to the local environment when considering the close proximity of Green Belt land, the Erewash River and the Derby Road to Draycott canal and footpath. These areas contain a magnitude of nature and local habitat that will be negatively impacted by increased population density, carbon footprint and does not align to the NPPF sustainable location assessment. NPPF 20. States that strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and design quality of places and make sufficient provision for infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, security, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat). The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowwash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic. NPPF 89. States that planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads. The road network in and around the identified development would require signific

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Nikki Riches	Response-00950	ant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowwash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Oliver Kirk	Response-00569	The increase in housing and thus village Populus will put added strain on already busy roads, causing delays during peak times and also present an increased danger to those who go to school in the village, due to the inherent danger of cars.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Paul Allen	Response-01082	There is insufficient school spaces, school parking, village parking and medical services at present and the development can only make matters worse.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	paul butcher	Response-01154	The Road Traffic Assessment which was undertaken by Systra (13.03.25) did not include Draycott or assess the road network in or around the land south west of Draycott. This is a huge error and oversight by EBC, and further compounds the hasty and reckless approach taken by EBC when developing the housing plan with Draycott. A road traffic survey would have highlighted the significant volume of traffic experienced on the A6005 (Derby Road), which can see over 4,000 cars per day, and the already locally congested network of Gypsy Lane and Hopewell Road which cannot take the current volume of traffic. A transport assessment needs to undertaken, particularly for the residents directly opposite the proposed site entrance; but also the whole route that the construction traffic will take. This passes through Draycott and Borrowwash. Passing busy junctions, Doctor?s surgeries, public car parks, Primary schools, local cricket club as well as numerous resident?s homes. The increased road and traffic to the area will have a detrimental impact to the local environment when considering the close proximity of Green Belt land, the Erewash River and the Derby Road to Draycott canal and footpath. These areas contain a magnitude of nature and local habitat that will be negatively impacted by increased population density, carbon footprint and does not align to the NPPF sustainable location assessment. NPPF 89. States that planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads. The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowwash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Pauline Marks	Response-00927	Draycott?s road network was not designed to handle high traffic volumes. Increased vehicle use would lead to congestion, parking shortages, and road safety concerns. The development offers no improvements to public transport, making it car-dependent and environmentally unsustainable. Loss of Village Identity and Policy Non-Compliance
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Peter Bates	Response-01912	why has no traffic survey been carried out by EBC when we have an average of over 4000 cars per week entering and leaving the village? The increase in traffic to the area will have a detrimental impact when considering the close proximity of Green Belt land, the River Derwent and the Derby Road to Draycott canal and footpath. These areas contain a magnitude of nature and local habitat that will be negatively impacted by increased population density and the carbon footprint does not align to the NPPFs sustainable assessment. Increased traffic will also cause more pollution to the air quality thus adversely effecting the village population.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	R Fazackerley	Response-01415	The planned development access onto the A6005 will add significant additional traffic to the local area . Site access during construction and use is unsafe as the access is obscured by thr bridge over the canal for traffic coming from Borrowwash
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Richard Keith Hanbury	Response-01087	The huge increase in traffic will cause congestion. I ride a bike to work and have already been hit by a car 2 years ago. I am worried that the increase traffic will cause more safety issues with cyclists and pedestrians. The road works already cause problems with the traffic lights often breaking down and causing chaos.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Richard Syson	Response-01317	The roads in and around the proposed housing development South West of Draycott are not adequate for the volume of traffic that would use these routes if the development goes ahead. These include the A6005 (Derby Road) which itself experiences c. 4,000 vehicles per day, Gypsy Lane and Hopewell Road which are small country lanes. These roads currently struggle to cope with the current traffic demand and would not cope with at least a further 190 cars if this development goes ahead. Adding another 190 homes plus a potential extra 70 homes would add c. 500 extra vehicles. The current road noise and pollution from vehicles is already considerable and would obviously worsen, especially as there appears to be no thought or plan as how to alleviate the already significant traffic issues in the village.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Rick Howden	Response-01421	The roads in and around the proposed housing development South West of Draycott are not adequate for the volume of traffic that would use these routes if the development goes ahead. These include the A6005 (Derby Road) which itself experiences 3,861 car per day, Gypsy Lane and Hopewell Road which are small country lanes. These roads currently struggle to cope with the current traffic demand and would not cope with at least a further 190 cars if this development goes ahead. The current road network between Borrowwash and Draycott, which includes Derby Road, Hopewell Road and Gypsy Lane, already struggles to handle current traffic demand let alone the potential for at least 190 more cars.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Ricky fisher	Response-00048	Traffic congestion in the village is already at a high with out another 190 houses adding to it as soon as one road work goes up in the village its absolute chaos
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Robert Alan Duncanson	Response-00855	THE INCREASE IN TRAFFIC WOULD BE DETRIMENTAL TO THE VILLAGE, WE ALREADY HAVE ALOT OF TRAFFIC AT PEAK TIMES
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Roger Brown	Response-00999	The A6005 Derby Rd through Draycott already has in excess of 500 vehicles per hour travelling in each direction during morning and evenings, these additional homes, together with those of other nearby developments will add considerably with these homes having access to and egress from the development onto this busy road at a known speeding location. These additional homes are likely to have an average of about 2 cars per home and the likely residents will be of working age with younger children who will commute to work and school making this a busy new junction in a dangerous location.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Ruth Hawkins	Response-01277	The roads in and around the proposed housing development South West of Draycott are not adequate for the volume of traffic that would use these routes if the development goes ahead. These include the A6005 (Derby Road) which itself experiences 3,861 car per day, Gypsy Lane and Hopewell Road which are small country lanes. These roads currently struggle to cope with the current traffic demand and would not cope with at least a further 190 cars if this development goes ahead. Adding 190 additional houses will cause significant congestion issues throughout the village and increase accidents within this overburdened area.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Sarah	Response-01541	There is already enough through traffic with road works and traffic lights almost weekly
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Sarah Hargreaves	Response-01314	1. Traffic Congestion: The A6005 (Derby Road) already experiences significant traffic, with over 3,861 cars per day. The addition of 190 houses will exacerbate congestion and increase the risk of accidents. Recent work by Cadent Gas has caused gridlock within the village due.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Scott Gardner	Response-01554	The proposed development will have a catastrophic impact on the already strained traffic conditions on the A6005 (Derby Road). This road is a vital artery for Draycott, connecting us to Derby and Nottingham. It is already a busy road suffering from significant congestion and has a concerning history of traffic accidents. The addition of approximately 190 homes will inevitably lead to a severe increase in traffic volume, exacerbating existing congestion , increasing the risk of accidents , and further endangering pedestrians.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Sean Peace	Response-01347	The road in and around Draycott are not designed to accommodate the extra vehicles this development will bring. Increased congestion and parking issues will negatively impact both resident and commuters
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Simon Jenkins	Response-01287	Derby Road is already a dangerous road. Every night without fail some idiot will be speeding, almost rocking the houses on the main road. Proper speed cameras would need to be installed as a minimum, but if you go ahead with this purely political decision to build 190 houses there will without doubt be more deaths on this road.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	S M Beresford	Response-01851	The A6005 (Derby Road) is already significantly busy, and the addition of 190 houses will exacerbate traffic volume, impacting road safety and increasing the risk of accidents. Increased traffic can lead to congestion, longer travel times, and heightened frustration among drivers, which may result in more aggressive driving behaviours. The road infrastructure may not be equipped to handle the additional load, leading to potential bottlenecks and increased wear and tear on the road surface.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Stephanie Ashley-Lane	Response-01380	The traffic is already terrible at times through draycott without adding more!
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Susan Baker	Response-01316	As someone who's lived here for over 3 years, I can say with certainty that the A6005 (Derby Road) has long struggled with heavy traffic?over 3,800 vehicles a day, and that's without the added pressure of 190 new homes. The recent chaos caused by Cadent Gas works brought the village to a standstill. Adding more cars will only make things worse and increase the risk of serious accidents.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Susan Foster	Response-00824	Imagine the infrastructure in a project like you are proposing, just replacing a few gas pipes has caused chaos, mess and delays due to traffic lights. The whole village will become gridlocked, a no go area and everyone will avoid the village.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Teresa Batchelor	Response-01240	I appreciate the proposed improvements to footpaths and the junction to the site, but nevertheless, the increased traffic, on an already busy Derby Road, where there has been at least one fatality, to my knowledge, would only cause more problems for existing residents.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Teresa Shaw	Response-01309	1. With the increased traffic throughput is the Derby road budget for maintenance to be increased locally? 2. Slowing Derby Road down to make it safe enough for the new housing estate and existing residents. Will impact the Ambulances that pass through the villages to the hospital. This new pinch point / bottle neck plus additional traffic in general in Erewash will add crucial time to a critical ambulance route. Minutes will cost lives. Has this been seriously considered at all? 3. With the average household owning 1.3 Car this will introduce another 247 cars just in Draycott and 40 Breaston. When taking into account Borrowash, Draycott & Breaston our close neighbours another 612 vehicles will be zooming around. With planned extensions to the plan, it will easily tip the 1000 figure. Is introducing this many cars in a condensed area is this safe & practical? 4. Congestion, Road works & speed on the humpback bridge on Derby Road in March 2020 contributed to a fatality. Having a junction after a blind spot will only cause a permanent congestion point making it highly unsafe.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Tim Hawkins	Response-00661	Well, it won't relieve it will it? It is unlikely that the 300 or so new cars in the village will be heading into the village centre, rather to the out of town facilities in Derby, but it will possibly mean a huge increase in delivery services as the development is proposed to increase the local population by some 10% or so. However, as I have not been permitted to see EBC's master plan for the development it's difficult to say.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Tom	Response-01477	With the addition of 190 new houses, it's reasonable to expect at least one car per household. This increase in vehicles is unnecessary and will only worsen the already existing traffic issues in the village, where speeding is already a serious concern. This is a quiet, peaceful village that does not need the added burden of more traffic and speeding vehicles. There was a fatality last week in the village, having more vehicles will only make the risks of crashing higher.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	Tracey Morton	Response-00968	1 The road traffic assessment did not include Draycott, huge error by EBC, hasty approach and reckless, over 40 vehicles travel along A6005 per day, very busy road. 2. Cole Lane, Gypsy Lane, Victoria Av, Hopewell Road already have significant traffic volume 3 Traffic assessment required particularly for residents opposite the site entrance, also for the route of construction traffic 4 Noise from construction vehicles needs to be addressed 5. Traffic heavy already building 190+ houses will add more traffic causing more problems 6 Living opposite this junction causing problem getting on and off my driveway at most times of the day 7 Increased traffic will have an effect on the environment, wildlife, air quality and people's health and wellbeing 8 Roads around the area don't cope with volume of traffic ATM, the proposed houses within Draycott, Breaston and Borrowash will cause major problems

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	T Shields	Response-00570	Draycott is not heavily congested. It can get busy at peak times which is short-lived, so any increase in traffic resulting from the proposed housing would not be significant. A new crossing is proposed as well as improvements to the main junction. It would be a short walk to the bus stop for trips between Derby and Long Eaton/Nottingham so the site is sustainably located in accordance with the NPPF and local Development Plan policies in that sense.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	William Batchelor	Response-01210	already a busy road at peak hours, difficulty in safely exiting Derby Road properties already
1.14	South West of Draycott	Traffic Congestion	zak butcher	Response-01156	he Road Traffic Assessment which was undertaken by Systra (13.03.25) did not include Draycott or assess the road network in or around the land south west of Draycott. This is a huge error and oversight by EBC, and further compounds the hasty and reckless approach taken by EBC when developing the housing plan with Draycott. A road traffic survey would have highlighted the significant volume of traffic experienced on the A6005 (Derby Road), which can see over 4,000 cars per day, and the already locally congested network of Gypsy Lane and Hopewell Road which cannot take the current volume of traffic. A transport assessment needs to be undertaken, particularly for the residents directly opposite the proposed site entrance; but also the whole route that the construction traffic will take. This passes through Draycott and Borrowash. Passing busy junctions, Doctor's surgeries, public car parks, Primary schools, local cricket club as well as numerous resident's homes. The increased road and traffic to the area will have a detrimental impact to the local environment when considering the close proximity of Green Belt land, the Erewash River and the Derby Road to Draycott canal and footpath. These areas contain a magnitude of nature and local habitat that will be negatively impacted by increased population density, carbon footprint and does not align to the NPPF sustainable location assessment. NPPF 89. States that planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads. The road network in and around the identified development would require significant investment and remodelling to handle the anticipated volume of cars. This when considering EBC have proposed nearly 700 additional houses in Draycott, Breaston and Borrowash. This is totally unrealistic and the current roads would not cope with the volume of traffic.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	adrian leeming	Response-01249	My belief is that the existing brownfield sites are seen as not attractive enough to attract developers however the objective is to address the housing crisis, not maximise developer returns. The developers want the work so the UK authorities and government need to play a bit harder with them and oblige them to develop sites which will earn them revenue, but not convert new sites in order to maximise their profits. The need for affordable housing will not be fulfilled by developing on this site, as local property values for new build property currently start at circa £300,000. The intention of the government push for more housing is an intention to resolve the housing shortage created by enabling too high borrowing levels, leading to house price inflation and building mostly 4 and 5 bedroom homes isn't the right approach. Building cheaper 3 bedroom houses on the edge of a town which would be reasonably priced and attractive to new buyers is more in line with this requirement.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Alison Bowley	Response-01174	Interestingly, as I write this objection, there are 50 houses for sale in Draycott, 25 of them having been reduced in price, so obviously not selling. Would people want to buy a house in a known flood risk area? Affordable housing would certainly not be in keeping with the type of houses along Derby Rd. Draycott already has a large number of EMH social housing developments, including Wallis Close, The Green, St Mary's Court, Queen's Court, Walter St, Elvaston St and many houses/flats on Cowslip Meadow, Mapleton Rd and in Victoria Mill are let as social housing.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Alison Thirlwall	Response-01390	The proposed 40% affordable housing within the development is not in keeping with the surrounding housing and in particular the houses that will border the development. The houses along Derby Road which would back onto the new development are 4-5 bedroom detached houses with a valuation range of £600,000+. Careful consideration must be given to the existing housing and how the developers ensure similar housing is developed to maintain the neighbourhood and village character. The proposed siting of the development is particularly ill-considered. It is on a Green Belt site and is Grade 2 quality land, and building here would both diminish the striking views from Derby Road when entering and leaving the village and be prominent from most angles within the village. The proposed housing mix is out of keeping with the village's strong historic character? no other dwellings in the village in this area are 2 bedroom terraces of which there are x29, for instance. While design issues might be solved by conditions or revised proposals, these could not remedy the siting problem.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	A Northeast	Response-01848	The proposed 40% affordable housing within the development is not in keeping with the surrounding housing, particularly the houses along Derby Road. Careful consideration must be given to ensure similar housing is developed to maintain the neighborhood and village character.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Anthony Lawton-Reeve	Response-00971	The proposed siting of the development is particularly ill-considered. It is on a Green Belt site and is Grade 2 quality land, and building here would both diminish the striking views from Derby Road when entering and leaving the village, and be prominent from most angles within the village. The proposed housing mix is out of keeping with the village's strong historic character? no other dwellings in the village in this area are 2 bedroom terraces of which there are x29, for instance. While design issues might be solved by conditions or revised proposals, these could not remedy the siting problem. The need for affordable housing will not be fulfilled by developing on this site, as local property values for new build property currently start at circa £300,000.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Anthony Walsh	Response-00992	The proposed 40% affordable housing within the development is not in keeping with the surrounding housing and in particular the houses that will boarder the development. The houses along Derby Road which would back onto the new development are 4-5 bedroom detached houses with a valuation range of £600,000+. Careful consideration must be given to the existing housing and how the developers ensure similar housing is developed to maintain the neighbourhood and village character. Within the EBCs Core Strategy plan it details out a draft housing allocation which refers to the type of houses. It states that 40% of the x190 dwellings has been designated as affordable housing which breaks down to x29 '2 Bed Terraces' and x95 '3 Bed Semis'. This type of housing is not in keeping with the surrounding and existing housing which comprises of 4-5 bedroom detached houses. This allocation of affordable housing is overbearing and not in keeping with the surrounding neighbourhood and character of the village. Only x66 of the x190 houses are in keeping with the surrounding existing type of houses. Other similar developments in recent times have designated 10% of its allocation to affordable housing,
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Avice Boyle	Response-01427	Within the EBCs Core Strategy plan it details out a draft housing allocation which refers to the type of houses. It states that 40% of the x190 dwellings has been designated as affordable housing which breaks down to x29 '2 Bed Terraces' and x95 '3 Bed Semis'. This type of housing is not in keeping with the surrounding and existing housing which comprises of 4-5 bedroom detached houses. This allocation of affordable housing is overbearing and not in keeping with the surrounding neighbourhood and character of the village. Only x66 of the x190 houses are in keeping with the surrounding existing type of houses. Other similar developments in recent times have designated 10% of its allocation to affordable housing. The proposed siting of the development is particularly ill-considered. It is on a Green Belt site and is Grade 2 quality land, and building here would both diminish the striking views from Derby Road when entering and leaving the village, and be prominent from most angles within the village. The proposed housing mix is out of keeping with the village's strong historic character ? no other dwellings in the village in this area are 2 bedroom terraces of which there are x29, for instance. While design issues might be solved by conditions or revised proposals, these could not remedy the siting problem. The need for affordable housing will not be fulfilled by developing on this site, as local property values for new build property currently start at circa £300,000.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Barbara Crane	Response-00268	Affordable housing will be bought up by landlords who charge extortionate rents. This does not ease problems for first-time buyers.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Ben Marshall	Response-01212	The proposed siting of the development is particularly ill-considered. It is on a Green Belt site and is Grade 2 quality land, and building here would both diminish the striking views from Derby Road when entering and leaving the village, and be prominent from most angles within the village. The proposed housing mix is out of keeping with the village's strong historic character ? no other dwellings in the village in this area are 2 bedroom terraces of which there are x29, for instance. While design issues might be solved by conditions or revised proposals, these could not remedy the siting problem. The need for affordable housing will not be fulfilled by developing on this site, as local property values for new build property currently start at circa £300,000.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Bev Marvell	Response-01892	This development will not significantly increase affordable housing in Draycott. Draycott has already a good record regarding creation of new social housing. 137 social houses were built in 2008 on a Brown Field site (Cowslip Meadow) and 2005-2015 the large listed Victoria Mill was converted to approximately 140 apartments.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Bradley Peace	Response-01348	The proposed 40% affordable housing within the development is not in keeping with the surrounding housing and in particular the houses that will boarder the development. The houses along Derby Road which would back onto the new development are 4-5 bedroom detached houses with a valuation range of £600,000+. Careful consideration must be given to the existing housing and how the developers ensure similar housing is developed to maintain the neighbourhood and village character. 5 2 Within the EBCs Core Strategy plan it details out a draft housing allocation which refers to the type of houses. It states that 40% of the x190 dwellings has been designated as affordable housing which breaks down to x29 '2 Bed Terraces' and x95 '3 Bed Semis'. This type of housing is not in keeping with the surrounding and existing housing which comprises of 4-5 bedroom detached houses. This allocation of affordable housing is overbearing and not in keeping with the surrounding neighbourhood and character of the village. Only x66 of the x190 houses are in keeping with the surrounding existing type of houses. Other similar developments in recent times have designated 10% of its allocation to affordable housing, 6 3 The proposed siting of the development is particularly ill-considered. It is on a Green Belt site and is Grade 2 quality land, and building here would both diminish the striking views from Derby Road when entering and leaving the village, and be prominent from most angles within the village. The proposed housing mix is out of keeping with the village's strong historic character ? no other dwellings in the village in this area are 2 bedroom terraces of which there are x29, for instance. While design issues might be solved by conditions or revised proposals, these could not remedy the siting problem. 7 4 The need for affordable housing will not be fulfilled by developing on this site, as local property values for new build property currently start at circa £300,000.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Colin & Cynthia Green	Response-00922	Understand the 190+ new builds are some private, proportion social housing but interested to know exactly what is in the pipeline to be built? I have objected about this to EBC & asked who will be allocated these new builds but did not receive exact details, eg will the illegals in this area jump queues or what prices will be asked, are they 2, 3, or 4 beds, are garage spaces for vehicles allocated, so much unknown or we are not told!
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	David Atchison	Response-01247	The proposed siting of the development is particularly ill-considered. It is on a Green Belt site and is Grade 2 quality land, and building here would both diminish the striking views from Derby Road when entering and leaving the village, and be prominent from most angles within the village. The proposed housing mix is out of keeping with the village's strong historic character ? no other dwellings in the village in this area are 2 bedroom terraces of which there are x29, for instance. While design issues might be solved by conditions or revised proposals, these could not remedy the siting problem. The need for affordable housing will not be fulfilled by developing on this site, as local property values for new build property currently start at circa £300,000.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	David Boyle	Response-01426	The proposed siting of the development is particularly ill-considered. It is on a Green Belt site and is Grade 2 quality land, and building here would both diminish the striking views from Derby Road when entering and leaving the village, and be prominent from most angles within the village. The proposed housing mix is out of keeping with the village's strong historic character ? no other dwellings in the village in this area are 2 bedroom terraces of which there are x29, for instance. While design issues might be solved by conditions or revised proposals, these could not remedy the siting problem. Within the EBCs Core Strategy plan it details out a draft housing allocation which refers to the type of houses. It states that 40% of the x190 dwellings has been designated as affordable housing which breaks down to x29 '2 Bed Terraces' and x95 '3 Bed Semis'. This type of housing is not in keeping with the surrounding and existing housing which comprises of 4-5 bedroom detached houses. This allocation of affordable housing is overbearing and not in keeping with the surrounding neighbourhood and character of the village. Only x66 of the x190 houses are in keeping with the surrounding existing type of houses. Other similar developments in recent times have designated 10% of its allocation to affordable housing, The proposed 40% affordable housing within the development is not in keeping with the surrounding housing and in particular the houses that will boarder the development. The houses along Derby Road which would back onto the new development are 4-5 bedroom detached houses with a valuation range of £600,000+. Careful consideration must be given to the existing housing and how the developers ensure similar housing is developed to maintain the neighbourhood and village character.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	David G York	Response-01843	The proposed 40% affordable housing within the development is not in keeping with the surrounding housing, particularly the houses along Derby Road. Careful consideration must be given to ensure similar housing is developed to maintain the neighborhood and village character.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	David Thompson	Response-00654	Allowed development of this land will bring the requirement for potential developers to include further development of social housing. Previous required development of social housing in Draycott brought waves of increased crime rates, which are not welcomed in the village.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	David Webster	Response-01113	The proposed 40% affordable housing within the development is not in keeping with the surrounding housing and in particular the houses that will boarder the development. The houses along Derby Road which would back onto the new development are 4-5 bedroom detached houses with a valuation range of £600,000+. Careful consideration must be given to the existing housing and how the developers ensure similar housing is developed to maintain the neighbourhood and village character. Within the EBCs Core Strategy plan it details out a draft housing allocation which refers to the type of houses. It states that 40% of the x190 dwellings has been designated as affordable housing which breaks down to x29 '2 Bed Terraces' and x95 '3 Bed Semis'. This type of housing is not in keeping with the surrounding and existing housing which comprises of 4-5 bedroom detached houses. This allocation of affordable housing is overbearing and not in keeping with the surrounding neighbourhood and character of the village. Only x66 of the x190 houses are in keeping with the surrounding existing type of houses. Other similar developments in recent times have designated 10% of its allocation to affordable housing, The proposed siting of the development is particularly ill-considered. It is on a Green Belt site and is Grade 2 quality land, and building here would both diminish the striking views from Derby Road when entering and leaving the village, and be prominent from most angles within the village. The proposed housing mix is out of keeping with the village's strong historic character ? no other dwellings in the village in this area are 2 bedroom terraces of which there are x29, for instance. While design issues might be solved by conditions or revised proposals, these could not remedy the siting problem. The need for affordable housing will not be fulfilled by developing on this site, as local property values for new build property currently start at circa £300,000.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Dexter Codrington	Response-00986	The proposed 40% affordable housing within the development is not in keeping with the surrounding housing, particularly the houses along Derby Road. Any planned development should take place on Brownfield sites.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Diane Webster	Response-01177	Within the EBCs Core Strategy plan it details out a draft housing allocation which refers to the type of houses. It states that 40% of the x190 dwellings has been designated as affordable housing which breaks down to x29 '2 Bed Terraces' and x95 '3 Bed Semis'. This type of housing is not in keeping with the surrounding and existing housing which comprises of 4-5 bedroom detached houses. This allocation of affordable housing is overbearing and not in keeping with the surrounding neighbourhood and character of the village. Only x66 of the x190 houses are in keeping with the surrounding existing type of houses. Other similar developments in recent times have designated 10% of its allocation to affordable housing, The proposed siting of the development is particularly ill-considered. It is on a Green Belt site and is Grade 2 quality land, and building here would both diminish the striking views from Derby Road when entering and leaving the village, and be prominent from most angles within the village. The proposed housing mix is out of keeping with the village's strong historic character ? no other dwellings in the village in this area are 2 bedroom terraces of which there are x29, for instance. While design issues might be solved by conditions or revised proposals, these could not remedy the siting problem. The need for affordable housing will not be fulfilled by developing on this site, as local property values for new build property currently start at circa £300,000.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Donna Butcher	Response-01155	Recognise the loss of the ecology in the area and the importance of the flora, fauna and wildlife. Unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape. This is a colossal development which is not appropriate for the location chosen. The development will negatively impact the ecology, wildlife and beauty of the area. The taking away of grazing/arable land and the disruption for the wildlife. These decisions are irreversible, and our children will have less open countryside to explore and play in. Losing safe connecting space between locations. This when existing and available Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised over Greenbelt. The land to the south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of wildlife from birds, foxes, hedgehogs and squirrels and the development of 190 homes will mean the death of many different animals and the destruction of this mature natural habitat. These plans plus the plans for National Grid to install super pylons only circa 600 meters away means the south west area of Draycott, will be hugely impacted from both a conservation and natural environment perspective. This area of the village will be unrealistically overburdened with development on Green Belt and green spaces. The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the village of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. The proposed site south west of Draycott and the second phase of the development which would mean that in addition to the initial 190 houses, the development of an additional c70 dwellings would be undertaken on the identified safeguarded land on Banksfield Farm, would result in the removal of several TPO trees which contribute to the visual amenity of the area. The removal of these trees would detrimentally impact upon Lime Grove and Derby Road character and appearance. NPPF 151. States that once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. This development will remove existing green spaces forever which residents currently have access to including footpath, walks and visual vistas and spatial openness. NPPF 192. States that to protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity. The land south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of trees and wildlife including squirrels and badgers. The development on this land will kill wildlife and destroy historic trees and wildlife in the area. This is reckless when existing Brownfield si
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Donna Butcher	Response-01155	tes existing in EBC which should be used first before Green Belt. NPPF 2. States it has three objectives to enable sustainable development. The third of these is an environmental objective ? to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy. The EBCs proposal of reclassifying the land South West of Draycott from Greenbelt to Greenbelt land does not meet this objective and will actually achieve the total opposite.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Donna Peace	Response-01344	1 The proposed 40% affordable housing within the development is not in keeping with the surrounding housing and in particular the houses that will boarder the development. The houses along Derby Road which would back onto the new development are 4-5 bedroom detached houses with a valuation range of £600,000+. Careful consideration must be given to the existing housing and how the developers ensure similar housing is developed to maintain the neighbourhood and village character. 5 2 Within the EBCs Core Strategy plan it details out a draft housing allocation which refers to the type of houses. It states that 40% of the x190 dwellings has been designated as affordable housing which breaks down to x29 '2 Bed Terraces' and x95 '3 Bed Semis'. This type of housing is not in keeping with the surrounding and existing housing which comprises of 4-5 bedroom detached houses. This allocation of affordable housing is overbearing and not in keeping with the surrounding neighbourhood and character of the village. Only x66 of the x190 houses are in keeping with the surrounding existing type of houses. Other similar developments in recent times have designated 10% of its allocation to affordable housing, 6 3 The proposed siting of the development is particularly ill-considered. It is on a Green Belt site and is Grade 2 quality land, and building here would both diminish the striking views from Derby Road when entering and leaving the village, and be prominent from most angles within the village. The proposed housing mix is out of keeping with the village?s strong historic character ? no other dwellings in the village in this area are 2 bedroom terraces of which there are x29, for instance. While design issues might be solved by conditions or revised proposals, these could not remedy the siting problem. 7 4 The need for affordable housing will not be fulfilled by developing on this site, as local property values for new build property currently start at circa £300,000.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Douglas Walker	Response-00994	The proposed 40% affordable housing within the development is not in keeping with the surrounding housing and in particular the houses that will boarder the development. The houses along Derby Road which would back onto the new development are 4-5 bedroom detached houses with a valuation range of £600,000+. Careful consideration must be given to the existing housing and how the developers ensure similar housing is developed to maintain the neighbourhood and village character. Within the EBCs Core Strategy plan it details out a draft housing allocation which refers to the type of houses. It states that 40% of the x190 dwellings has been designated as affordable housing which breaks down to x29 '2 Bed Terraces' and x95 '3 Bed Semis'. This type of housing is not in keeping with the surrounding and existing housing which comprises of 4-5 bedroom detached houses. This allocation of affordable housing is overbearing and not in keeping with the surrounding neighbourhood and character of the village. Only x66 of the x190 houses are in keeping with the surrounding existing type of houses. Other similar developments in recent times have designated 10% of its allocation to affordable housing, The proposed siting of the development is particularly ill-considered. It is on a Green Belt site and is Grade 2 quality land, and building here would both diminish the striking views from Derby Road when entering and leaving the village, and be prominent from most angles within the village. The proposed housing mix is out of keeping with the village?s strong historic character ? no other dwellings in the village in this area are 2 bedroom terraces of which there are x29, for instance. While design issues might be solved by conditions or revised proposals, these could not remedy the siting problem. The proposed siting of the development is particularly ill-considered. It is on a Green Belt site and is Grade 2 quality land, and building here would both diminish the striking views from Derby Road when entering and leaving the village, and be prominent from most angles within the village. The proposed housing mix is out of keeping with the village?s strong historic character ? no other dwellings in the village in this area are 2 bedroom terraces of which there are x29, for instance. While design issues might be solved by conditions or revised proposals, these could not remedy the siting problem. The need for affordable housing will not be fulfilled by developing on this site, as local property values for new build property currently start at circa £300,000.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Dudley Medhurst	Response-01180	I do not think for one minute this will be 40% affordable housing as many first time buyers will struggle to buy these new house anyway.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Francis Ian Scott	Response-01535	The proposed 40% affordable housing within the development is not in keeping with the surrounding housing and in particular the houses that will boarder the development. The houses along Derby Road which would back onto the new development are 4-5 bedroom detached houses with a valuation range of £600,000+. Careful consideration must be given to the existing housing and how the developers ensure similar housing is developed to maintain the neighbourhood and village character. Within the EBCs Core Strategy plan it details out a draft housing allocation which refers to the type of houses. It states that 40% of the x190 dwellings has been designated as affordable housing which breaks down to x29 '2 Bed Terraces' and x95 '3 Bed Semis'. This type of housing is not in keeping with the surrounding and existing housing which comprises of 4-5 bedroom detached houses. This allocation of affordable housing is overbearing and not in keeping with the surrounding neighbourhood and character of the village. Only x66 of the x190 houses are in keeping with the surrounding existing type of houses. Other similar developments in recent times have designated 10% of its allocation to affordable housing, The proposed siting of the development is particularly ill-considered. It is on a Green Belt site and is Grade 2 quality land, and building here would both diminish the striking views from Derby Road when entering and leaving the village, and be prominent from most angles within the village. The proposed housing mix is out of keeping with the village?s strong historic character ? no other dwellings in the village in this area are 2 bedroom terraces of which there are x29, for instance. While design issues might be solved by conditions or revised proposals, these could not remedy the siting problem. The need for affordable housing will not be fulfilled by developing on this site, as local property values for new build property currently start at circa £300,000.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Gail Holdsworth	Response-00937	Proposed 40% affordable housing will be totally different to the houses at that end of Draycott. For all of these reasons Draycott will no longer be a village. The whole character of Draycott will be lost for ever.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Gary Siddall	Response-01237	Within the EBCs Core Strategy plan it details out a draft housing allocation which refers to the type of houses. It states that 40% of the new 190 houses has been designated as "affordable housing" which breaks down to 29 x "2 Bed Terraces", and 95 x "3 Bed Semis". This type of housing is not in keeping with the surrounding and existing housing which comprises of 4-5 bedroom detached houses. This allocation of affordable housing is overbearing and not in keeping with the surrounding neighbourhood and character of the village. The proposed 40% affordable housing within the development is not in keeping with the surrounding housing and in particular the houses that will boarder the development. The houses along Derby Road which would back onto the new development are 4-5 bedroom detached houses with a valuation range of £600,000+. Careful consideration must be given to the existing housing and how the developers ensure similar housing is developed to maintain the neighbourhood and village character.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	George Foster	Response-01199	The proposed 40% affordable housing within the development is not in keeping with the surrounding housing and in particular the houses that will boarder the development. The houses along Derby Road which would back onto the new development are 4-5 bedroom detached houses with a valuation range of £600,000+. Careful consideration must be given to the existing housing and how the developers ensure similar housing is developed to maintain the neighbourhood and village character. Within the EBCs Core Strategy plan it details out a draft housing allocation which refers to the type of houses. It states that 40% of the x190 dwellings has been designated as affordable housing which breaks down to x29 '2 Bed Terraces' and x95 '3 Bed Semis'. This type of housing is not in keeping with the surrounding and existing housing which comprises of 4-5 bedroom detached houses. This allocation of affordable housing is overbearing and not in keeping with the surrounding neighbourhood and character of the village. Only x66 of the x190 houses are in keeping with the surrounding existing type of houses. Other similar developments in recent times have designated 10% of its allocation to affordable housing. The proposed siting of the development is particularly ill-considered. It is on a Green Belt site and is Grade 2 quality land, and building here would both diminish the striking views from Derby Road when entering and leaving the village, and be prominent from most angles within the village. The proposed housing mix is out of keeping with the village?s strong historic character ? no other dwellings in the village in this area are 2 bedroom terraces of which there are x29, for instance. While design issues might be solved by conditions or revised proposals, these could not remedy the siting problem. The need for affordable housing will not be fulfilled by developing on this site, as local property values for new build property currently start at circa £300,000.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Gill Trickitt	Response-01157	any large number of homes on the edge of a village will feel like a heavy set of building and not at all create a village. The road currently has a single file each side of independant detached houses, each unique and gently creating a blend into countryside as you leave the village. No-one wants to enter a village and be met with a huge housing estate of towering buildings, crammed together in a tight space.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Graham Wakeling	Response-01238	New build house will not be in keeping with traditional local houses and mills in the surrounding area. They will be a complete eye sore.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Hannah Pritchard	Response-01399	The type and size of housing proposed have not been sufficiently detailed. If the homes are aimed at families (as is typical with new developments), this will exacerbate school and healthcare capacity issues. There is also no clear provision for genuinely affordable housing or properties suited to the elderly or first-time buyers, which should be prioritised for local housing need.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	James Hargreaves	Response-01315	1. Mismatch with Local Character: The proposed 40% affordable housing does not align with the existing 4?5 bedroom detached homes. The design and density are inconsistent with the village?s character. 2. Overdevelopment: The scale of the project is excessive and will alter the village?s heritage and landscape. Brownfield sites should be prioritized. 3. Policy Misalignment: National housing policy emphasizes brownfield development and sustainable communities. This proposal contradicts those goals by targeting Green Belt land. 4. Affordable Housing Standards: Government guidelines require 50% affordable housing on Green Belt land, with a focus on social rent. The proposed 40% falls short and is out of character with the area.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	James Whyman	Response-01551	1 The proposed 40% affordable housing within the development is not in keeping with the surrounding housing and in particular the houses that will boarder the development. The houses along Derby Road which would back onto the new development are 4-5 bedroom detached houses with a valuation range of £600,000+. Careful consideration must be given to the existing housing and how the developers ensure similar housing is developed to maintain the neighbourhood and village character. 2 Within the EBCs Core Strategy plan it details out a draft housing allocation which refers to the type of houses. It states that 40% of the x190 dwellings has been designated as affordable housing which breaks down to x29 '2 Bed Terraces' and x95 '3 Bed Semis'. This type of housing is not in keeping with the surrounding and existing housing which comprises of 4-5 bedroom detached houses. This allocation of affordable housing is overbearing and not in keeping with the surrounding neighbourhood and character of the village. Only x66 of the x190 houses are in keeping with the surrounding existing type of houses. Other similar developments in recent times have designated 10% of its allocation to affordable housing, 3 The proposed siting of the development is particularly ill-considered. It is on a Green Belt site and is Grade 2 quality land, and building here would both diminish the striking views from Derby Road when entering and leaving the village, and be prominent from most angles within the village. The proposed housing mix is out of keeping with the village?s strong historic character ? no other dwellings in the village in this area are 2 bedroom terraces of which there are x29, for instance. While design issues might be solved by conditions or revised proposals, these could not remedy the siting problem. 4 The need for affordable housing will not be fulfilled by developing on this site, as local property values for new build property currently start at circa £300,000.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Jane Barker	Response-01178	The proposed plans say 40% affordable housing but how will this work. The developers will try and build the least that they can and the rest will be 3/4 bed houses.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	J Morgan	Response-01847	The proposed 40% affordable housing within the development is not in keeping with the surrounding housing, particularly the houses along Derby Road. Careful consideration must be given to ensure similar housing is developed to maintain the neighborhood and village character.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Jonathan Childs	Response-01117	The proposed 40% affordable housing within the development is not in keeping with the surrounding housing and in particular the houses that will boarder the development. The houses along Derby Road which would back onto the new development (and some on Lime Grove) are 4-5 bedroom detached houses with a valuation range of £600,000+. Careful consideration must be given to the existing housing and how the developers ensure similar housing is developed to maintain the neighbourhood and village character. Within the EBCs Core Strategy plan it details out a draft housing allocation which refers to the type of houses. It states that 40% of the 190 no. dwellings has been designated as affordable housing. 40% of 190 = 76 homes. A recent, cursory search of local estate agents reveals that at least half of this number are currently vacant in the immediate locality, bringing into question whether or not the proposed development serves any true purpose other than to satisfy a political/theoretical requirement which in practice, does not actually exist? This type of housing is not in keeping with the surrounding and existing housing which comprises of 4-5 bedroom detached houses. This allocation of affordable housing is overbearing and not in keeping with the surrounding neighbourhood and character of the village. Only 66 of the 190 houses are in keeping with the surrounding existing type of houses. Other similar developments in recent times have designated 10% of its allocation to affordable housing, What consideration/compensation will be offered to affected property owners when their properties are devalued by the presence of this unwanted blight? The proposed siting of the development is particularly ill-considered. It is on a Green Belt site and is Grade 2 quality land, and building here would both diminish the striking views from Derby Road when entering and leaving the village, and be prominent from most angles within the village, in particular, Lime Grove The proposed housing mix is out of keeping with the village?s strong historic character ? no other dwellings in the village in this area are 2 bedroom terraces of which there are x29, for instance. While design issues might be solved by conditions or revised proposals, these could not remedy the siting problem and while the proposed site may (for reasons of sheer, individual greed) be an easy purchase, there are comparable sites very close by which have none of the flooding problems and no adjoining properties to consider or affect. The need for affordable housing will not be fulfilled by developing on this site, as local property values for new build property currently start at circa £300,000 and existing two-bedroom properties remaining vacant with prices as low as £155k!
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Jonathan Fletcher	Response-01463	The types of properties outlined will definitely introduce multiple vehicles per household into the community bringing all the problems that go along with heightened congestion.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Judith Boyle	Response-01418	Within the EBCs Core Strategy plan it details out a draft housing allocation which refers to the type of houses. It states that 40% of the x190 dwellings has been designated as affordable housing which breaks down to x29 '2 Bed Terraces' and x95 '3 Bed Semis'. This type of housing is not in keeping with the surrounding and existing housing which comprises of 4-5 bedroom detached houses. This allocation of affordable housing is overbearing and not in keeping with the surrounding neighbourhood and character of the village. Only x66 of the x190 houses are in keeping with the surrounding existing type of houses. Other similar developments in recent times have designated 10% of its allocation to affordable housing. The need for affordable housing will not be fulfilled by developing on this site, as local property values for new build property currently start at circa £300,000.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Juliet Macve	Response-01572	The proposed siting of the development is particularly ill-considered. It is on a Green Belt site and is Grade 2 quality land, and building here would both diminish the striking views from Derby Road when entering and leaving the village, and be prominent from most angles within the village. The proposed housing mix is out of keeping with the village?s strong historic character ? no other dwellings in the village in this area are 2 bedroom terraces of which there are x29, for instance. While design issues might be solved by conditions or revised proposals, these could not remedy the siting problem. The need for affordable housing will not be fulfilled by developing on this site, as local property values for new build property currently start at circa £300,000.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Karla Williams	Response-00077	Houses should reflect the character of the village. The density and design of Cowslip Meadow is an example of what NOT to do. Affordable housing percentage should be in line with other releases Acorn Way/Spondon Woods i.e a portion on site and contribution to improve existing stock in other parts of the borough where needs are higher.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Katie May	Response-01518	The proposed 40% affordable housing within the development is not in keeping with the surrounding housing and in particular the houses that will boarder the development. The houses along Derby Road which would back onto the new development are 4-5 bedroom detached houses with a valuation range of £600,000+. Careful consideration must be given to the existing housing and how the developers ensure similar housing is developed to maintain the neighbourhood and village character. Within the EBCs Core Strategy plan it details out a draft housing allocation which refers to the type of houses. It states that 40% of the x190 dwellings has been designated as affordable housing which breaks down to x29 '2 Bed Terraces' and x95 '3 Bed Semis'. This type of housing is not in keeping with the surrounding and existing housing which comprises of 4-5 bedroom detached houses. This allocation of affordable housing is overbearing and not in keeping with the surrounding neighbourhood and character of the village. Only x66 of the x190 houses are in keeping with the surrounding existing type of houses. Other similar developments in recent times have designated 10% of its allocation to affordable housing, The proposed siting of the development is particularly ill-considered. It is on a Green Belt site and is Grade 2 quality land, and building here would both diminish the striking views from Derby Road when entering and leaving the village, and be prominent from most angles within the village. The proposed housing mix is out of keeping with the village?s strong historic character ? no other dwellings in the village in this area are 2 bedroom terraces of which there are x29, for instance. While design issues might be solved by conditions or revised proposals, these could not remedy the siting problem. The need for affordable housing will not be fulfilled by developing on this site, as local property values for new build property currently start at circa £300,000.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Kelly Walker	Response-00911	The proposed 40% affordable housing within the development is not in keeping with the surrounding housing and in particular the houses that will boarder the development. The houses along Derby Road which would back onto the new development are 4-5 bedroom detached houses with a valuation range of £600,000+. Careful consideration must be given to the existing housing and how the developers ensure similar housing is developed to maintain the neighbourhood and village character. Within the EBCs Core Strategy plan it details out a draft housing allocation which refers to the type of houses. It states that 40% of the x190 dwellings has been designated as affordable housing which breaks down to x29 '2 Bed Terraces' and x95 '3 Bed Semis'. This type of housing is not in keeping with the surrounding and existing housing which comprises of 4-5 bedroom detached houses. This allocation of affordable housing is overbearing and not in keeping with the surrounding neighbourhood and character of the village. Only x66 of the x190 houses are in keeping with the surrounding existing type of houses. Other similar developments in recent times have designated 10% of its allocation to affordable housing. The proposed siting of the development is particularly ill-considered. It is on a Green Belt site and is Grade 2 quality land, and building here would both diminish the striking views from Derby Road when entering and leaving the village, and be prominent from most angles within the village. The proposed housing mix is out of keeping with the village?s strong historic character ? no other dwellings in the village in this area are 2 bedroom terraces of which there are x29, for instance. While design issues might be solved by conditions or revised proposals, these could not remedy the siting problem.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Laura Charier	Response-01218	The proposed siting of the development is particularly ill-considered. It is on a Green Belt site and is Grade 2 quality land, and building here would both diminish the striking views from Derby Road when entering and leaving the village, and be prominent from most angles within the village. The proposed housing mix is out of keeping with the village?s strong historic character ? no other dwellings in the village in this area are 2 bedroom terraces of which there are x29, for instance. While design issues might be solved by conditions or revised proposals, these could not remedy the siting problem. The need for affordable housing will not be fulfilled by developing on this site, as local property values for new build property currently start at circa £300,000.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Lee	Response-00742	1. Why 40% for affordable living this is an insult to the people that have worked hard for what they have. This plan enables the current abuse of the system to continue by certain people who are not worthy. Its encouraging people not to go to work, claim benefit or seek asylum.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Linda Jane Jenkins	Response-01007	I currently live in a quiet Dorma bungalow just off Derby road. My garden runs along the field that you are propsing to build on. What type of housing will be built. I currently have 3 neighbours bordering my property I don't want another 3-5. The likelihood of noise and disturbance is immense. How much imput will we have.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Luke Hatch	Response-00160	I don't know much about the different types of housing. It seems densely packed for a village development, especially one the size of Draycott. I don't particularly understand the argument that building affordable homes in Draycott will make flat prices in Long Eaton cheaper, as they serve completely different people. People live in Long Eaton for restaurants, amenities, and fast transport links. Draycott offers a more countryfied feel but none of the things that people want in Long Eaton. It's just building to hit government targets and not thinking about where 190 houses need to be built. Also, why do we need more affordable housing in Draycott? We have a good number of council homes, and we have the Victoria Mills conversion and Cowslip Meadow. There are plenty of houses under £190k available in Draycott. How will adding 40% affordable here help with housing pressures elsewhere in Erewash?
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Maggie Murphy	Response-00833	1. The proposed 40% affordable housing within the development is not in keeping with the surrounding housing and in particular the houses that will boarder the development. The houses along Derby Road which would back onto the new development are 4-5 bedroom detached houses with a valuation range of £600,000+. Careful consideration must be given to the existing housing and how the developers ensure similar housing is developed to maintain the neighbourhood and village character. 2. Within the EBCs Core Strategy plan it details a draft housing allocation which refers to the type of houses. It states that 40% of the 190 dwellings have been designated as affordable housing which breaks down to 29 '2 Bed Terraces' and 95 '3 Bed Semis'. This type of housing is not in keeping with the surrounding and existing housing which comprises of 4-5 bedroom detached houses. This allocation of affordable housing is overbearing and not in keeping with the surrounding neighbourhood and character of the village. Only 66 of the 190 houses are in keeping with the surrounding existing type of houses. Other similar developments in recent times have designated 10% of its allocation to affordable housing.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Martin Fawcett	Response-01077	Focus should be building on non green belt sites and houses that the younger generation can afford

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Martin Kilcoyne	Response-01460	The proposed 40% affordable housing within the development is not in keeping with the surrounding housing and in particular the houses that will boarder the development. The houses along Derby Road which would back onto the new development are 4-5 bedroom detached houses with a valuation range of £600,000+. Careful consideration must be given to the existing housing and how the developers ensure similar housing is developed to maintain the neighbourhood and village character. Within the EBCs Core Strategy plan it details out a draft housing allocation which refers to the type of houses. It states that 40% of the x190 dwellings has been designated as affordable housing which breaks down to x29 '2 Bed Terraces' and x95 '3 Bed Semis'. This type of housing is not in keeping with the surrounding and existing housing which comprises of 4-5 bedroom detached houses. This allocation of affordable housing is overbearing and not in keeping with the surrounding neighbourhood and character of the village. Only x66 of the x190 houses are in keeping with the surrounding existing type of houses. Other similar developments in recent times have designated 10% of its allocation to affordable housing. The proposed siting of the development is particularly ill-considered. It is on a Green Belt site and is Grade 2 quality land, and building here would both diminish the striking views from Derby Road when entering and leaving the village, and be prominent from most angles within the village. The proposed housing mix is out of keeping with the village?s strong historic character ? no other dwellings in the village in this area are 2 bedroom terraces of which there are x29, for instance. While design issues might be solved by conditions or revised proposals, these could not remedy the siting problem. The need for affordable housing will not be fulfilled by developing on this site, as local property values for new build property currently start at circa £300,000.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Mary Walsh	Response-01197	The proposed siting of the development is particularly ill-considered. It is on a Green Belt site and is Grade 2 quality land, and building here would both diminish the striking views from Derby Road when entering and leaving the village, and be prominent from most angles within the village. The proposed housing mix is out of keeping with the village?s strong historic character ? no other dwellings in the village in this area are 2 bedroom terraces of which there are x29, for instance. While design issues might be solved by conditions or revised proposals, these could not remedy the siting problem. The need for affordable housing will not be fulfilled by developing on this site, as local property values for new build property currently start at circa £300,000.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Matthew Walker	Response-01313	The proposed 40% affordable housing within the development is not in keeping with the surrounding housing and in particular the houses that will boarder the development. The houses along Derby Road which would back onto the new development are 4-5 bedroom detached houses with a valuation range of £600,000+. Careful consideration must be given to the existing housing and how the developers ensure similar housing is developed to maintain the neighbourhood and village character. Within the EBCs Core Strategy plan it details out a draft housing allocation which refers to the type of houses. It states that 40% of the x190 dwellings has been designated as affordable housing which breaks down to x29 '2 Bed Terraces' and x95 '3 Bed Semis'. This type of housing is not in keeping with the surrounding and existing housing which comprises of 4-5 bedroom detached houses. This allocation of affordable housing is overbearing and not in keeping with the surrounding neighbourhood and character of the village. Only x66 of the x190 houses are in keeping with the surrounding existing type of houses. Other similar developments in recent times have designated 10% of its allocation to affordable housing. The proposed siting of the development is particularly ill-considered. It is on a Green Belt site and is Grade 2 quality land, and building here would both diminish the striking views from Derby Road when entering and leaving the village, and be prominent from most angles within the village. The proposed housing mix is out of keeping with the village?s strong historic character ? no other dwellings in the village in this area are 2 bedroom terraces of which there are x29, for instance. While design issues might be solved by conditions or revised proposals, these could not remedy the siting problem. The need for affordable housing will not be fulfilled by developing on this site, as local property values for new build property currently start at circa £300,000.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Melanie Wilson	Response-00974	If the development is to go ahead more emphasis should be placed on affordable housing.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Miss Ella Meredith	Response-01850	The proposed 40% affordable housing within the development is not in keeping with the surrounding housing, particularly the houses along Derby Road. Careful consideration must be given to ensure similar housing is developed to maintain the neighborhood and village character.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Miss Natalie Walsh	Response-01846	The proposed 40% affordable housing within the development is not in keeping with the surrounding housing, particularly the houses along Derby Road. Careful consideration must be given to ensure similar housing is developed to maintain the neighborhood and village character.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Miss Paige Murray	Response-01842	The proposed 40% affordable housing within the development is not in keeping with the surrounding housing, particularly the houses along Derby Road. Careful consideration must be given to ensure similar housing is developed to maintain the neighborhood and village character.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Mr Graham Bingham and Mrs Kristine Bingham	Response-01302	The proposed 40% affordable housing within the development is not in keeping with the surrounding housing, particularly the houses along Derby Road. Careful consideration must be given to ensure similar housing is developed to maintain the neighborhood and village character.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Mr R Sykes	Response-00412	None
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Mr Scott Walsh	Response-01844	The proposed 40% affordable housing within the development is not in keeping with the surrounding housing, particularly the houses along Derby Road. Careful consideration must be given to ensure similar housing is developed to maintain the neighborhood and village character.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Mrs Maria E Hardy	Response-00614	Ruin the traditional historic houses present in Draycott

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Mrs Mary Walsh	Response-01845	The proposed 40% affordable housing within the development is not in keeping with the surrounding housing, particularly the houses along Derby Road. Careful consideration must be given to ensure similar housing is developed to maintain the neighborhood and village character.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Mr Tony Walsh	Response-01849	The proposed 40% affordable housing within the development is not in keeping with the surrounding housing, particularly the houses along Derby Road. Careful consideration must be given to ensure similar housing is developed to maintain the neighborhood and village character.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Nigel morton	Response-01351	The houses will not be affordable ,they will not be in character with the present houses next to and across from the proposed site .none will be for single and elderly people because not enough profit for the developer
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Nikki Riches	Response-00950	The need for affordable housing will not be fulfilled by developing on this site, as local property values for new build property currently start at circa £300,000 - not affordable!
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Oliver Kirk	Response-00569	40% of affordable housing is unacceptable.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Owen	Response-01547	I have read that 40% will be affordable housing. What percentage of housing will be, private owned, private rent, social housing and temporary accommodation?
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	paul butcher	Response-01154	Recognise the loss of the ecology in the area and the importance of the flora, fauna and wildlife. Unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape. This is a colossal development which is not appropriate for the location chosen. The development will negatively impact the ecology, wildlife and beauty of the area. The taking away of grazing/arable land and the disruption for the wildlife. These decisions are irreversible, and our children will have less open countryside to explore and play in. Losing safe connecting space between locations. This when existing and available Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised over Greenbelt. The land to the south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of wildlife from birds, foxes, hedgehogs and squirrels and the development of 190 homes will mean the death of many different animals and the destruction of this mature natural habitat. These plans plus the plans for National Grid to install super pylons only circa 600 meters away means the south west area of Draycott, will be hugely impacted from both a conservation and natural environment perspective. This area of the village will be unrealistically overburdened with development on Green Belt and green spaces. The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the village of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. The proposed site south west of Draycott and the second phase of the development which would mean that in addition to the initial 190 houses, the development of an additional c70 dwellings would be undertaken on the identified safeguarded land on Banksfield Farm, would result in the removal of several TPO trees which contribute to the visual amenity of the area. The removal of these trees would detrimentally impact upon Lime Grove and Derby Road character and appearance. NPPF 151. States that once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. This development will remove existing green spaces forever which residents currently have access to including footpath, walks and visual vistas and spatial openness. NPPF 192. States that to protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity. The land south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of trees and wildlife including squirrels and badgers. The development on this land will kill wildlife and destroy historic trees and wildlife in the area. This is reckless when existing Brownfield si
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	paul butcher	Response-01154	tes existing in EBC which should be used first before Green Belt. NPPF 2. States it has three objectives to enable sustainable development. The third of these is an environmental objective ? to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy. The EBCs proposal of reclassifying the land South West of Draycott from Greenbelt to Greenbelt land does not meet this objective and will actually achieve the total opposite.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Richard Keith Hanbury	Response-01087	Are you building flats? Are you taking into account the existing housing and building to match the new houses into the environment. Or do you care?
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Richard Syson	Response-01317	The proposed siting of the development is particularly ill-considered. It is on a Green Belt site and is Grade 2 quality land, and building here would both diminish the striking views from Derby Road when entering and leaving the village, and be prominent from most angles within the village. The proposed housing mix is out of keeping with the village's strong historic character. The need for affordable housing will not be fulfilled by developing on this site, as local property values for new build property currently start at circa £300,000 - therefore these houses would not be 'affordable' to many people. Houses should not be allowed to be built on this site. They should be built on the many brownfield sites which already exist and are not being used - and building on such sites would allow cheaper housing that would be more 'affordable'

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Rick Howden	Response-01421	Within the EBCs Core Strategy plan it details out a draft housing allocation which refers to the type of houses. It states that 40% of the x190 dwellings has been designated as affordable housing which breaks down to x29 '2 Bed Terraces' and x95 '3 Bed Semis'. This type of housing is not in keeping with the surrounding and existing housing which comprises of 4-5 bedroom detached houses. This allocation of affordable housing is overbearing and not in keeping with the surrounding neighbourhood and character of the village. Only x66 of the x190 houses are in keeping with the surrounding existing type of houses. Other similar developments in recent times have designated 10% of its allocation to affordable housing,
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Roger Brown	Response-00999	The proposed housing seems inappropriate for its surroundings. 40% affordable housing is suggested for a village that already has a large amount of social housing and these will be located close to larger detached 3-5 bedroom homes.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Ruth Hawkins	Response-01277	The proposed 40% affordable housing within the development is not in keeping with the surrounding housing and in particular the houses that will boarder the development. The houses along Derby Road which would back onto the new development are 4-5 bedroom detached houses with a valuation range of £600,000+. Careful consideration must be given to the existing housing and how the developers ensure similar housing is developed to maintain the neighbourhood and village character. Also, the need for affordable housing which is needed will not actually be fulfilled by developing on this site, as local property values for new build property currently start at circa £300,000. At 20% less to meet the affordable housing definition remains unaffordable housing
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Sarah	Response-01541	Never enough starter homes and even the smaller built are purchased by investors.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Sarah Hargreaves	Response-01314	1. Mismatch with Existing Housing: The proposed 40% affordable housing is not in keeping with the surrounding 4-5 bedroom detached houses. This allocation is overbearing and does not harmonize with the village character. The homes on Derby Road are established older homes, all unique in their design and do not fit with an 'Estate' or 'New Build' design aesthetic. 2. Scale of Development: The scale of the development is unrealistic and will significantly change the heritage and landscape of Draycott. There are better-suited Brownfield sites that should be prioritized. 3. National Housing Policies: The government's long-term housing strategy emphasizes the importance of prioritizing brownfield development and adhering to mandatory local housing targets. The strategy also includes plans to regenerate towns and cities, focusing on sustainable and beautiful neighborhoods. The proposed development contradicts these policies by prioritizing Green Belt land over available brownfield sites. 4. Affordable Housing Requirements: The government's policy mandates that any Green Belt development should include targets of 50% affordable housing with a focus on social rent. The proposed development's allocation of 40% affordable housing does not meet this requirement, and the type of housing proposed is not in keeping with the surrounding area
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Scott Gardner	Response-01554	The large proportion of affordable housing is not in proportion to the village and wont therefore be in keeping. This doesn't support social cohesion. There are >150 houses within a 5 mile radius of Draycott presently for sale, the presence of affordability housing is not an issue.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Sean Peace	Response-01347	The proposed 40% affordable housing within the development is not in keeping with the surrounding housing and in particular the houses that will boarder the development. The houses along Derby Road which would back onto the new development are 4-5 bedroom detached houses with a valuation range of £600,000+. Careful consideration must be given to the existing housing and how the developers ensure similar housing is developed to maintain the neighbourhood and village character. 5 2 Within the EBCs Core Strategy plan it details out a draft housing allocation which refers to the type of houses. It states that 40% of the x190 dwellings has been designated as affordable housing which breaks down to x29 '2 Bed Terraces' and x95 '3 Bed Semis'. This type of housing is not in keeping with the surrounding and existing housing which comprises of 4-5 bedroom detached houses. This allocation of affordable housing is overbearing and not in keeping with the surrounding neighbourhood and character of the village. Only x66 of the x190 houses are in keeping with the surrounding existing type of houses. Other similar developments in recent times have designated 10% of its allocation to affordable housing, 6 3 The proposed siting of the development is particularly ill-considered. It is on a Green Belt site and is Grade 2 quality land, and building here would both diminish the striking views from Derby Road when entering and leaving the village, and be prominent from most angles within the village. The proposed housing mix is out of keeping with the village's strong historic character? no other dwellings in the village in this area are 2 bedroom terraces of which there are x29, for instance. While design issues might be solved by conditions or revised proposals, these could not remedy the siting problem. 7 4 The need for affordable housing will not be fulfilled by developing on this site, as local property values for new build property currently start at circa £300,000.
		Type of Housing	Simon Jenkins	Response-01287	NONE !!!!!!!
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	S M Beresford	Response-01851	The proposed 40% affordable housing within the development is not in keeping with the surrounding housing, particularly the houses along Derby Road. Careful consideration must be given to ensure similar housing is developed to maintain the neighborhood and village character.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Susan Baker	Response-01316	This plan doesn't fit our village. Forty percent affordable housing might sound good on paper, but it doesn't match the character of our area, which is made up of older, unique homes. This isn't just about aesthetics?it's about preserving the identity of Draycott. And let's be honest: there are better places for this kind of development, like brownfield sites, which the government itself says should be prioritized.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	Susan Foster	Response-00824	What is affordable housing, cheaply built homes that will not stand the test of time?

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	type of Housing	Teresa Batchelor	Response-01240	Why 40% social housing? I believe this is more than the Government actually demands to be built on new estates, so why is Draycott expected to accept this level? In my experience of working in the housing sector, cheaper housing tends to attract investors who purchase and then re-let property, quite often to anyone who can afford the rent, with no regard to their suitability to the type of housing or the area and this often leads to anti-social behaviour . At the very least there should be some restrictions put in place to ensure such housing is sold to owner-occupiers, not investors.
1.14	South West of Draycott	type of Housing	Teresa Shaw	Response-01309	1. Why 40% for affordable living this is an insult to the people that have worked hard for what they have. This plan enables the current abuse of the system to continue by certain people who are not worthy. Its encouraging people not to go to work, claim benefit or illegal immigration
1.14	South West of Draycott	type of Housing	Tim Hawkins	Response-00661	The claimed 40% affordable housing is a laudable claim, but it will never happen (from past experience) and the development will end up as a faceless 3 or 4 bedroom executive estate with a bit of buy off for social accommodation somewhere in the area. However, as I have not been permitted to see EBC's master plan for the development it's difficult to say.
1.14	South West of Draycott	type of Housing	Tracey Morton	Response-00968	The houses will be for newcomers to the village 2 there will be no houses for single people or older people
1.14	South West of Draycott	type of Housing	T Shields	Response-00570	Erewash, like many parts of the region is failing to provide enough full-market housing and affordable housing. The proposed development would provide a high (40%) proportion of affordable housing. Draycott needs to play its part in providing homes for its children's future.
1.14	South West of Draycott	type of Housing	Wilfred Boone	Response-01424	The proposed 40% affordable housing within the development is not in keeping with the surrounding housing and in particular the houses that will boarder the development. The houses along Derby Road which would back onto the new development are 4-5 bedroom detached houses with a valuation range of £600,000+. Careful consideration must be given to the existing housing and how the developers ensure similar housing is developed to maintain the neighbourhood and village character. Within the EBCs Core Strategy plan it details out a draft housing allocation which refers to the type of houses. It states that 40% of the x190 dwellings has been designated as affordable housing which breaks down to x29 '2 Bed Terraces' and x95 '3 Bed Semis'. This type of housing is not in keeping with the surrounding and existing housing which comprises of 4-5 bedroom detached houses. This allocation of affordable housing is overbearing and not in keeping with the surrounding neighbourhood and character of the village. Only x66 of the x190 houses are in keeping with the surrounding existing type of houses. Other similar developments in recent times have designated 10% of its allocation to affordable housing,
1.14	South West of Draycott	type of Housing	William Batchelor	Response-01210	40% of affordable housing is far more than legal requirement, most will be bought by landlords to rent out meaning intention to provide affordable homes for people to own will be lost. Affordable housing has to be restricted to encourage other purchasers to buy into the housing estate what control over development design will there be, there are examples of good design (Melbourne) and just putting up unimaginative boxes to shoe in as many people as possible
1.14	South West of Draycott	type of Housing	zak butcher	Response-01156	Recognise the loss of the ecology in the area and the importance of the flora, fauna and wildlife. Unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape. This is a colossal development which is not appropriate for the location chosen. The development will negatively impact the ecology, wildlife and beauty of the area. The taking away of grazing/arable land and the disruption for the wildlife. These decisions are irreversible, and our children will have less open countryside to explore and play in. Losing safe connecting space between locations. This when existing and available Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised over Greenbelt. The land to the south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of wildlife from birds, foxes, hedgehogs and squirrels and the development of 190 homes will mean the death of many different animals and the destruction of this mature natural habitat. These plans plus the plans for National Grid to install super pylons only circa 600 meters away means the south west area of Draycott, will be hugely impacted from both a conservation and natural environment perspective. This area of the village will be unrealistically overburdened with development on Green Belt and green spaces. The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the village of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. The proposed site south west of Draycott and the second phase of the development which would mean that in addition to the initial 190 houses, the development of an additional c70 dwellings would be undertaken on the identified safeguarded land on Banksfield Farm, would result in the removal of several TPO trees which contribute to the visual amenity of the area. The removal of these trees would detrimentally impact upon Lime Grove and Derby Road character and appearance. NPPF 151. States that once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. This development will remove existing green spaces forever which residents currently have access to including footpath, walks and visual vistas and spatial openness. NPPF 192. States that to protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity. The land south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of trees and wildlife including squirrels and badgers. The development on this land will kill wildlife and destroy historic trees and wildlife in the area. This is reckless when existing Brownfield si



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Type of Housing	ix butcher	Response-01155	tes existing in EBC which should be used first before Green Belt. NPPF 2. States it has three objectives to enable sustainable development. The third of these is an environmental objective ? to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy. The EBCs proposal of reclassifying the land South West of Draycott from Greenbelt to Greenbelt land does not meet this objective and will actually achieve the total opposite.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	adrian leeming	Response-01249	If there are no other options housing people is ultimately a priority however whilst other sites are available green belt land needs to be held to protect wildlife and biodiversity. This is a national/global policy and essential for the survival of our ecosystem. I have regularly spotted a bird of prey on this site as well as bats and a fox. Across the road the canal was blocked to protect a water vole. I'm amazed that developing this site is seen as viable given the wildlife it supports and will of course be killed if the work takes place. This site is a mature natural habitat which can not be replaced. It will create unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape. The taking away of grazing/arable land and the disruption for the wildlife. These decisions are irreversible, and our children will have less open countryside to explore and play in. Losing safe connecting space between locations. This when existing and available Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised over Greenbelt. Planners must recognise the loss of the ecology in the area and the importance of the flora, fauna and wildlife. There is an opinion that the deer fencing would devalue the area of open farmland and public right of way. This is a colossal development which is not appropriate for the location chosen. The development will negatively impact the ecology, wildlife and beauty of the area. The land to the south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of wildlife from birds, foxes, hedgehogs and squirrels and the development of 190 homes will mean the death of many different animals and the destruction of this These plans plus the plans for National Grid to install super pylons only circa 600 meters away means the south west area of Draycott, will be hugely impacted from both a conservation and natural environment perspective. This area of the village will be unrealistically overburdened with development on Green Belt and green spaces. Following the excavation of the adjacent Derby Road to Draycott canal water voles were discovered and remedial action was taken during this work to prevent endangerment of this wildlife. When considering the adjacent development of 190 houses and the heavy and sustained construction traffic during the life cycle of the development, this will likely force this and other wildlife to relocate from the area. There us a historical badger sett on part of the site to the Victorian tip at the bridge of Nooning Lane. The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the village of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. To safeguard and enhance biodiversity (including BAP Habitats and Species) and geodiversity and improve connectivity between, and access to, green spaces and functional habitats. This area forms a green corridor and houses a number of RED LIST species The proposed site will lead to removal of several TPO trees which contribute to the visual amenity of the ar
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	adrian leeming	Response-01249	ea. The removal of these trees would detrimentally impact upon Lime Grove and Derby Road character and appearance. NPPF 151. States that once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. This development will remove existing green spaces forever which residents currently have access to including footpath, walks and visual vistas and spatial openness. NPPF 192. States that to protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity. The land south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of trees and wildlife including squirrels and badgers. The development on this land will kill wildlife and destroy historic trees and wildlife in the area. This is reckless when existing Brownfield sites existing in EBC which should be used first before Green Belt. "NPPF 2. States it has three objectives to enable sustainable development. The third of these is an environmental objective ? to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy. The EBCs proposal of reclassifying the land South West of Draycott from Greenbelt to Greenbelt land does not meet this objective and will actually achieve the total opposite. "
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Alastair Dundas	Response-01200	The development will negatively impact the ecology/wildlife and beauty of the area.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Alison Bowley	Response-01174	Any development will hugely impact the local wildlife and biodiversity which the area currently has. As I understand it, if developments go ahead, builders have to incorporate biodiversity conservation measures through Biodiversity Net Gain(BNG). Can you inform me of any such measures currently occurring in Derbyshire please? If our local green space is replaced by 190 houses, what will happen to the local wildlife? The Covid pandemic illustrated just how important our green spaces are in helping with mental well being.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Alison Thirlwall	Response-01390	The loss of the ecology in the area and the impact on the flora, fauna and wildlife is a serious concern as is the unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape. This is a colossal development which is not appropriate for the location chosen. The development will negatively impact the ecology, wildlife and beauty of the area. It will result in the taking away of grazing/arable land and the disruption for the wildlife. These decisions are irreversible, and our residents will have less open countryside to explore and play in. Losing safe connecting space between locations. This when existing and available Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised over Greenbelt. The land to the south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of wildlife from birds, foxes, hedgehogs and squirrels and the development of 190 homes will mean the death of many different animals and the destruction of this mature natural habitat. These plans plus the plans for National Grid to install super pylons only circa 600 meters away means the south west area of Draycott, will be hugely impacted from both a conservation and natural environment perspective. This area of the village will be unrealistically overburdened with development on Green Belt and green spaces. Following the excavation of the adjacent Derby Road to Draycott canal water voles were discovered and remedial action was taken during this work to prevent endangerment of this wildlife. When considering the adjacent development of 190 houses and the heavy and sustained construction traffic during the life cycle of the development, this will likely force this and other wildlife to relocate from the area. The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the village of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites. I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. The proposed site south west of Draycott and the second phase of the development which would mean that in addition to the initial 190 houses, the development of an additional c70 dwellings would be undertaken on the identified safeguarded land on Banksfield Farm, would result in the removal of several TPO trees which contribute to the visual amenity of the area. The removal of these trees would detrimentally impact upon Lime Grove and Derby Road character and appearance. and cause psychological distress for residents.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	A Northeast	Response-01848	The area has an abundance of wildlife, including protected species such as bats and many migrating birds. These animals and birds will lose their habitats and nesting sites, which is not protecting our fragile environment or providing for biodiversity in our green spaces. The development will damage the biodiversity of the site and adjoining Green Belt. The area has an abundance of wildlife, including protected species. This development will remove grazing land, a valuable asset for horses, and scatter local wildlife, leading to the loss of habitats.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Anthony Lawton-Reeve	Response-00971	This is a colossal development which is not appropriate for the location chosen. The development will negatively impact the ecology, wildlife and beauty of the area. Recognise the loss of the ecology in the area and the importance of the flora, fauna and wildlife.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Anthony Walsh	Response-00992	The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the village of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. The proposed site south west of Draycott and the second phase of the development which would mean that in addition to the initial 190 houses, the development of an additional c70 dwellings would be undertaken on the identified safeguarded land on Banksfield Farm, would result in the removal of several TPO trees which contribute to the visual amenity of the area. The removal of these trees would detrimentally impact upon Lime Grove and Derby Road character and appearance. "NPPF 2. States it has three objectives to enable sustainable development. The third of these is an environmental objective ? to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy. The EBCs proposal of reclassifying the land South West of Draycott from Greenbelt to Greenbelt land does not meet this objective and will actually achieve the total opposite. "
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Ashley Cartlidge	Response-01420	Wildlife is being squeezed and many of our native species are under threat.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Avice Boyle	Response-01427	These decisions are irreversible, and our children will have less open countryside to explore and play in. Losing safe connecting space between locations. This when existing and available Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised over Greenbelt. This is a colossal development which is not appropriate for the location chosen. The development will negatively impact the ecology, wildlife and beauty of the area. The land to the south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of wildlife from birds, foxes, hedgehogs and squirrels and the development of 190 homes will mean the death of many different animals and the destruction of this mature natural habitat. These plans plus the plans for National Grid to install super pylons only circa 600 meters away means the south west area of Draycott, will be hugely impacted from both a conservation and natural environment perspective. This area of the village will be unrealistically overburdened with development on Green Belt and green spaces. Historical badger sett on part of the site to the Victorian tip at the bridge of Nooning Lane.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Ben Marshall	Response-01212	This green space is treasured by many local residence and helps many with their mental health by enjoying and connected with nature. This development is not appropriate for the location chosen and will negatively impact the ecology, wildlife and beauty of the area. These decisions are irreversible, and our children will have less open countryside to explore and play in. Losing safe connecting space between locations. This when existing and available Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised over Greenbelt. The land to the south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of wildlife from birds, foxes, hedgehogs and squirrels and the development of 190 homes will mean the death of many different animals and the destruction of this mature natural habitat. These plans plus the plans for National Grid to install super pylons only circa 600 meters away means the south west area of Draycott, will be hugely impacted from both a conservation and natural environment perspective. This area of the village will be unrealistically overburdened with development on Green Belt and green spaces. The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the village of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. NPPF 151. States that once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. This development will remove existing green spaces forever which residents currently have access to including footpath, walks and visual vistas and spatial openness. NPPF 2. States it has three objectives to enable sustainable development. The third of these is an environmental objective ? to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy. The EBCs proposal of reclassifying the land South West of Draycott from Greenbelt to Greenbelt land does not meet this objective and will actually achieve the total opposite.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Bernadette Rothwell	Response-00998	I can?t imagine the destruction to wildlife from these plans. There is much wildlife and bird life in the area which will be disrupted from these plans.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Bev Marvell	Response-01892	This Green Belt is valuable for its ecological contributions. The wooded area included on the map of this proposal has a Council Tree Preservation order: 'EV14, PROTECTION OF TREES AND HEDGEROWS,DC5 - 88, Land near Bankfields Farm, Draycott, 19830429,19840203,W1 - Hawthorn copper beech sycamore limes willows & oaks' This is to protect groups of trees/woodlands considered important for their contribution to the local environment and the public's enjoyment. Half of this wooded area is in the proposal for development. The other half of the wood is within the area of 'safeguarded land'. Aerial maps show this wooded area is an 'oasis' for natural habitat within a sea of open countryside. It can not be lost or replaced. It is known that there are bats, owls, hedgehogs in this area, as well as other creatures. The Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 provides protection for Barn Owls and Hedgehogs. Bats are protected under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. There have been Barn Owl boxes very nearby for many years which are used by owls every year to raise their young

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Bradley Peace	Response-01348	Recognise the loss of the ecology in the area and the importance of the flora, fauna and wildlife. 5 2 Unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape. 6 3 This is a colossal development which is not appropriate for the location chosen. The development will negatively impact the ecology, wildlife and beauty of the area. 7 4 The taking away of grazing/arable land and the disruption for the wildlife. 8 5 These decisions are irreversible, and our children will have less open countryside to explore and play in. Losing safe connecting space between locations. This when existing and available Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised over Greenbelt. 9 6 Recognise the loss of the ecology in the area and the importance of the flora, fauna and wildlife. There is an opinion that the deer fencing would devalue the area of open farmland and public right of way. 10 7 This is a colossal development which is not appropriate for the location chosen. The development will negatively impact the ecology, wildlife and beauty of the area. 7 4 The taking away of grazing/arable land and the disruption for the wildlife. 8 5 These decisions are irreversible, and our children will have less open countryside to explore and play in. Losing safe connecting space between locations. This when existing and available Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised over Greenbelt. 9 6 Recognise the loss of the ecology in the area and the importance of the flora, fauna and wildlife. There is an opinion that the deer fencing would devalue the area of open farmland and public right of way. 10 7 This is a colossal development which is not appropriate for the location chosen. The development will negatively impact the ecology, wildlife and beauty of the area. 11 8 The land to the south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of wildlife from birds, foxes, hedgehogs and squirrels and the development of 190 homes will mean the death of many different animals and the destruction of this mature natural habitat. 12 9 These plans plus the plans for National Grid to install super pylons only circa 600 meters away means the south west area of Draycott, will be hugely impacted from both a conservation and natural environment perspective. This area of the village will be unrealistically overburdened with development on Green Belt and green spaces. 13 10 Following the excavation of the adjacent Derby Road to Draycott canal water voles were discovered and remedial action was taken during this work to prevent endangerment of this wildlife. When considering the adjacent development of 190 houses and the heavy and sustained construction traffic during the life cycle of the development, this will likely force this and other wildlife to relocate from the area. 14 11 Historical badger sett on part of the site to the Victorian tip at the bridge of Nooning Lane. 15 12 The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the village of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the v
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Bradley Peace	Response-01348	illages to living in the midst of a housing estate. 16 13 To safeguard and enhance biodiversity (including BAP Habitats and Species) and geodiversity and improve connectivity between, and access to, green spaces and functional habitats. This area forms a green corridor and houses a number of RED LIST species 17 14 The proposed site south west of Draycott and the second phase of the development which would mean that in addition to the initial 190 houses, the development of an additional c70 dwellings would be undertaken on the identified safeguarded land on Banksfield Farm, would result in the removal of several TPO trees which contribute to the visual amenity of the area. The removal of these trees would detrimentally impact upon Lime Grove and Derby Road character and appearance. 18 15 NPPF 151. States that once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. This development will remove existing green spaces forever which residents currently have access to including footpath, walks and visual vistas and spatial openness. 19 16 NPPF 192. States that to protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity. The land south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of trees and wildlife including squirrels and badgers. The development on this land will kill wildlife and destroy historic trees and wildlife in the area. This is reckless when existing Brownfield sites existing in EBC which should be used first before Green Belt. 20 17 NPPF 2. States it has three objectives to enable sustainable development. The third of these is an environmental objective ? to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy. The EBCs proposal of reclassifying the land South West of Draycott from Greenbelt to Greenbelt land does not meet this objective and will actually achieve the total opposite.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Caroline and John Thirwell	Response-01001	This would also result in the destruction of local wildlife including protected species.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Colin & Cynthia Green	Response-00922	Bats apparently in vicinity, different species recorded. Also, badger setts nearby recorded, not to mention hares etc.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Dale Longmuir	Response-01543	The land to the south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of wildlife from birds, foxes, hedgehogs and squirrels and the development of 190 homes will mean the death of many different animals and the destruction of this mature natural habitat. NPPF 192. States that to protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity. The land south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of trees and wildlife including squirrels and badgers. The development on this land will kill wildlife and destroy historic trees and wildlife in the area. This is reckless when existing Brownfield sites existing in EBC which should be used first before Green Belt.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	David and Mary Murden	Response-01898	As well as its primary use as agricultural land, this area is also a much valued haven for local wildlife, much of which is considered endangered in our country. At present we are visited by badgers, foxes, hedgehogs, bats and many, many birds. At the last RSPB birdcount we recorded 20 different species in our garden. Also in the fields and woods which are under consideration we know that Sparrow hawks regularly make their nests, they are a home for the Little Owl and the Barn Owl, both Green and Greater spotted woodpeckers and buzzards. It goes without saying that once building work commences in this area much of this wildlife will disappear and this would be a very sorry state of affairs.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	David and Nicala O'Leary	Response-00822	The proposed site is rich in biodiversity, supporting a variety of bird species, bats, and small mammals. Development would destroy these habitats permanently. It would also eliminate a key green corridor that serves as a natural buffer between settlements. The proposed development also contradicts commitments under the Climate Change Act 2008 and Environment Act 2021, including the legal requirement to achieve a 10% Biodiversity Net Gain.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	David Atchison	Response-01247	The land to the south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of wildlife from birds, foxes, hedgehogs and squirrels and the development of 190 homes will mean the death of many different animals and the destruction of this mature natural habitat. These plans plus the plans for National Grid to install super pylons only circa 600 meters away means the south west area of Draycott, will be hugely impacted from both a conservation and natural environment perspective. This area of the village will be unrealistically overburdened with development on Green Belt and green spaces. Following the excavation of the adjacent Derby Road to Draycott canal water voles were discovered and remedial action was taken during this work to prevent endangerment of this wildlife. When considering the adjacent development of 190 houses and the heavy and sustained construction traffic during the life cycle of the development, this will likely force this and other wildlife to relocate from the area. NPPF 192. States that to protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity. The land south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of trees and wildlife including squirrels and badgers. The development on this land will kill wildlife and destroy historic trees and wildlife in the area. This is reckless when existing Brownfield sites existing in EBC which should be used first before Green Belt.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	David Boyle	Response-01426	The proposed site south west of Draycott and the second phase of the development which would mean that in addition to the initial 190 houses, the development of an additional c70 dwellings would be undertaken on the identified safeguarded land on Banksfield Farm, would result in the removal of several TPO trees which contribute to the visual amenity of the area. The removal of these trees would detrimentally impact upon Lime Grove and Derby Road character and appearance. Following the excavation of the adjacent Derby Road to Draycott canal water voles were discovered and remedial action was taken during this work to prevent endangerment of this wildlife. When considering the adjacent development of 190 houses and the heavy and sustained construction traffic during the life cycle of the development, this will likely force this and other wildlife to relocate from the area. NPPF 192. States that to protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity. The land south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of trees and wildlife including squirrels and badgers. The development on this land will kill wildlife and destroy historic trees and wildlife in the area. This is reckless when existing Brownfield sites existing in EBC which should be used first before Green Belt. Historical badger sett on part of the site to the Victorian tip at the bridge of Nooning Lane. These decisions are irreversible, and our children will have less open countryside to explore and play in. Losing safe connecting space between locations. This when existing and available Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised over Greenbelt. This is a colossal development which is not appropriate for the location chosen. The development will negatively impact the ecology, wildlife and beauty of the area.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	David G York	Response-01843	The area has an abundance of wildlife, including protected species such as bats and many migrating birds. These animals and birds will lose their habitats and nesting sites, which is not protecting our fragile environment or providing for biodiversity in our green spaces. The development will damage the biodiversity of the site and adjoining Green Belt. The area has an abundance of wildlife, including protected species. This development will remove grazing land, a valuable asset for horses, and scatter local wildlife, leading to the loss of habitats.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	David Thompson	Response-00654	Use of the proposed area for housing will have a detrimental impact wildlife and biodiversity. If the proposal was to be approved a substantial Biodiversity Net Gain plan would be required.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	David Thurgood	Response-01195	These plans, plus the plans for National Grid to install super pylons only circa 600 metres away, means that the south west area of Draycott will be hugely impacted from both a conservation and natural environment perspective. This development will negatively impact the ecology, wildlife and beauty of the area.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	David Webster	Response-01113	The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the villages of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds , bats etc who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate when existing Brownfield sites are available within EBC.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Debra Martin	Response-01470	Could object to this by all of the options, destroying wildlife habitat, not enough schools in the area, can't get GP appointments, I also don't believe the village can cope with all the extra traffic

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Dexter Codrington	Response-00986	we have Badgers, Bats, rabbits, foxes and hares on our property. We have also has muntjac deer in out garden. The birdlife is amazing with many migrating birds including endangered swallows. We have many nesting birds including Woodpeckers and birds of prey including Buzzards and owls. The greenbelt provides a safe haven for these animals. The grasslands attract a varied array of butterflies during the summer with rare species year after year. This development will devastate this wildlife and biodiversity. Once it is gone it will never come back.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Diane Webster	Response-01177	Unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape. This is a colossal development which is not appropriate for the location chosen. The development will negatively impact the ecology, wildlife and beauty of the area. The taking away of grazing/arable land and the disruption for the wildlife. These decisions are irreversible, and our children will have less open countryside to explore and play in. Losing safe connecting space between locations. This when existing and available Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised over Greenbelt. Recognise the loss of the ecology in the area and the importance of the flora, fauna and wildlife. There is an opinion that the deer fencing would devalue the area of open farmland and public right of way. This is a colossal development which is not appropriate for the location chosen. The development will negatively impact the ecology, wildlife and beauty of the area. The land to the south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of wildlife from birds, foxes, hedgehogs and squirrels and the development of 190 homes will mean the death of many different animals and the destruction of this mature natural habitat. These plans plus the plans for National Grid to install super pylons only circa 600 meters away means the south west area of Draycott, will be hugely impacted from both a conservation and natural environment perspective. This area of the village will be unrealistically overburdened with development on Green Belt and green spaces. Following the excavation of the adjacent Derby Road to Draycott canal water voles were discovered and remedial action was taken during this work to prevent endangerment of this wildlife. When considering the adjacent development of 190 houses and the heavy and sustained construction traffic during the life cycle of the development, this will likely force this and other wildlife to relocate from the area. Historical badger sett on part of the site to the Victorian tip at the bridge of Nooning Lane. The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the village of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. To safeguard and enhance biodiversity (including BAP Habitats and Species) and geodiversity and improve connectivity between, and access to, green spaces and functional habitats. This area forms a green corridor and houses a number of RED LIST species The proposed site south west of Draycott and the second phase of the development which would mean that in addition to the initial 190 houses, the development of an additional c70 dwellings would be undertaken on the identified safeguarded land on Banksfield Farm, would result in the removal of several TPO trees which contribute to the visual amenity of the area. The removal of these trees would detrimentally impact upon Lime Grove and Derby Road character and appearance. NPPF 151. States that once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Diane Webster	Response-01177	plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. This development will remove existing green spaces forever which residents currently have access to including footpath, walks and visual vistas and spatial openness. NPPF 192. States that to protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity. The land south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of trees and wildlife including squirrels and badgers. The development on this land will kill wildlife and destroy historic trees and wildlife in the area. This is reckless when existing Brownfield sites existing in EBC which should be used first before Green Belt. "NPPF 2. States it has three objectives to enable sustainable development. The third of these is an environmental objective ? to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy. The EBCs proposal of reclassifying the land South West of Draycott from Greenbelt to Greenbelt land does not meet this objective and will actually achieve the total opposite. "

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Donna Butcher	Response-01155	<p>Recognise the loss of the ecology in the area and the importance of the flora, fauna and wildlife. Unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape. This is a colossal development which is not appropriate for the location chosen. The development will negatively impact the ecology, wildlife and beauty of the area. The taking away of grazing/arable land and the disruption for the wildlife. These decisions are irreversible, and our children will have less open countryside to explore and play in. Losing safe connecting space between locations. This when existing and available Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised over Greenbelt. The land to the south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of wildlife from birds, foxes, hedgehogs and squirrels and the development of 190 homes will mean the death of many different animals and the destruction of this mature natural habitat. These plans plus the plans for National Grid to install super pylons only circa 600 meters away means the south west area of Draycott, will be hugely impacted from both a conservation and natural environment perspective. This area of the village will be unrealistically overburdened with development on Green Belt and green spaces. The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the village of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. The proposed site south west of Draycott and the second phase of the development which would mean that in addition to the initial 190 houses, the development of an additional c70 dwellings would be undertaken on the identified safeguarded land on Banksfield Farm, would result in the removal of several TPO trees which contribute to the visual amenity of the area. The removal of these trees would detrimentally impact upon Lime Grove and Derby Road character and appearance. NPPF 151. States that once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. This development will remove existing green spaces forever which residents currently have access to including footpath, walks and visual vistas and spatial openness. NPPF 192. States that to protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity. The land south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of trees and wildlife including squirrels and badgers. The development on this land will kill wildlife and destroy historic trees and wildlife in the area. This is reckless when existing Brownfield si</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Donna Butcher	Response-01155	<p>tes existing in EBC which should be used first before Green Belt. NPPF 2. States it has three objectives to enable sustainable development. The third of these is an environmental objective ? to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy. The EBCs proposal of reclassifying the land South West of Draycott from Greenbelt to Greenbelt land does not meet this objective and will actually achieve the total opposite.</p>

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Donna Peace	Response-01344	<p>1 Recognise the loss of the ecology in the area and the importance of the flora, fauna and wildlife. 5 2 Unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape. 6 3 This is a colossal development which is not appropriate for the location chosen. The development will negatively impact the ecology, wildlife and beauty of the area. 7 4 The taking away of grazing/arable land and the disruption for the wildlife. 8 5 These decisions are irreversible, and our children will have less open countryside to explore and play in. Losing safe connecting space between locations. This when existing and available Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised over Greenbelt. 9 6 Recognise the loss of the ecology in the area and the importance of the flora, fauna and wildlife. There is an opinion that the deer fencing would devalue the area of open farmland and public right of way. 10 7 This is a colossal development which is not appropriate for the location chosen. The development will negatively impact the ecology, wildlife and beauty of the area. 7 4 The taking away of grazing/arable land and the disruption for the wildlife. 8 5 These decisions are irreversible, and our children will have less open countryside to explore and play in. Losing safe connecting space between locations. This when existing and available Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised over Greenbelt. 9 6 Recognise the loss of the ecology in the area and the importance of the flora, fauna and wildlife. There is an opinion that the deer fencing would devalue the area of open farmland and public right of way. 10 7 This is a colossal development which is not appropriate for the location chosen. The development will negatively impact the ecology, wildlife and beauty of the area. 11 8 The land to the south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of wildlife from birds, foxes, hedgehogs and squirrels and the development of 190 homes will mean the death of many different animals and the destruction of this mature natural habitat. 12 9 These plans plus the plans for National Grid to install super pylons only circa 600 meters away means the south west area of Draycott, will be hugely impacted from both a conservation and natural environment perspective. This area of the village will be unrealistically overburdened with development on Green Belt and green spaces. 13 10 Following the excavation of the adjacent Derby Road to Draycott canal water voles were discovered and remedial action was taken during this work to prevent endangerment of this wildlife. When considering the adjacent development of 190 houses and the heavy and sustained construction traffic during the life cycle of the development, this will likely force this and other wildlife to relocate from the area. 14 11 Historical badger sett on part of the site to the Victorian tip at the bridge of Noonning Lane. 15 12 The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the village of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Donna Peace	Response-01344	<p>villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. 16 13 To safeguard and enhance biodiversity (including BAP Habitats and Species) and geodiversity and improve connectivity between, and access to, green spaces and functional habitats. This area forms a green corridor and houses a number of RED LIST species 17 14 The proposed site south west of Draycott and the second phase of the development which would mean that in addition to the initial 190 houses, the development of an additional c70 dwellings would be undertaken on the identified safeguarded land on Banksfield Farm, would result in the removal of several TPO trees which contribute to the visual amenity of the area. The removal of these trees would detrimentally impact upon Lime Grove and Derby Road character and appearance. 18 15 NPPF 151. States that once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. This development will remove existing green spaces forever which residents currently have access to including footpath, walks and visual vistas and spatial openness. 19 16 NPPF 192. States that to protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity. The land south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of trees and wildlife including squirrels and badgers. The development on this land will kill wildlife and destroy historic trees and wildlife in the area. This is reckless when existing Brownfield sites existing in EBC which should be used first before Green Belt. 20 17 NPPF 2. States it has three objectives to enable sustainable development. The third of these is an environmental objective ? to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy. The EBCs proposal of reclassifying the land South West of Draycott from Greenbelt to Greenbelt land does not meet this objective and will actually achieve the total opposite.</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Donna Wheatley	Response-00863	<p>There is an abundance of wildlife in the area which will be totally wiped out if the development is allowed to proceed, the proposed land is greenbelt for a reason, the wildlife will lose its current habitat and have nowhere else to go which is a travesty</p>



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Douglas Walker	Response-00994	This development will lead to the unnecessary damage to Greenfield and Green Belt sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape. NPPF 2. States it has three objectives to enable sustainable development. The third of these is an environmental objective ? to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy. The EBCs proposal of reclassifying the land South West of Draycott from Greenbelt to Greenbelt land does not meet this objective and will actually achieve the total opposite. NPPF 192. States that to protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity. The land south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of trees and wildlife including squirrels and badgers. The development on this land will kill wildlife and destroy historic trees and wildlife in the area. This is reckless when existing Brownfield sites existing in EBC which should be used first before Green Belt. NPPF 151. States that once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. This development will remove existing green spaces forever which residents currently have access to including footpath, walks and visual vistas and spatial openness. The proposed site south west of Draycott and the second phase of the development which would mean that in addition to the initial 190 houses, the development of an additional c70 dwellings would be undertaken on the identified safeguarded land on Banksfield Farm, would result in the removal of several TPO trees which contribute to the visual amenity of the area. The removal of these trees would detrimentally impact upon Lime Grove and Derby Road character and appearance. To safeguard and enhance biodiversity (including BAP Habitats and Species) and geodiversity and improve connectivity between, and access to, green spaces and functional habitats. This area forms a green corridor and houses a number of RED LIST species. there is a historical badger sett on part of the site to the Victorian tip at the bridge of Nooning Lane. there is also deer and other wildlife including bats in Banksfield Farm and. There is recent video and photographic evidence of this in the area. This development will destroy this local wildlife and natural habitats. How will the development mitigate these risk? Following the excavation of the adjacent Derby Road to Draycott canal water voles were discovered and remedial action was taken during this work to prevent endangerment of this wildlife. When considering the adjacent development of 190 houses and the heavy and sustained construction traffic during the life cycle of the development, this will likely force this and other wildlife to relocate from the area.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Dr Shelagh Brown	Response-01158	It will be detrimental to wildlife.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Dudley Medhurst	Response-01180	This is a rural area and wildlife is in abundance. Building will decimate nesting places and roosts (bats have been recorded here and under UK law are protected) . There are also badger setts on the prosed site.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Francis Ian Scott	Response-01535	Recognise the loss of the ecology in the area and the importance of the flora, fauna and wildlife. Unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape. This is a colossal development which is not appropriate for the location chosen. The development will negatively impact the ecology, wildlife and beauty of the area. The taking away of grazing/arable land and the disruption for the wildlife. These decisions are irreversible, and our children will have less open countryside to explore and play in. Losing safe connecting space between locations. This when existing and available Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised over Greenbelt. Recognise the loss of the ecology in the area and the importance of the flora, fauna and wildlife. There is an opinion that the deer fencing would devalue the area of open farmland and public right of way. This is a colossal development which is not appropriate for the location chosen. The development will negatively impact the ecology, wildlife and beauty of the area. The land to the south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of wildlife from birds, foxes, hedgehogs and squirrels and the development of 190 homes will mean the death of many different animals and the destruction of this mature natural habitat. These plans plus the plans for National Grid to install super pylons only circa 600 meters away means the south west area of Draycott, will be hugely impacted from both a conservation and natural environment perspective. This area of the village will be unrealistically overburdened with development on Green Belt and green spaces. Following the excavation of the adjacent Derby Road to Draycott canal water voles were discovered and remedial action was taken during this work to prevent endangerment of this wildlife. When considering the adjacent development of 190 houses and the heavy and sustained construction traffic during the life cycle of the development, this will likely force this and other wildlife to relocate from the area. Historical badger sett on part of the site to the Victorian tip at the bridge of Nooning Lane. The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the village of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. To safeguard and enhance biodiversity (including BAP Habitats and Species) and geodiversity and improve connectivity between, and access to, green spaces and functional habitats. This area forms a green corridor and houses a number of RED LIST species The proposed site south west of Draycott and the second phase of the development which would mean that in addition to the initial 190 houses, the development of an additional c70 dwellings would be undertaken on the identified safeguarded land on Banksfield Farm, would result in the removal of several TPO trees which contribute to the visual amenity of the area. The removal of these trees would detrimentally impact upon Lime Grove and Derby Road character and appe

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Francis Ian Scott	Response-01595	arance. NPPF 151. States that once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. This development will remove existing green spaces forever which residents currently have access to including footpath, walks and visual vistas and spatial openness. NPPF 192. States that to protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity. The land south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of trees and wildlife including squirrels and badgers. The development on this land will kill wildlife and destroy historic trees and wildlife in the area. This is reckless when existing Brownfield sites existing in EBC which should be used first before Green Belt. NPPF 2. States it has three objectives to enable sustainable development. The third of these is an environmental objective ? to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy. The EBCs proposal of reclassifying the land South West of Draycott from Greenbelt to Greenbelt land does not meet this objective and will actually achieve the total opposite.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Gail Holdsworth	Response-00937	The village is surrounded by wildlife and nature reserves. Chad Water for example. The proposed sites proximity to the river and other bodies of water make it a haven for wildlife. Why is green belt and protected areas like trees being used when there is plenty of brown field and grey belt available. There are paths and walks around Draycott that are well used by residents for dog walking and for the positive effect in mental health, for adults but especially for children.
			Garry Hickton	Response-01473	Bats and other wildlife live in the area concerned
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Gary Siddall	Response-01237	This site not only has a number of protected trees/woodland areas, but is also many species of wildlife too: It is known - and recorded - that the area is home to various species of hedgehogs, squirrels, foxes, and also deer, bats and badgers. As well as these there are many types of birds - importantly, including some on the "Red List" - which use or return to the area annually, for their nesting habitat. Obviously, their whole environment will be destroyed, with no chance of it ever coming back again. A few years ago, Water Voles were discovered at an adjacent site on Derby Road and immediately, steps were taken to protect them. Now, due to the close proximity of this proposed housing site, it is highly possible that it's development could affect/disrupt the Voles' colonies... As Water Voles are legally protected in the UK, has this been properly investigated/assessed ??
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Gemma Woolnough	Response-01394	The land this development is planned for is precious green belt land, which provides homes for lots of nature & wildlife. By building on this land it would negatively impact the wildlife in the area due to a significant loss of habitat. Deer, badgers, foxes, pheasants, barn owls & bats and many bird species have been seen on this land, all of which would be displaced if this housing development were to go ahead. Also being very close to multiple water sources water vole have also been seen in the very near surrounding areas. As more and more green belt land is being built on this will only continue to get worse with less & less places for wildlife to live in leading to a loss of biodiversity in Draycott and surrounding villages but also negatively disrupting vital ecosystems.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	George Foster	Response-01199	This development will lead to the loss of the ecology in the area and the importance of the flora, fauna and wildlife and the unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape, and will take away grazing/arable land and the disruption for the wildlife. This is a colossal development which is not appropriate for the location chosen. The development will negatively impact the ecology, wildlife and beauty of the area. These decisions are irreversible, and our children will have less open countryside to explore and play in. Losing safe connecting space between locations. This when existing and available Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised over Greenbelt. The land to the south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of wildlife from birds, foxes, hedgehogs and squirrels and the development of 190 homes will mean the death of many different animals and the destruction of this mature natural habitat. These plans plus the plans for National Grid to install super pylons only circa 600 meters away means the south west area of Draycott, will be hugely impacted from both a conservation and natural environment perspective. This area of the village will be unrealistically overburdened with development on Green Belt and green spaces. Following the excavation of the adjacent Derby Road to Draycott canal water voles were discovered and remedial action was taken during this work to prevent endangerment of this wildlife. When considering the adjacent development of 190 houses and the heavy and sustained construction traffic during the life cycle of the development, this will likely force this and other wildlife to relocate from the area. Historical badger sett on part of the site to the Victorian tip at the bridge of Nooning Lane. The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the village of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. To safeguard and enhance biodiversity (including BAP Habitats and Species) and geodiversity and improve connectivity between, and access to, green spaces and functional habitats. This area forms a green corridor and houses a number of RED LIST species The proposed site south west of Draycott and the second phase of the development which would mean that in addition to the initial 190 houses, the development of an additional c70 dwellings would be undertaken on the identified safeguarded land on Banksfield Farm, would result in the removal of several TPO trees which contribute to the visual amenity of the area. The removal of these trees would detrimentally impact upon Lime Grove and Derby Road character and appearance. NPPF 151. States that once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve dam
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	George Foster	Response-01199	aged and derelict land. This development will remove existing green spaces forever which residents currently have access to including footpath, walks and visual vistas and spatial openness. NPPF 192. States that to protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity. The land south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of trees and wildlife including squirrels and badgers. The development on this land will kill wildlife and destroy historic trees and wildlife in the area. This is reckless when existing Brownfield sites existing in EBC which should be used first before Green Belt. NPPF 2. States it has three objectives to enable sustainable development. The third of these is an environmental objective ? to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy. The EBCs proposal of reclassifying the land South West of Draycott from Greenbelt to Greenbelt land does not meet this objective and will actually achieve the total opposite.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Gerri Hickton	Response-01472	The area is a haven for wildlife. I have personally seen bats, Mont jack deer and a barn owl.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Gill Trickitt	Response-01157	There are multiple protected wildlife that live I the area. Deer fawn wandering in the fields in question just last week. How is this move going to be anything other than negative for the wildlife living in this GREEN belt area.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Gordon Dahill	Response-00690	The woods hedges and field borders are home to much wild life, and the field itself. These also help to CO2 and other emissions. Badgers foxes hedgehogs little owls greater spotted woodpeckers green woodpeckers buzzards sparrow hawkes (nesting in the trees) many smaller birds blue tits great tits gold finchand many others. Occasionally a rare little egret when the field is waterlogged behind Lime Grove .
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Graham Wakeling	Response-01238	I strongly object to the to the proposed reclassification of greenbelt land, Wildlife and biodiversity will be heavily affected, and will not recover, Wildlife will be forced away from its natural habits and closer to dangerous inner city locations. Biodiversity will be massively affected, many wild plants will be destroyed and lost forever. Newt populations will also suffer. From a human prospective green spaces, trees and wild life are important to local residents mental health and wellbeing.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Hannah McMaster	Response-01381	The site earmarked for development is a natural habitat for hordes of wildlife including bats and badgers. This would devastate their natural habitat
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Hannah Pritchard	Response-01399	The development would result in the destruction of mature hedgerows, open grassland, and habitats vital for local wildlife, including bats, owls, badgers, and newts which have been reported in the area. Disruption to the local ecosystem cannot be reversed. The removal of these green spaces would break ecological corridors and have a knock-on effect on biodiversity in the wider area. No adequate mitigation or biodiversity net gain strategy has been demonstrated.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jacqueline Hyett	Response-01548	The land to the south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of wildlife from birds, foxes, hedgehogs and squirrels and the development of 190 homes will mean the death of many different animals and the destruction of this mature natural habitat. Recognise the loss of the ecology in the area and the importance of the flora, fauna and wildlife. Unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape. The taking away of grazing/arable land and the disruption for the wildlife.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	James Hargreaves	Response-01315	1. Loss of Recreational Land: The development will eliminate open green spaces used by locals for leisure, negatively affecting mental health and community wellbeing. 2. Threat to Wildlife: The area supports diverse wildlife, including red-listed species like hedgehogs, foxes, squirrels, and birds. Construction will destroy habitats, despite the availability of brownfield alternatives. 3. Protected Species: The site is home to protected bats and deer. Bats are safeguarded under UK law, and development will disrupt their habitats. Deer also play a role in maintaining ecological balance and will be displaced. 4. Visual Impact: The development will obstruct scenic views and reduce the rural character of the area. 5. Tree Protection: Many trees in the area are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) and must remain untouched.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	James Whyman	Response-01551	1 Recognise the loss of the ecology in the area and the importance of the flora, fauna and wildlife. 2 Unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape. 3 This is a colossal development which is not appropriate for the location chosen. The development will negatively impact the ecology, wildlife and beauty of the area. 4 The taking away of grazing/arable land and the disruption for the wildlife. 5 These decisions are irreversible, and our children will have less open countryside to explore and play in. Losing safe connecting space between locations. This when existing and available Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised over Greenbelt. 6 Recognise the loss of the ecology in the area and the importance of the flora, fauna and wildlife. There is an opinion that the deer fencing would devalue the area of open farmland and public right of way. 7 This is a colossal development which is not appropriate for the location chosen. The development will negatively impact the ecology, wildlife and beauty of the area. 8 The land to the south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of wildlife from birds, foxes, hedgehogs and squirrels and the development of 190 homes will mean the death of many different animals and the destruction of this mature natural habitat. 9 These plans plus the plans for National Grid to install super pylons only circa 600 meters away means the south west area of Draycott, will be hugely impacted from both a conservation and natural environment perspective. This area of the village will be unrealistically overburdened with development on Green Belt and green spaces. 10 Following the excavation of the adjacent Derby Road to Draycott canal water voles were discovered and remedial action was taken during this work to prevent endangerment of this wildlife. When considering the adjacent development of 190 houses and the heavy and sustained construction traffic during the life cycle of the development, this will likely force this and other wildlife to relocate from the area. 11 Historical badger sett on part of the site to the Victorian tip at the bridge of Nooning Lane. 12 The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the village of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. 13 To safeguard and enhance biodiversity (including BAP Habitats and Species) and geodiversity and improve connectivity between, and access to, green spaces and functional habitats. This area forms a green corridor and houses a number of RED LIST species 14 The proposed site south west of Draycott and the second phase of the development which would mean that in addition to the initial 190 houses, the development of an additional c70 dwellings would be undertaken on the identified safeguarded land on Banksfield Farm, would result in the removal of several TPO trees which contribute to the visual amenity of the area. The removal of these trees would detrimentally impact upon Lime Grove
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	James Whyman	Response-01551	and Derby Road character and appearance. 15 NPPF 151. States that once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. This development will remove existing green spaces forever which residents currently have access to including footpath, walks and visual vistas and spatial openness. 16 NPPF 192. States that to protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity. The land south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of trees and wildlife including squirrels and badgers. The development on this land will kill wildlife and destroy historic trees and wildlife in the area. This is reckless when existing Brownfield sites existing in EBC which should be used first before Green Belt. 17 NPPF 2. States it has three objectives to enable sustainable development. The third of these is an environmental objective ? to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jane Barker	Response-01178	This area of Draycott is home to a wide range of wildlife including 4 species (maybe now more during the warmer climate) of bats (which are by law protected), badgers, deer, foxes and many many other small mammals. This also includes a very wide range of birds including Owls and sparrowhawks using as nesting areas.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	J Morgan	Response-01847	The area has an abundance of wildlife, including protected species such as bats and many migrating birds. These animals and birds will lose their habitats and nesting sites, which is not protecting our fragile environment or providing for biodiversity in our green spaces. The development will damage the biodiversity of the site and adjoining Green Belt. The area has an abundance of wildlife, including protected species. This development will remove grazing land, a valuable asset for horses, and scatter local wildlife, leading to the loss of habitats.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	John Brayshaw	Response-01379	Too much natural habitat is being destroyed. We already see an increase in the urban foxes in the area and this is a known habitat area for them as well as the pipistral bats too.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jonathan Childs	Response-01117	This is a colossal development which is not appropriate for the location chosen. The development will negatively impact the ecology, wildlife and beauty of the area and is totally disproportionate to the existing population. The taking away of grazing/arable land and the disruption for the wildlife. While this may no longer be required by the farm, why should the adjacent residents suffer the imposition of a new (and largely unwanted) development when this area has been protected for so long? These decisions are irreversible, and our children will have less open countryside to explore and play in. Losing safe connecting space between locations. This when existing and available Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised over Greenbelt. The land to the south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of wildlife from birds, foxes, hedgehogs and squirrels as well as a considerable number of protected species. The development of 190+ homes will mean the 'eviction' or death of many different animals and the destruction of this mature natural habitat. Following the excavation of the adjacent Derby Road to Draycott canal water voles were discovered and remedial action was taken during this work to prevent endangerment of this wildlife. When considering the adjacent development of 190+ houses and the heavy and sustained construction traffic during the life cycle of the development, this will likely force this and other wildlife to relocate from the area and disturb or destroy the present ecological balance of the area. To safeguard and enhance biodiversity (including BAP Habitats and Species) and geodiversity and improve connectivity between, and access to, green spaces and functional habitats. This area forms a green corridor and houses a number of RED LIST species. The proposed site and the second phase of the development which would mean that in addition to the initial 190 houses, the development of an additional c70 dwellings would be undertaken on the identified safeguarded land on Bankfields Farm, would result in the removal of several TPO trees which contribute to the visual amenity of the area. The removal of these trees would detrimentally impact upon Lime Grove and Derby Road character and appearance and overall, destroy something which has been protected for many, many years merely for political reasons! NPPF 151. States that once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. This development will remove existing green spaces forever which residents currently have access to including footpath, walks and visual vistas and spatial openness. NPPF 192. States that to protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity. The land south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of trees and wildlife including squirrels and badgers. The development on this land will kill wildlife and destroy historic trees and wildlife in the area. This is reckless when existing Brownfield sites existing in EB
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jonathan Childs	Response-01117	C which should be used first before Green Belt. NPPF 2. States it has three objectives to enable sustainable development. The third of these is an environmental objective ? to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy. The EBCs proposal of reclassifying the land South West of Draycott from Greenbelt to Greenbelt land does not meet this objective and will actually achieve the total opposite. In addition to the above, there is a large wildlife population which includes a considerable number of protected species in a wooded/hedgerow area immediately located between one of the main site areas and the ironically-named 'safeguarded' field adjacent. The development cannot proceed without consideration of this and to do so is fundamentally illegal!
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Jonathan Fletcher	Response-01463	There are currently thousands of varied species of wildlife using the green space as home. This will destroy and kill many of those and I feel very strongly about this!!
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Judith Boyle	Response-01418	The land to the south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of wildlife from birds, foxes, hedgehogs and squirrels and the development of 190 homes will mean the death of many different animals and the destruction of this mature natural habitat. To safeguard and enhance biodiversity (including BAP Habitats and Species) and geodiversity and improve connectivity between, and access to, green spaces and functional habitats. This area forms a green corridor and houses a number of RED LIST species
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Julie Pleass	Response-01526	The land to the south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of wildlife from birds, foxes, hedgehogs and squirrels and the development of 190 homes will mean the death of many different animals and the destruction of this mature natural habitat. These plans plus the plans for National Grid to install super pylons only circa 600 meters away means the south west area of Draycott, will be hugely impacted from both a conservation and natural environment perspective. This area of the village will be unrealistically overburdened with development on Green Belt and green spaces. Following the excavation of the adjacent Derby Road to Draycott canal water voles were discovered and remedial action was taken during this work to prevent endangerment of this wildlife. When considering the adjacent development of 190 houses and the heavy and sustained construction traffic during the life cycle of the development, this will likely force this and other wildlife to relocate from the area.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Juliet Macve	Response-01572	The proposed area is very important to flora and fauna, both as a wildlife corridor and in its own right. The area either supports or is home to several endangered and declining species including, but not limited to, skylarks, house sparrows, little owls, hedgehogs, hares and various species of bat. In addition, water voles are present very close by, in the canal. The UK is amongst the world's most nature-depleted nations. Changing the status of this land away from greenbelt, and subsequently building on it will only go to further this trend and this is entirely reckless and unacceptable. There is insufficient alternative habitat for displaced wildlife to establish elsewhere, and any damage caused to the area is irreversible. The fundamental purpose of the Nottingham and Derby Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl and restrict development in order to preserve the countryside and the environment. This change absolutely does not fit in with those objectives. It is also entirely unrealistic that the rules noted below could be met in developing an area that is currently so rich in wildlife. Please see the following excerpts from the NPPF: Para 8 - "Achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has three overarching objectives, which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways ... c) an environmental objective ? to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy." Para 151 - "Once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, such as ... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity ..." Para 192 - "To protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should: a) Identify, map and safeguard components of local wildlife-rich habitats and wider ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity; wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them; and areas identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation; and b) promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity. In addition to the NPPF, the Town and Country Planning Act (as amended by the Environment Act), requires a biodiversity net gain of 10%.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Justine Murrin	Response-01478	This will cause significant loss to local wildlife, greenspace and local biodiversity. There are many brown sites that could be utilised to these new houses.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Karen Doxey	Response-01236	Recognise the loss of the ecology in the area and the importance of the flora, fauna and wildlife. Unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape. This is a colossal development which is not appropriate for the location chosen. The development will negatively impact the ecology, wildlife and beauty of the area. The taking away of grazing/arable land and the disruption for the wildlife. These decisions are irreversible, and our children will have less open countryside to explore and play in. Losing safe connecting space between locations. This when existing and available Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised over Greenbelt. This is a colossal development which is not appropriate for the location chosen. The development will negatively impact the ecology, wildlife and beauty of the area. The land to the south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of wildlife from birds, foxes, hedgehogs and squirrels and the development of 190 homes will mean the death of many different animals and the destruction of this mature natural habitat.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Katie May	Response-01518	Recognise the loss of the ecology in the area and the importance of the flora, fauna and wildlife. Unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape. This is a colossal development which is not appropriate for the location chosen. The development will negatively impact the ecology, wildlife and beauty of the area. The taking away of grazing/arable land and the disruption for the wildlife. These decisions are irreversible, and our children will have less open countryside to explore and play in. Losing safe connecting space between locations. This when existing and available Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised over Greenbelt. Recognise the loss of the ecology in the area and the importance of the flora, fauna and wildlife. There is an opinion that the deer fencing would devalue the area of open farmland and public right of way. This is a colossal development which is not appropriate for the location chosen. The development will negatively impact the ecology, wildlife and beauty of the area. The land to the south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of wildlife from birds, foxes, hedgehogs and squirrels and the development of 190 homes will mean the death of many different animals and the destruction of this mature natural habitat. These plans plus the plans for National Grid to install super pylons only circa 600 meters away means the south west area of Draycott, will be hugely impacted from both a conservation and natural environment perspective. This area of the village will be unrealistically overburdened with development on Green Belt and green spaces. Following the excavation of the adjacent Derby Road to Draycott canal water voles were discovered and remedial action was taken during this work to prevent endangerment of this wildlife. When considering the adjacent development of 190 houses and the heavy and sustained construction traffic during the life cycle of the development, this will likely force this and other wildlife to relocate from the area. Historical badger sett on part of the site to the Victorian tip at the bridge of Nooning Lane. The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the village of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. To safeguard and enhance biodiversity (including BAP Habitats and Species) and geodiversity and improve connectivity between, and access to, green spaces and functional habitats. This area forms a green corridor and houses a number of RED LIST species The proposed site south west of Draycott and the second phase of the development which would mean that in addition to the initial 190 houses, the development of an additional c70 dwellings would be undertaken on the identified safeguarded land on Banksfield Farm, would result in the removal of several TPO trees which contribute to the visual amenity of the area. The removal of these trees would detrimentally impact upon Lime Grove and Derby Road character and appe
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Katie May	Response-01518	arance. NPPF 151. States that once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. This development will remove existing green spaces forever which residents currently have access to including footpath, walks and visual vistas and spatial openness. NPPF 192. States that to protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity. The land south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of trees and wildlife including squirrels and badgers. The development on this land will kill wildlife and destroy historic trees and wildlife in the area. This is reckless when existing Brownfield sites existing in EBC which should be used first before Green Belt. "NPPF 2. States it has three objectives to enable sustainable development. The third of these is an environmental objective ? to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy. The EBCs proposal of reclassifying the land South West of Draycott from Greenbelt to Greenbelt land does not meet this objective and will actually achieve the total opposite. "
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Kayleigh Bonallie	Response-01375	The wildlife presenting in the proposed site is flourishing at the most it has ever been, badger sets, foxes, deer, bats etc all seen in the area, enjoying the natural green area. This build will impact protected animals

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Kelly Walker	Response-00911	The land to the south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of wildlife from birds, foxes, hedgehogs and squirrels and the development of 190 homes will mean the death of many different animals and the destruction of this mature natural habitat. Following the excavation of the adjacent Derby Road to Draycott canal water voles were discovered and remedial action was taken during this work to prevent endangerment of this wildlife. When considering the adjacent development of 190 houses and the heavy and sustained construction traffic during the life cycle of the development, this will likely force this and other wildlife to relocate from the area. The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the village of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. To safeguard and enhance biodiversity (including BAP Habitats and Species) and geodiversity and improve connectivity between, and access to, green spaces and functional habitats. This area forms a green corridor and houses a number of RED LIST species The proposed site south west of Draycott and the second phase of the development which would mean that in addition to the initial 190 houses, the development of an additional c70 dwellings would be undertaken on the identified safeguarded land on Banksfield Farm, would result in the removal of several TPO trees which contribute to the visual amenity of the area. The removal of these trees would detrimentally impact upon Lime Grove and Derby Road character and appearance. NPPF 151. States that once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. This development will remove existing green spaces forever which residents currently have access to including footpath, walks and visual vistas and spatial openness. NPPF 2. States it has three objectives to enable sustainable development. The third of these is an environmental objective ? to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy. The EBCs proposal of reclassifying the land South West of Draycott from Greenbelt to Greenbelt land does not meet this objective and will actually achieve the total opposite.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Kerry Naylor	Response-00993	There are numerous different species of wildlife that will be affected by development. The copse of trees in the field has birds of prey, buzzards as well as a well established nesting site of crows. The barn owl feeds in the filed area. Bats are seen every night feeding from the insects in the filed and nearby gardens. We have blue tits nesting in a bird box, who fly across the field to find food. Where will they find the natural food when the trees are gone?! Rabbits and foxes can be seen in the fields every day/evening. Where will they go? It cannot be right to affect the rural landscape for housing when wildlife is established.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Laura Charier	Response-01218	This is a colossal development which is not appropriate for the location chosen. The development will negatively impact the ecology, wildlife and beauty of the area. The land to the south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of wildlife from birds, foxes, hedgehogs and squirrels and the development of 190 homes will mean the death of many different animals and the destruction of this mature natural habitat. NPPF 151. States that once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. This development will remove existing green spaces forever which residents currently have access to including footpath, walks and visual vistas and spatial openness.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Laura Roffey	Response-01479	The loss of the greenbelt will have a huge negative effect on wildlife and biodiversity with the reduced open spaces, fields and hedgerows being lost.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Lee	Response-00742	1. The development will cause further loss of wildlife habitats like trees grasslands, hedges. When we first moved in, we regularly saw foxes, squirrels, rabbits, hedgehogs, frogs and the odd badger. Bird life was in abundance robins and finches were continuous visitors. At night you could & can see the Bats circling. Wildlife has already been negatively impacted by the development shoehorned in at 101 Derby Road. Anymore further building and sprawl will just decimate this end of the village's wildlife - how can this be justified?
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Lee Bunday	Response-00028	The review outlines significant housing expansion, much of which is planned near or within ecologically sensitive areas ? including woodlands, Grasslands and hedgerows that support a diverse range of species. However, the strategy does not sufficiently identify or safeguard priority habitats, nor does it provide robust measures to prevent habitat fragmentation, species displacement, or biodiversity loss. Key concerns include: A lack of detailed ecological assessments for the proposed development areas. Insufficient integration of green corridors and habitat connectivity into site plans. Absence of binding targets or enforcement mechanisms to ensure biodiversity net gain. Risk to protected species and loss of ecosystem services such as pollination, flood mitigation, and air purification. The Environment Act 2021 places a legal duty on planning authorities to ensure that new developments deliver measurable biodiversity net gain. This obligation appears to be under-addressed in the current Core Strategy Review. I urge the council to revise the strategy to include: Comprehensive ecological surveys and impact assessments. Requirements for developers to enhance, not just preserve, local biodiversity. Long-term monitoring and funding for habitat restoration. Strategic green infrastructure planning that connects and protects natural spaces. Without these steps, the strategy risks doing irreversible damage to local ecosystems and undermining commitments to environmental sustainability.



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Linda Jane Jenkins	Response-01007	I live at 93 Derby road. There are bats, foxes, hedgehogs and numerous birds. The wild life has already reduced with the building of Lace Gardens at the back of 91 and 93 Derby road. It isn't right that our green and pleasant land should be further diminished just because it is now easy to do this.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Louise and Shane Foster	Response-01219	This development seems to fly in the face of preserving our open spaces and wildlife, including protected species such as bats.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Louise Burnell	Response-00262	Loss of greenfield land will lead to destruction of natural habitats and negative impacts for local wildlife populations.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Luke Harper	Response-00898	This is green belt land with many beautiful trees.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Luke Hatch	Response-00160	The area includes open fields and hedgerows used by local wildlife. Losing this space disrupts nature and chips away at local biodiversity something we should be protecting, not replacing with tarmac. When Keir Starmer spoke about "Grey Belt land" he spoke about abandoned petrol stations, not green fields!
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Maggie Murphy	Response-00833	. EBC must acknowledge the loss of Ecology in the area and the importance of Flora, fauna and wildlife The irreversible and unnecessary damage to the planned site and adjacent greenfield environments The size of the development will damage the biodiversity of the site and the adjoining greenbelt. The area has an abundance of wildlife including numerous Badger sets, foxes, hares and deer. There are protected species such as Bats and many migrating bird including Swallows , Resident birds include Buzzards these animals and birds will lose their habitats and their annual breeding sites . This is not protecting our fragile environment or providing for biodiversity in our green spaces. This development will remove grazing land which is a valuable asset when used by horses to protect and retain the greenspaces and Green Belt. Once our local wildlife has been scattered by this development it will be lost as there will be nowhere to re-establish their habitats
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Martin Fawcett	Response-01077	See landscape comments
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Martin Kilcoyne	Response-01460	Recognise the loss of the ecology in the area and the importance of the flora, fauna and wildlife. Unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape. This is a colossal development which is not appropriate for the location chosen. The development will negatively impact the ecology, wildlife and beauty of the area. The taking away of grazing/arable land and the disruption for the wildlife. These decisions are irreversible, and our children will have less open countryside to explore and play in. Losing safe connecting space between locations. This when existing and available Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised over Greenbelt. Recognise the loss of the ecology in the area and the importance of the flora, fauna and wildlife. There is an opinion that the deer fencing would devalue the area of open farmland and public right of way. This is a colossal development which is not appropriate for the location chosen. The development will negatively impact the ecology, wildlife and beauty of the area. The land to the south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of wildlife from birds, foxes, hedgehogs and squirrels and the development of 190 homes will mean the death of many different animals and the destruction of this mature natural habitat. These plans plus the plans for National Grid to install super pylons only circa 600 meters away means the south west area of Draycott, will be hugely impacted from both a conservation and natural environment perspective. This area of the village will be unrealistically overburdened with development on Green Belt and green spaces. Following the excavation of the adjacent Derby Road to Draycott canal water voles were discovered and remedial action was taken during this work to prevent endangerment of this wildlife. When considering the adjacent development of 190 houses and the heavy and sustained construction traffic during the life cycle of the development, this will likely force this and other wildlife to relocate from the area. Historical badger sett on part of the site to the Victorian tip at the bridge of Nooning Lane. The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the village of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. To safeguard and enhance biodiversity (including BAP Habitats and Species) and geodiversity and improve connectivity between, and access to, green spaces and functional habitats. This area forms a green corridor and houses a number of RED LIST species The proposed site south west of Draycott and the second phase of the development which would mean that in addition to the initial 190 houses, the development of an additional c70 dwellings would be undertaken on the identified safeguarded land on Banksfield Farm, would result in the removal of several TPO trees which contribute to the visual amenity of the area. The removal of these trees would detrimentally impact upon Lime Grove and Derby Road character and appe

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Martin Kicoyne	Response-01460	arance. NPPF 151. States that once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. This development will remove existing green spaces forever which residents currently have access to including footpath, walks and visual vistas and spatial openness. NPPF 192. States that to protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity. The land south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of trees and wildlife including squirrels and badgers. The development on this land will kill wildlife and destroy historic trees and wildlife in the area. This is reckless when existing Brownfield sites existing in EBC which should be used first before Green Belt. "NPPF 2. States it has three objectives to enable sustainable development. The third of these is an environmental objective ? to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy. The EBCs proposal of reclassifying the land South West of Draycott from Greenbelt to Greenbelt land does not meet this objective and will actually achieve the total opposite. "
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mary Walsh	Response-01197	The land to the south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of wildlife from birds, foxes, hedgehogs and squirrels and the development of 190 homes will mean the death of many different animals and the destruction of this mature natural habitat. The proposed site south west of Draycott and the second phase of the development which would mean that in addition to the initial 190 houses, the development of an additional c70 dwellings would be undertaken on the identified safeguarded land on Banksfield Farm, would result in the removal of several TPO trees which contribute to the visual amenity of the area. The removal of these trees would detrimentally impact upon Lime Grove and Derby Road character and appearance. NPPF 192. States that to protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity. The land south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of trees and wildlife including squirrels and badgers. The development on this land will kill wildlife and destroy historic trees and wildlife in the area. This is reckless when existing Brownfield sites existing in EBC which should be used first before Green Belt.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Matthew Walker	Response-01313	This is a colossal development which is not appropriate for the location chosen. The development will negatively impact the ecology, wildlife and beauty of the area. The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the village of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. These decisions are irreversible, and our children will have less open countryside to explore and play in. Losing safe connecting space between locations. This when existing and available Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised over Greenbelt. Following the excavation of the adjacent Derby Road to Draycott canal water voles were discovered and remedial action was taken during this work to prevent endangerment of this wildlife. When considering the adjacent development of 190 houses and the heavy and sustained construction traffic during the life cycle of the development, this will likely force this and other wildlife to relocate from the area. To safeguard and enhance biodiversity (including BAP Habitats and Species) and geodiversity and improve connectivity between, and access to, green spaces and functional habitats. This area forms a green corridor and houses a number of RED LIST species The proposed site south west of Draycott and the second phase of the development which would mean that in addition to the initial 190 houses, the development of an additional c70 dwellings would be undertaken on the identified safeguarded land on Banksfield Farm, would result in the removal of several TPO trees which contribute to the visual amenity of the area. The removal of these trees would detrimentally impact upon Lime Grove and Derby Road character and appearance. NPPF 151. States that once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. This development will remove existing green spaces forever which residents currently have access to including footpath, walks and visual vistas and spatial openness. NPPF 192. States that to protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity. The land south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of trees and wildlife including squirrels and badgers. The development on this land will kill wildlife and destroy historic trees and wildlife in the area. This is reckless when existing Brownfield sites existing in EBC which should be used first before Green Belt. NPPF 2. States it has three objectives to enable sustainable development. The third of these is an environmental objective ? to protect
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Matthew Walker	Response-01313	and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy. The EBCs proposal of reclassifying the land South West of Draycott from Greenbelt to Greenbelt land does not meet this objective and will actually achieve the total opposite.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Melanie Wilson	Response-00974	The development will have a negative impact / use should be made of Brown field sites before even considering Greenbelt

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Michael Thirtwall	Response-01196	Unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape. This is a colossal development which is not appropriate for the location chosen. The development will negatively impact the ecology, wildlife and beauty of the area. The land to the south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of wildlife from birds, foxes, hedgehogs and squirrels and the development of 190 homes will mean the death of many different animals and the destruction of this mature natural habitat.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Michelle Marks	Response-00924	The proposed site is designated Green Belt land, which serves a critical role in preventing urban sprawl, protecting natural habitats, and maintaining the rural character of our countryside. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2023) explicitly states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances (Paragraph 140), and that inappropriate development should not be permitted unless very special circumstances exist (Paragraphs 149-150). No compelling justification has been provided to demonstrate that these criteria have been met. The environmental impact of this development would be devastating: Destruction of vital ecosystems ? The site is home to a range of wildlife, including birds, bats, and small mammals, which rely on this area for survival. Habitat destruction will result in biodiversity loss, contravening the Environment Act 2021, which mandates a 10% Biodiversity Net Gain.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Miss Ella Meredith	Response-01850	The area has an abundance of wildlife, including protected species such as bats and many migrating birds. These animals and birds will lose their habitats and nesting sites, which is not protecting our fragile environment or providing for biodiversity in our green spaces. The development will damage the biodiversity of the site and adjoining Green Belt. The area has an abundance of wildlife, including protected species. This development will remove grazing land, a valuable asset for horses, and scatter local wildlife, leading to the loss of habitats.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Miss Natalie Walsh	Response-01846	The area has an abundance of wildlife, including protected species such as bats and many migrating birds. These animals and birds will lose their habitats and nesting sites, which is not protecting our fragile environment or providing for biodiversity in our green spaces. The development will damage the biodiversity of the site and adjoining Green Belt. The area has an abundance of wildlife, including protected species. This development will remove grazing land, a valuable asset for horses, and scatter local wildlife, leading to the loss of habitats.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Miss Paige Murray	Response-01842	The area has an abundance of wildlife, including protected species such as bats and many migrating birds. These animals and birds will lose their habitats and nesting sites, which is not protecting our fragile environment or providing for biodiversity in our green spaces. The development will damage the biodiversity of the site and adjoining Green Belt. The area has an abundance of wildlife, including protected species. This development will remove grazing land, a valuable asset for horses, and scatter local wildlife, leading to the loss of habitats.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mr Graham Bingham and Mrs Kristine Bingham	Response-01302	The development will damage the biodiversity of the site and adjoining Green belt land. the area has an abundance of wildlife, including some protected species. This development will remove valuable grazing land and scatter local wildlife leading to the loss of habitats
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mr R Sykes	Response-00412	Destruction of habitat.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mr Scott Walsh	Response-01844	The area has an abundance of wildlife, including protected species such as bats and many migrating birds. These animals and birds will lose their habitats and nesting sites, which is not protecting our fragile environment or providing for biodiversity in our green spaces. The development will damage the biodiversity of the site and adjoining Green Belt. The area has an abundance of wildlife, including protected species. This development will remove grazing land, a valuable asset for horses, and scatter local wildlife, leading to the loss of habitats.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mrs Maria E Hardy	Response-00614	Beautiful wildlife will be destroyed and that another reason we love Draycott so much.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mrs Mary Walsh	Response-01845	The area has an abundance of wildlife, including protected species such as bats and many migrating birds. These animals and birds will lose their habitats and nesting sites, which is not protecting our fragile environment or providing for biodiversity in our green spaces. The development will damage the biodiversity of the site and adjoining Green Belt. The area has an abundance of wildlife, including protected species. This development will remove grazing land, a valuable asset for horses, and scatter local wildlife, leading to the loss of habitats.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mrs V Atkin	Response-01871	Not to mention the amount of wildlife that will be affected.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Mr Tony Walsh	Response-01849	The area has an abundance of wildlife, including protected species such as bats and many migrating birds. These animals and birds will lose their habitats and nesting sites, which is not protecting our fragile environment or providing for biodiversity in our green spaces. The development will damage the biodiversity of the site and adjoining Green Belt. The area has an abundance of wildlife, including protected species. This development will remove grazing land, a valuable asset for horses, and scatter local wildlife, leading to the loss of habitats.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Nat	Response-00158	The horses/ birds etc will loose their homes
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Neil Johnstone	Response-00725	This speaks for itself. Building a housing estate on green belt will ruin the wildlife of that area.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Nicole Howe	Response-00881	Habitat Protection Green Belt areas often contain: ? Woodlands, hedgerows, grasslands, and wetlands that support a wide range of species. ? Species include badgers, foxes, bats, hedgehogs, owls, bees, butterflies, and many types of birds. These spaces are especially important in regions where urban sprawl has already reduced natural habitats. 2. Wildlife Corridors ? Green Belts act as ?green corridors? allowing animals to move safely between habitats. ? This movement is vital for feeding, mating, and genetic diversity, particularly for species that are threatened or declining. 3. Protection for Pollinators ? Bees, butterflies, and other pollinators thrive in wildflower meadows and hedgerows. ? Their presence supports wider ecosystems, including agriculture, by aiding in plant pollination. 4. Buffer Against Extinction ? Many species in the UK are under threat due to habitat loss, pollution, and climate change. ? Green Belt land helps slow this decline by offering protected, undisturbed zones

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Nigel morton	Response-01351	We have lots of wildlife surrounding us and in the protected wooded area at the side of bankfield farm ,TPO88 ,as confirmed by ererwash Borough Council, there are 4 different sorts of bats ,foxes ,birds,deers and several badgers sets ,I fear where they will go to.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Nikki Riches	Response-00950	<p>? The new development is unnecessarily damaging green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape. ? This is a colossal development which is not appropriate for the location chosen. The development will negatively impact the ecology, wildlife and beauty of the area, which is highly important to the biodiversity of the area. ? The taking away of grazing/arable land and the disruption for the wildlife. ? These decisions are irreversible, and our children will have less open countryside to explore and play in. Losing safe connecting space between locations. This when existing and available Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised over Greenbelt. ? The land to the south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of wildlife from birds, foxes, hedgehogs and squirrels and the development of 190 homes will mean the death of many different animals and the destruction of this mature natural habitat. ? These plans plus the plans for National Grid to install super pylons only circa 600 meters away means the south west area of Draycott, will be hugely impacted from both a conservation and natural environment perspective. This area of the village will be unrealistically overburdened with development on Green Belt and green spaces. ? Following the excavation of the adjacent Derby Road to Draycott canal water voles were discovered and remedial action was taken during this work to prevent endangerment of this wildlife. When considering the adjacent development of 190 houses and the heavy and sustained construction traffic during the life cycle of the development, this will likely force this and other wildlife to relocate from the area, if not disappear. ? Historical badger sett on part of the site to the Victorian tip at the bridge of Nooning Lane. ? The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the village of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. ? To safeguard and enhance biodiversity (including BAP Habitats and Species) and geodiversity and improve connectivity between, and access to, green spaces and functional habitats. This area forms a green corridor and houses a number of RED LIST species ? The proposed site south west of Draycott and the second phase of the development which would mean that in addition to the initial 190 houses, the development of an additional c70 dwellings would be undertaken on the identified safeguarded land on Banksfield Farm, would result in the removal of several TPO trees which contribute to the visual amenity of the area. The removal of these trees would detrimentally impact upon Lime Grove and Derby Road character and appearance. ? NPPF 151. States that once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Nikki Riches	Response-00950	<p>and derelict land. This development will remove existing green spaces forever which residents currently have access to including footpath, walks and visual vistas and spatial openness. ? NPPF 192. States that to protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity. The land south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of trees and wildlife including squirrels and badgers. The development on this land will kill wildlife and destroy historic trees and wildlife in the area. This is reckless when existing Brownfield sites existing in EBC which should be used first before Green Belt. ? NPPF 2. States it has three objectives to enable sustainable development. The third of these is an environmental objective ? to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy. The EBCs proposal of reclassifying the land South West of Draycott from Greenbelt to Greenbelt land does not meet this objective and will actually achieve the total opposite.</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Oliver Kirk	Response-00569	The loss of greenspaces will reduce local wildlife, driving them to unfamiliar habitats and causing secondary chain issues far beyond the initial unsettling of this environment.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Owen	Response-01547	What steps will be followed to ensure that the wildlife in the surrounding areas will not be at risk.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Paul Allen	Response-01082	The green space provides an important corridor for wildlife, which will be impacted by light pollution and urban noise. There does not seem to be an Ecological survey carried by EBC prior to this proposal, which seems to be at odds with the Biodiversity Supplementary Planning Document.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	paul butcher	Response-01154	Recognise the loss of the ecology in the area and the importance of the flora, fauna and wildlife. Unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape. This is a colossal development which is not appropriate for the location chosen. The development will negatively impact the ecology, wildlife and beauty of the area. The taking away of grazing/arable land and the disruption for the wildlife. These decisions are irreversible, and our children will have less open countryside to explore and play in. Losing safe connecting space between locations. This when existing and available Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised over Greenbelt. The land to the south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of wildlife from birds, foxes, hedgehogs and squirrels and the development of 190 homes will mean the death of many different animals and the destruction of this mature natural habitat. These plans plus the plans for National Grid to install super pylons only circa 600 meters away means the south west area of Draycott, will be hugely impacted from both a conservation and natural environment perspective. This area of the village will be unrealistically overburdened with development on Green Belt and green spaces. The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the village of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. The proposed site south west of Draycott and the second phase of the development which would mean that in addition to the initial 190 houses, the development of an additional c70 dwellings would be undertaken on the identified safeguarded land on Banksfield Farm, would result in the removal of several TPO trees which contribute to the visual amenity of the area. The removal of these trees would detrimentally impact upon Lime Grove and Derby Road character and appearance. NPPF 151. States that once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. This development will remove existing green spaces forever which residents currently have access to including footpath, walks and visual vistas and spatial openness. NPPF 192. States that to protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity. The land south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of trees and wildlife including squirrels and badgers. The development on this land will kill wildlife and destroy historic trees and wildlife in the area. This is reckless when existing Brownfield si
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	paul butcher	Response-01154	tes existing in EBC which should be used first before Green Belt. NPPF 2. States it has three objectives to enable sustainable development. The third of these is an environmental objective ? to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy. The EBCs proposal of reclassifying the land South West of Draycott from Greenbelt to Greenbelt land does not meet this objective and will actually achieve the total opposite.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Paul Daniel Murrin	Response-01517	This will have a detrimental impact on the fauna and flora of this area.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Pauline Marks	Response-00927	The area supports a diverse range of wildlife, including protected species such as bats and nesting birds. The destruction of these habitats violates the principles of the Environment Act 2021, which requires a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain. Increased flood risk: Natural land currently helps absorb rainfall and reduce surface water runoff. Replacing it with impermeable surfaces will raise the risk of flooding in Draycott and nearby communities.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Peter Bates	Response-01912	The area has an abundance of wildlife including numerous Badger sets,foxes hares and Deer There are also protected species such as Bats and Water voles. Many migrating birds such as Swallows, Swifts, House and Sand Martins, Red Wings, aswell as Owls, Buzzards, Red Kites, Crows, Sparrows, Blackbirds, Thrushes, Robins, various Finches and Blue Tits, even Wood Peckers. This is by no means an exhaustive list but does gives a good idea of the variety of species that have their habitat on this Green Belt area. If this plan goes ahead these animals and birds will lose their habitats and their annual nesting sites.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Peter Sutton	Response-00409	The area is home to bats, badgers, foxes, birds, insects and too many species to name. Once this habitat is removed, it cannot be replaced.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	R Beresford	Response-01907	Along with all the loss of the wildlife in the wooded area through which the footpath runs, including Buzzards, green and Greater spotted Wood peckers - bats ,foxes, hedgehogs, owls ,sparrow hawks, also a little egret often in early spring behind our house while the field is waterlogged. All this habitat will be lost.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	R Fazackerley	Response-01415	The proposed development will adversely impact the local wildlife in the river Derwent valley and poses additional new risks to the river based on the proximity and scale of the development
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Richard Keith Hanbury	Response-01087	We currently get hedgehogs in the garden. There are deer in the field. Foxes inhabit this area along with hares, bats and many other animals. What right do we have to take their habitat. away from them.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Richard Syson	Response-01317	This is a colossal proposed development which is not appropriate for the location chosen. The development will negatively impact the ecology, wildlife and beauty of the area. This would cause appalling damage to green field sites by taking away grazing land, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape. NPPF 2. States it has three objectives to enable sustainable development. The third of these is an environmental objective ? to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy. The EBCs proposal of reclassifying the land South West of Draycott from Green Belt to Grey Belt land does not meet this objective and will actually achieve the total opposite.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Rick Howden	Response-01421	Following the excavation of the adjacent Derby Road to Draycott canal water voles were discovered and remedial action was taken during this work to prevent endangerment of this wildlife. When considering the adjacent development of 190 houses and the heavy and sustained construction traffic during the life cycle of the development, this will likely force this and other wildlife to relocate from the area. To safeguard and enhance biodiversity (including BAP Habitats and Species) and geodiversity and improve connectivity between, and access to, green spaces and functional habitats. This area forms a green corridor and houses a number of RED LIST species
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Ricky fisher	Response-00048	Lots of wildlife lives the area that the houses are going to be built in i often walk my dog along them and its full of badgers foxes rabbits birds owls you name it there in and along the area highlighted it will kill all of them
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Roger Brown	Response-00999	Bats, barn owls, badgers, deer and foxes are known to live in this area and have been surveyed. A recent bat survey showed the presence of 4 bat species resident in the area. There are a number of TPOs on the site.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Ruth Hawkins	Response-01277	The development on this land will kill wildlife and destroy historic trees and wildlife in the area. This is reckless when existing Brownfield sites existing in EBC should be used first before Green Belt. The development will negatively impact the ecology, wildlife and beauty of the area. The land is home to a significant amounts of wildlife from birds, foxes, hedgehogs and squirrels and the development of 190 homes will mean the death of many different animals and the destruction of this mature natural habitat. These plans plus the plans for National Grid to install super pylons only circa 600 meters away means the south west area of Draycott, will be hugely impacted from both a conservation and natural environment perspective and this area of the village will be unrealistically overburdened with development on what should be Green Belt and green space.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Sarah Hargreaves	Response-01314	1. Loss of Open Land: The development will result in the loss of open land frequently used by residents for recreation, negatively impacting mental health and wellbeing. 2. Impact on Wildlife: The land is home to significant wildlife, including red-listed species such as birds, foxes, hedgehogs, and squirrels. The development will destroy habitats and nesting sites, which is unacceptable when existing Brownfield sites can be used. The area also includes historical badger sets, Muntjac Deer, and potentially water voles, which are all protected species. The excavation and construction activities will likely force these animals to relocate, causing irreversible damage to the local ecosystem. 3. Protected Bats and Deer: The land Southwest of Draycott is known to be a habitat for protected bat species and deer. Bats are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. The development will disrupt their roosting sites and foraging areas, leading to a decline in their population. Similarly, the presence of deer in the area contributes to the biodiversity and ecological balance. The construction activities and subsequent human encroachment will severely impact their natural habitat. 4. Visual and Spatial Openness: The development will have a significant impact on the visual and spatial openness of the area, obstructing the landscape and diminishing the visual experience of the countryside. 5. Tree Preservation: Many the trees within the area are subject to TPO classification. These should remain protected.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Sara Walker-Bradley	Response-01440	There are barn owls and other wild life in this area, these habitats need to be kept.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Scott Gardner	Response-01554	The proposed housing development west of Draycott raises significant concerns regarding its impact on local wildlife and ecosystems. The land is described as greenfield arable land , which, while currently agricultural, can still support wildlife. Draycott is noted to be suitable for ground-nesting birds such as skylarks, and lapwings are also common in the area. The nearby Derby Canal, which the proposed development is close to, is a known wildlife haven, supporting smooth newts, frogs, fish, and potentially water voles. The Trust restoring the canal has even planted hedges at Draycott specifically to attract wildlife. Developing this Green Belt land for housing will inevitably lead to habitat loss. The construction process itself can cause direct harm to wildlife through land clearing and excavation, potentially destroying nests, burrows, and other important habitats. Noise and light pollution from the construction and the subsequent residential area can also disturb wildlife, affecting their feeding and breeding behaviours, and potentially causing them to avoid the area. While the provided research doesn't explicitly list protected species on this specific site, Derbyshire is home to several protected species, including the great crested newt, water vole, and various bat species. The loss of habitat due to this development could negatively impact these or other protected species that may be present in the area. The Erewash Valley, where Draycott is located, is identified as one of the key landscape areas in the Lowland Derbyshire Biodiversity Action Plan , highlighting the ecological importance of this region. It is crucial that a thorough ecological survey is conducted to identify the presence of any protected species or important habitats on the proposed development site. The potential for significant harm to local wildlife must be a key consideration in the planning decision, in line with national planning policies that aim to protect and enhance biodiversity. The long-term impact of habitat loss and fragmentation on the local ecosystem must be carefully weighed against the perceived benefits of this housing development.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Sean Peace	Response-01347	Recognise the loss of the ecology in the area and the importance of the flora, fauna and wildlife. 5 2 Unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape. 6 3 This is a colossal development which is not appropriate for the location chosen. The development will negatively impact the ecology, wildlife and beauty of the area. 7 4 The taking away of grazing/arable land and the disruption for the wildlife. 8 5 These decisions are irreversible, and our children will have less open countryside to explore and play in. Losing safe connecting space between locations. This when existing and available Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised over Greenbelt. 9 6 Recognise the loss of the ecology in the area and the importance of the flora, fauna and wildlife. There is an opinion that the deer fencing would devalue the area of open farmland and public right of way. 10 7 This is a colossal development which is not appropriate for the location chosen. The development will negatively impact the ecology, wildlife and beauty of the area. 7 4 The taking away of grazing/arable land and the disruption for the wildlife. 8 5 These decisions are irreversible, and our children will have less open countryside to explore and play in. Losing safe connecting space between locations. This when existing and available Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised over Greenbelt. 9 6 Recognise the loss of the ecology in the area and the importance of the flora, fauna and wildlife. There is an opinion that the deer fencing would devalue the area of open farmland and public right of way. 10 7 This is a colossal development which is not appropriate for the location chosen. The development will negatively impact the ecology, wildlife and beauty of the area. 11 8 The land to the south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of wildlife from birds, foxes, hedgehogs and squirrels and the development of 190 homes will mean the death of many different animals and the destruction of this mature natural habitat. 12 9 These plans plus the plans for National Grid to install super pylons only circa 600 meters away means the south west area of Draycott, will be hugely impacted from both a conservation and natural environment perspective. This area of the village will be unrealistically overburdened with development on Green Belt and green spaces. 13 10 Following the excavation of the adjacent Derby Road to Draycott canal water voles were discovered and remedial action was taken during this work to prevent endangerment of this wildlife. When considering the adjacent development of 190 houses and the heavy and sustained construction traffic during the life cycle of the development, this will likely force this and other wildlife to relocate from the area. 14 11 Historical badger sett on part of the site to the Victorian tip at the bridge of Nooning Lane. 15 12 The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the village of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the v
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Sean Peace	Response-01347	illages to living in the midst of a housing estate. 16 13 To safeguard and enhance biodiversity (including BAP Habitats and Species) and geodiversity and improve connectivity between, and access to, green spaces and functional habitats. This area forms a green corridor and houses a number of RED LIST species 17 14 The proposed site south west of Draycott and the second phase of the development which would mean that in addition to the initial 190 houses, the development of an additional c70 dwellings would be undertaken on the identified safeguarded land on Banksfield Farm, would result in the removal of several TPO trees which contribute to the visual amenity of the area. The removal of these trees would detrimentally impact upon Lime Grove and Derby Road character and appearance. 18 15 NPPF 151. States that once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. This development will remove existing green spaces forever which residents currently have access to including footpath, walks and visual vistas and spatial openness. 19 16 NPPF 192. States that to protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity. The land south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of trees and wildlife including squirrels and badgers. The development on this land will kill wildlife and destroy historic trees and wildlife in the area. This is reckless when existing Brownfield sites existing in EBC which should be used first before Green Belt. 20 17 NPPF 2. States it has three objectives to enable sustainable development. The third of these is an environmental objective ? to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy. The EBCs proposal of reclassifying the land South West of Draycott from Greenbelt to Greenbelt land does not meet this objective and will actually achieve the total opposite.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Simon Jenkins	Response-01287	We have badgers, foxes, Bats and owls frequently passing through the garden or spotted in the air. Again, obviously, it will greatly affect them.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	S M Beresford	Response-01851	The area has an abundance of wildlife, including protected species such as bats and many migrating birds. These animals and birds will lose their habitats and nesting sites, which is not protecting our fragile environment or providing for biodiversity in our green spaces. The development will damage the biodiversity of the site and adjoining Green Belt. The area has an abundance of wildlife, including protected species. This development will remove grazing land, a valuable asset for horses, and scatter local wildlife, leading to the loss of habitats. This will soon be concrete and noise if Erewash council have their way. Along with all the loss of the wildlife in the wooded area through which the footpath runs, including Buzzards green and Greater spotted Wood peckers - bats ,foxes, hedgehogs, owls, sparrow hawks, also a little egret often in early spring behind our house while the field is waterlogged. All this habitat will be lost.
	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Stephanie Ashley-Lane	Response-01380	There is so much protected wildlife in and around the farm area. They simply can't just be moved on.

PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Susan Baker	Response-01316	We're not just losing land?we're losing a way of life. That open space is where many of us walk, reflect, and connect with nature. It's home to red-listed birds, foxes, hedgehogs, and squirrels. There are badger sets, Muntjac deer, and possibly water voles?all of which will be displaced. Bats, protected by law, roost here too. Once these habitats are gone, they're gone for good. And let's not forget the trees?many of which are protected and should remain so.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Susan Foster	Response-00824	There is an abundance of wildlife in the area which will be affected by the building of that many houses, birds, especially those on the river Derwent will be put off nesting so close to habitation. There are foxes, hedgehogs, voles and mice which will be driven away.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Teresa Batchelor	Response-01240	The site proposed for development is a lovely, fairly unspoilt area, with a small copse and views down towards the river. I believe it is a precious site, which locals enjoy for walking, bird watching and general relaxation and its loss will be to the detriment of the village and the area generally.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Teresa Shaw	Response-01309	1. The development will cause further loss of wildlife habitats like trees grasslands, hedges. I regularly go on walks with the grandkids these areas are home to foxes, squirrels, rabbits, hedgehogs, frogs and the odd badger. Wildlife has already been negatively impacted by the development shoehorned in at 101 Derby Road. Anymore further building and sprawl will just decimate this end of the village's wildlife - how can this be justified?
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Tim Hawkins	Response-00661	The proposals will lead to the destruction of cropping and grazing land for horses. There are also bats, badgers, deer and numerous species of birds both within the hedgerow system and the protected coppice on the safeguarded area. The propensity for the drainage and sewerage system to overflow and pollute the water courses leading to the river will effect the fish, waterfowl and other population, especially in the short term where there will inevitably be run off from the building works.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Tom	Response-01477	That land is the home to many different animals.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Tony burton	Response-01382	Supposed to be greenbelt land what about the wild life
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Tracey Morton	Response-00968	1 Taking away arable and grazing land 2 these decisions are not irreversible, brownfield sites should be used and greenbelt protectex at all cost 3 There are a significant amount of animals in this area, birds 4 types of bats (protected), foxes, squirrels, deer hedgehogs which will have there habitat destroyed resulting in the death of many 4 Historical badgers sets (protected) on the victorian tip at nooning lane back g on to this site 5 loss of ecology in the area and the importance of fauna, flora and wildlife 6 The wooded area that the footpath goes though has Tpo 88 on it, as informed by ebc tree officer 7 the proposed development is to big, out of character for the area
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	T Shields	Response-00570	There is now in place a national requirement for all housing developments to provide a minimum 10% net gain in biodiversity. As such there is no reason why biodiversity concerns should weigh against the proposed development.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Viv Wright	Response-00035	World wide we are constantly being told we need to protect our natural world for the sake of our planet!! Meanwhile we appear to be destroying habitats locally to build houses!!!!
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	Wilfred Boone	Response-01424	NPPF 192. States that to protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity. The land south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of trees and wildlife including squirrels and badgers. The development on this land will kill wildlife and destroy historic trees and wildlife in the area. This is reckless when existing Brownfield sites existing in EBC which should be used first before Green Belt. To safeguard and enhance biodiversity (including BAP Habitats and Species) and geodiversity and improve connectivity between, and access to, green spaces and functional habitats. This area forms a green corridor and houses a number of RED LIST species The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the village of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate.
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	William Batchelor	Response-01210	destruction pf protected wildlife and woodland. Exisiting hedgerow and trees alongside on Derby Road likely to be removed by developers loosing more essential wildlife habitat



PolicyRef	Consultation Site	Response Category	Name of Responder	Response ID	Detail
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	zak butcher	Response-01156	<p>Recognise the loss of the ecology in the area and the importance of the flora, fauna and wildlife. Unnecessary damage to green field sites, resulting in an irreversible stain on the landscape. This is a colossal development which is not appropriate for the location chosen. The development will negatively impact the ecology, wildlife and beauty of the area. The taking away of grazing/arable land and the disruption for the wildlife. These decisions are irreversible, and our children will have less open countryside to explore and play in. Losing safe connecting space between locations. This when existing and available Brownfield sites within EBC should be prioritised over Greenbelt. The land to the south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of wildlife from birds, foxes, hedgehogs and squirrels and the development of 190 homes will mean the death of many different animals and the destruction of this mature natural habitat. These plans plus the plans for National Grid to install super pylons only circa 600 meters away means the south west area of Draycott, will be hugely impacted from both a conservation and natural environment perspective. This area of the village will be unrealistically overburdened with development on Green Belt and green spaces. The proposal is far too big overpowering the area completely changing the whole heritage and important landscape denying the village of Draycott and surrounding areas some of its most beautiful escapes to walk freely into the countryside as they have done so for many years. The area has an abundance of wildlife especially special and red species of birds who are frequently noted year on year in the area, these will all lose their annual nesting sites what a compromise! We/I wish to strongly object to the whole application it is in the wrong area and is condemning the villages to living in the midst of a housing estate. The proposed site south west of Draycott and the second phase of the development which would mean that in addition to the initial 190 houses, the development of an additional c70 dwellings would be undertaken on the identified safeguarded land on Banksfield Farm, would result in the removal of several TPO trees which contribute to the visual amenity of the area. The removal of these trees would detrimentally impact upon Lime Grove and Derby Road character and appearance. NPPF 151. States that once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. This development will remove existing green spaces forever which residents currently have access to including footpath, walks and visual vistas and spatial openness. NPPF 192. States that to protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity. The land south west of Draycott is home to a significant amount of trees and wildlife including squirrels and badgers. The development on this land will kill wildlife and destroy historic trees and wildlife in the area. This is reckless when existing Brownfield si</p>
1.14	South West of Draycott	Wildlife / Biodiversity	zak butcher	Response-01156	<p>tes existing in EBC which should be used first before Green Belt. NPPF 2. States it has three objectives to enable sustainable development. The third of these is an environmental objective ? to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy. The EBCs proposal of reclassifying the land South West of Draycott from Greenbelt to Greenbelt land does not meet this objective and will actually achieve the total opposite.</p>